COMMUNITY ORGANIZING OR
ORGANIZING COMMUNITY?
Gender and the Crafts of Empowerment

SUSAN STALL
Northeastern Illinois University

RANDY STOECKER
University of Toledo

This article looks at two strains of urban community organizing, distinguished by philosophy and often by gender, and influenced by the historical division of American society into public and private spheres. The authors compare the well-known Alinsky model, which focuses on communities organizing for power, and what they call the women-centered model, which focuses on organizing relationships to build community. These models are rooted in somewhat distinct traditions and vary along several dimensions, including conceptions of human nature and conflict, power and politics, leadership, and the organizing process. The authors conclude by examining the implications of this analysis and questions for further research and practice.

> Despite a rich and proud heritage of female organizers and movement leaders, the
> field of community organization, in both its teaching models and its major expo-
> nents, has been a male-dominated preserve, where, even though values are ex-
> pressed in terms of participatory democracy, much of the focus within the domi-
> nant practice methods has been non-supportive or antithetical to feminism. Strategies
> have largely been based on "macho-power" models, manipulativeness, and zero-sum
> gamesmanship.
>
> *Weil (1986, 192)*

Behind every successful social movement is a community or a network of com-
munities. When these communities are effectively organized, they can provide so-
cial movements with important benefits. The community is more than just the infor-
mal backstage relationships between movement members (Buechler 1990, 1993)

or the foundation for social movement action. It sustains the movement potential during the hard times, when the movement itself may be in abeyance (Robnett 1997; Taylor 1989). It provides for the social reproduction needs of movement participants, providing things as basic as child care so parents can participate in movement events (Stoecker 1992). It provides a free space (Evans and Boyte 1986) where members can practice "prefigurative politics" (Breines 1989; Robnett 1997), attempting to create on a small scale the type of world they are struggling for.

These communities do not just happen. They must be organized. Someone has to build strong enough relationships between people so they can support each other through long and sometimes dangerous struggles. Or, if the community already exists, it may have to be "reorganized" to support political action (Alinsky 1971). This process of building a mobilizable community is called *community organizing*. It involves the "craft" of building an enduring network of people, who identify with common ideals and who can act on the basis of those ideals. In practice, it is much more than micromobilization or framing strategy (Snow et al. 1986). Community organizing can, in fact, refer to the entire process of organizing relationships, identifying issues, mobilizing around those issues, and building an enduring organization. Community organizing is localized, often "prepolitical" action that provides the foundation for multilocal and explicitly political social movements.

The distinction between social movements and organized communities, and scholars' neglect of the latter, is part of a gender-biased analysis of social movements. We are only recently becoming aware of the community organizing work that can make great social movements (COMM-ORG 1998). It results in organizations like the Montgomery Improvement Association, which helped lead the famed Montgomery Bus Boycott (Morris 1984) and ultimately provided the impetus for a national civil rights movement. This is also why community organizing occurs much more as local phenomena—since it has historically focused on building a "localized social movement" in places as small as a single neighborhood (Stoecker 1993). Viewing social movements as the outcome of community-organizing processes can stand social movement analysis on its head, showing how "leaders are often mobilized by the masses they will eventually come to lead" (Robnett 1996, 1664).

Added to the neglect of community organizing by social movements scholars is insufficient understanding of the role that gender structures and identities play, even in social movements. Gender as a variable in social movements has only recently received much attention (Barnett 1993, 1995; Bookman and Morgen 1988; Caldwell 1994; McAdam 1992; Naples 1997; Robnett 1997; Stoecker 1992; Taylor 1996; Wekerle 1996; West and Blumberg 1990). Yet, the organizational structure and practices of social movement organizations and actors are not gender neutral. Gender structures, as social products of interactional work, are also produced and reproduced through social movement actions (West and Zimmerman 1987, 126). Within social movements, inequities in the sexual division of labor lead to a differential evaluation of leadership and organizing activities. In the New York Tenants movement, women were restricted to the grassroots organizing activities, while

men did the high-level negotiating (Lawson and Barton 1990). Gender also affects problem identification and tactical choices (Brandwein 1987, 122). In the 1960s' Freedom Summer project, male organizers worried about the consequences of white women recruits developing relationships with Black men in the South. In addition, men engaged in the more risky voter registration work, while women worked in less valued roles as teachers, clerical workers, and community center staff (McAdam 1986, 1992). The rhythm and timing of social movement work also fails to adjust to the rhythms of life, of caring work outside of organizing meetings and actions (Stoecker 1992). Or, when it does, the result is that women's movement involvement is restricted.

It is possible that community organizing is neglected for the same reasons that women's work in social movements has been neglected. Women's work and community organizing are both, to an extent, invisible labor (Daniels 1987). What people see is the flashy demonstration, not knowing the many hours of preparation entailed in building relationships and providing for participants' basic needs. Indeed, community organizing is the part of social movement work that occurs closest to the grass roots and is more often done by women (Krauss 1997; Robnett 1996, 1997). Even when men such as Saul Alinsky do it, it receives short shrift. And social movement analysis, with some exceptions (Robnett 1997; Stoecker 1992; Taylor 1989, 1996; Taylor and Rupp 1993; Taylor and Whittier 1992) has scarcely developed concepts that would even allow us to see this grassroots labor, far less understand it.

As a consequence, the gender structures and processes that influence community organizing are also neglected. Payne (1989, 1990, 1994), Barnett (1993, 1995), and Robnett (1996, 1997) have challenged accounts of the civil rights movement that neglect the central contributions of women activists. Barnett critiques social movement research as presenting "the erroneous image that 'all of the women are white, all of the Blacks are men' " (1993, 165). She argues against the narrow definition of social movement leadership that elevates the movement spokesperson, while neglecting the "leaders," often women, who serve as grassroots community organizers. Robnett (1996) showed how the "gendered organization" of the civil rights movement created a substructure of Black women leaders. But while some authors have examined and critiqued the Alinsky style of organizing (Lancourt 1979; Sherrard and Murray 1965; Stein 1986) or argued that there is a distinct way of women's organizing (Education Center for Community Organizing [ECCO] 1989; Haywoode 1991; Oppenheim 1991; Weil 1986), no one has compared these approaches.

TOWARD A GENDER ANALYSIS
OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING MODELS

Our analysis begins with the historical division of American culture into public and private spheres that split the "public" work done mostly by men in the formal

economy and government from the "private" work done mostly by women in the community and home (Tilly and Scott 1978). Our notion of the private sphere, however, is expanded beyond the family to include the neighborhood or small-scale local community. The cult of domesticity in the mid-19th century attempted to idealize and confine women's activities to the domestic private sphere, creating a safe haven in a cruel world and "protecting" women from the corrupting influences of a public sphere characterized by often brutal competition (Cott 1977). But African American, Latina, and Asian American women, treated as units of labor, were historically excluded from the dominant ideal of the family as a protected private haven (Glenn, Chang, and Forcey 1994). Instead, women of color and low-income women expanded the boundaries of mothering and the private sphere beyond the private household as they raised and nurtured children in extended family networks within communities struggling for survival (Collins 1991; Stack 1974). Central to the institution of Black motherhood, for example, are women-centered networks of blood mothers and "other mothers"—"women who assist blood-mothers by sharing mothering responsibilities" (Collins 1991, 119). The experience of community other mothers "stimulates a more generalized ethic of caring and personal accountability among African-American women who often feel accountable to all the Black community's children" (129), providing an important foundation for Black women's political activism. Today, men are not active in the expanded private sphere similarly to how they are not active in the family for the middle class, providing both the need for, and the possibility of, women shaping the private sphere of family and community (Stack 1974). More important, women cooperate to meet their social reproduction needs in this expanded private sphere, leading to a greater possibility of collective action than in the isolated private sphere work of middle-class women in the family private sphere.

The public and private spheres have always influenced each other (through routes such as the economic impact of women's unpaid domestic labor or the impact of economic policy changes on family quality of life) but have been organized around different logics with different cultures. The separation of spheres also led to important differences between men and women, and to two different community organizing styles. Community organizing typically begins in the expanded private sphere of the neighborhood. But because the neighborhood is not as isolated as the family, and its networks include secondary as well as primary relationships, it can also be a public sphere space. This may particularly be the case for the men in those neighborhoods, who are pressured by the separation of spheres to think of themselves as public sphere actors. Consequently, there is a public sphere approach and a private sphere approach to community organizing that parallels differences between the community experiences of men and women. The community organizing model we believe most exemplifies the public sphere approach has been most associated with Saul Alinsky. The community organizing model we believe best exemplifies the private sphere approach has been developed by a wide variety of women.

The Alinsky model begins with "community organizing"—the public sphere battles between the haves and have-nots. The women-centered model begins with "organizing community"—building expanded private sphere relationships and empowering individuals through those relationships.

The Alinsky model is based in a conception of separate public and private spheres. Community organizing was not a job for family types, a position he reinforced by his own marital conflicts, by his demands on his trainees, and by his own poverty. In fact, if anything, the main role of the private sphere was to support the organizer's public sphere work (Alinsky 1971). His attitude toward which issues were important also illustrates his emphasis on the public sphere. While problems began in the private sphere, it was important to move the community to understand how those problems were connected to larger issues outside of the community. Thus, problems could not be solved within the community but by the community being represented better in the public sphere (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 27-28). This is not to say that Alinsky ignored private sphere issues. His first successful organizing attempt, in Chicago's "Back of the Yards" neighborhood, produced a well-baby clinic, a credit union, and a hot-lunch program (Finks 1984, 21). But these programs were accomplished through public sphere strategizing, not private relationships. In establishing and maintaining the hot-lunch program, Alinsky pushed the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council (BYNC) to understand its relationship to the national hot-lunch program, including that "in order to fight for their own Hot Lunch project they would have to fight for every Hot Lunch project in every part of the United States" (Alinsky 1969, 168).

The women-centered organizing model has a long history but has only recently received much attention (Ackelsberg 1988; Barnett 1995; ECCO 1989; Gutierrez and Lewis 1992; Haywoode 1991; Naples 1997; Weil 1986; West and Blumberg 1990). For the women-centered model, while organizing efforts are rooted in private sphere issues or relationships, the organizing process problematizes the split between public and private, since it includes "activities which do not fall smoothly into either category" (Tiano 1984, 21). Women-centered organizing extends "the boundaries of the household to include the neighborhood" and, as its efforts move ever further out, ultimately tries to "dissolve the boundaries between public and private life, between household and civil society" (Haywoode 1991, 175). Women-centered organizing also often requires bridging a gap between the community's needs and its resources, mobilizing to demand necessary state resources and/or to engage in institutional transformation (Collins 1991; Pardo 1997). For African American women raising families in a deteriorating inner-city neighborhood, "good mothering" may require struggling for better schools, for improved housing conditions, or a safer neighborhood (Naples 1992), and demonstrates the importance of the connections between the spheres (Ackelsberg 1988). Within this type of organizing there is an emphasis on community building, collectivism, caring, mutual respect, and self-transformation (Barnett 1995).

It is important to note that we use these models as ideal type constructs and recognize they may not occur as mutually exclusive in the real world. Indeed, many Alinsky organizations have been reluctant to engage in public conflict (Bailey 1972; Lancourt 1979), and Alinsky followers such as Fred Ross, Cesar Chavez, and Ed Chambers increasingly emphasized private sphere issues and family and community relationship building (Industrial Areas Foundation 1978; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b). Because of our desire to understand the gender influences on the two models, we focus on the more traditional Alinsky-style organizing rather than recent adaptations by groups like the Industrial Areas Foundation (1978). Likewise, the women-centered model has to date not been portrayed as a model and thus its practitioners, many of whom are trained in Alinsky-style organizing, are very diverse. Nevertheless, the Alinsky and women-centered models are distinct strains of influence on community organizing.

In this article we examine how gender structures and identities play out in community organizing. After discussing the methodological approach of this article, we examine the historical roots and some basic characteristics of each tradition. Next, we explore some key differences between the two approaches. We then discuss the implications of each model and questions for further research and practice.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Our research draws on U.S. examples across five decades using secondary sources and our own community-based research to compare the Alinsky model and the women-centered model. Our development of these models comes from a distillation of a decade of work each of us has been doing in the field of community organizing. Our primary data consist of four intensive case studies. Two studies were conducted by the first author: a women's empowerment project for teenage mothers (Stall 1993) and women's activism in a Chicago public housing project (Feldman and Stall 1994; Feldman, Stall, and Wright 1997). Two studies were conducted by the second author: a Minneapolis community-based organizing and development campaign (Stoecker 1994) and a traditional Alinsky-style community organization in Toledo (Stoecker 1991, 1995). We have also selected numerous secondary data cases to illustrate the commonness of each model, based on a review of the existing literature and our knowledge of the field. All of these examples were chosen because they illustrated typical features of the models.

Our purpose is not to systematically test theories or evaluate the models. Rather, using a heuristic approach, we want to develop the models and begin exploring the possible dimensions across which they can be compared. Consequently, adapting Skocpol and Somers (1980), we are constructing "ideal types" that can show the unique internal logic of each model. Our review of the cases showed that there were

still some relatively pure Alinsky-style and women-centered organizing going on, as well as many mixed models. Understanding the mixed cases, however, is very difficult without first knowing the internal logic of the ideal type models. By positing the differentness of each model here, further research can more rigorously compare them and the consequences of their various combinations.

BACKGROUND OF THE ORGANIZING MODELS

The Alinsky Model

The very term *community organizing* is inextricably linked with the late Saul Alinsky, whose community organizing career began in the late 1930s. While a graduate student at the University of Chicago, he took a job to develop a juvenile delinquency program in Chicago's "Back of the Yards" neighborhood—a slum of poor Poles, Lithuanians, and Slovaks downwind of the Chicago Stockyards. When he arrived, the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) was organizing the male stockyard workers living there. Expanding the CIO model beyond workplace issues, Alinsky organized the BYNC from local predominantly male neighborhood groups, ethnic clubs, union locals, bowling leagues, and an American Legion Post. The success of BYNC in getting expanded city services and political power started Alinsky off on a long career of organizing poor urban communities around the country (Finks 1984; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b). Alinsky had little patience for the version of community organizing practiced by predominantly women social workers, saying, "They organize to get rid of four-legged rats and stop there; we organize to get rid of four-legged rats so we can get on to removing two-legged rats" (Alinsky 1971, 68). Alinsky also argued that a career as a community organizer had to come before all else, including family, and to enforce this he would keep his trainees up all hours of the night at meetings and discussions (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 10). Although he did not publicly discourage women from engaging in the work (Alinsky 1971), the sexual division of labor and the expectations for the job made it much easier for men to be organizers, especially if there was a wife or other woman to take care of an organizer's personal needs and those of any children (Acker 1990). Alinsky was also skeptical of women doing his kind of community organizing, fearing they were too delicate (Finks 1984).[1] Heather Booth, who went on to help found the Midwest Academy and Citizen Action, quit the Community Action Program of Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), believing that the IAF was not sensitive to women's issues and provided them with inadequate training (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b).

Alinsky's approach has influenced an entire generation of organizers, producing powerful organizations and visible victories across the country: Back of the Yards and TWO in Chicago, SECO in Baltimore, FIGHT in Rochester, MACO in Detroit,

ACORN in Little Rock, ETCO in Toledo, and COPS in San Antonio, among others. These organizations have in some cases saved entire communities from destruction and produced influential leaders who have gone on to change the face of the public sphere.

The Women-Centered Model

Unlike the Alinsky model, the women-centered model of community organizing cannot be attributed to a single person or movement. We trace the model to two main sources.

First, bell hooks (1990) notes the historic importance for African Americans of "homeplace" as a site to recognize and resist domination. hooks argues,

> Historically, African-American people believed that the construction of a homeplace, however fragile and tenuous (the slave hut, the wooden shack), had a radical political dimension . . . it was about the construction of a safe place where black people could affirm one another and by so doing heal many of the wounds inflicted by racist domination. (1990, 42)

Later, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, African American women involved in the Black Women's Clubs organized day care centers, orphanages, and nursing homes. Others, such as Ida B. Wells, organized campaigns around such issues as lynching and rape (Duster 1970; Giddings 1984; Gutierrez and Lewis 1992). While engaging in individual and group actions to create "Black female spheres of influence within existing structures of oppression," Black women often find that they must simultaneously work for institutional transformation (Gilkes 1988; Collins 1991, 141).

Anglo women's "municipal housekeeping" activities of the 19th and early 20th centuries are the second source of current women-centered organizing efforts.

> Then public spirited women, in attempting to overcome disapproval of their public role . . . explain[ed] that they were only protecting their homes and families by extending their activities from the home into the public arena. Women claimed the right to be guardians of the neighborhood, just as they were acknowledged to be guardians of the family. (Haywoode 1991, 180)

Since then, women have created numerous voluntary and benevolent associations to campaign for concrete reforms in local neighborhoods and broader reforms in municipal services, education, labor, housing, health care, and children's rights (Berg 1978; Haywoode 1991; Tax 1980). Perhaps the most famous of these activities were the settlement houses, founded primarily by college-educated white middle-class women who believed they should live in the neighborhood where they worked (Bryan and Davis 1990, 5). The most well-known settlement house organizer was Jane Addams, who with Ellen Gates Starr founded Hull-House on Chicago's west side in 1889. They developed parks, playgrounds, community services,

and neighborhood plans. They also participated in reform movements promoting labor legislation for women and children, care of delinquents, and women's suffrage. But community organizers often viewed them as engaging in charity work rather than adversarial social action (Brandwein 1981, 1987; Finks 1984, 96-97), and clinical social workers saw them as violating the detached casework method that emphasized individual treatment over social reform and community development (Specht and Courtney 1994).

The women-centered model also carries a history of success different from the Alinsky model. The activism of women in the early settlement movement, the civil rights movement, and the consciousness-raising groups of the radical branch of the 1970s' women's movement allowed women to challenge private and public arrangements in ways that would forever affect their relationships, housework, parenting practices, and career paths. The consequent changes in women's health care and women's knowledge of their own bodies, in cultural practices around dating and relationships, and the relationship between work and family are still reverberating through society. That these successes have not been better documented is due to the fact that struggles focused on the private sphere have been neither defined nor valued as important. Today, women of color and low-income/working-class women create and sustain numerous protest efforts and organizations to alter living conditions or policies that threaten their families and communities (Bookman and Morgen 1988; Garland 1988; Gutierrez and Lewis 1992; Haywoode 1991; McCourt 1977; Naples 1997; Rabrenovic 1995). These include, but are not limited to, tenant (Leavitt and Saegert 1990), low-income housing (Feldman and Stall 1994), welfare rights (Naples 1991), and environmental issues (Krauss 1997).

COMPARING THE MODELS

Human Nature and Conflict

The Alinsky model and the women-centered model begin from different starting points—first, the rough and tumble world of aggressive public sphere confrontation and second, the more relational world of private sphere personal and community development. Consequently, they have very different views of human nature and conflict.

Among all the tenets of the Alinsky model, the assumption of self-interest has the strongest continuing sway (Beckwith n.d.) and is greatly influenced by the centrality of the public sphere in the Alinsky model. Modern society, from Alinsky's perspective, is created out of compromise between self-interested individuals operating in the public sphere. This makes sense when we consider that the public sphere has been structured to emphasize competition between men—forcing a separation and the ever-present potential for conflict between the competitors (Brittan 1989; Illich 1982; Sherrod 1987). In addition, Nancy Chodorow (1978) has

effectively shown how young boys learn to separate themselves from others, while girls learn to connect with others, under the conditions of separated spheres where the parenting is solely the mother's responsibility. When brought together, these two perspectives show how self-interest is structured in the public sphere and socialized into its mostly male participants.

Thus, from a perspective that emphasizes the importance of the public sphere, organizing people requires appealing to their self-interest. The belief is that people become involved because they think there is something in it for themselves (Alinsky 1969, 94-98; 1971, 53-59). Alinsky's emphasis on self-interest was connected to his wariness of ideology. From his perspective, organizing people around abstract ideology leads to boredom at best and ideological disputes at worst. He did hope that, as the community became organized, the process would bring out "innate altruism" and "affective commitment." But even that level of commitment was based on building victories through conflict with targets (Lancourt 1979, 51; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987a; 1987b, 56). Alinsky relates the story of one organizer's effort to use the self-interest principle:

> Mr. David was a businessman who . . . had avoided participation in any kind of social-betterment program or community group. . . . His whole manner let me know that in his opinion I was just another "do-gooder" and as soon as I finished my song and dance he would give me a dollar or two and wish me well. I suddenly shifted from my talk on the children and began to point out indirectly the implications of his joining our organization. . . . I could almost hear Mr. David thinking . . . "And where could I get better business relations than at this meeting." Then David turned to me and said "I'll be at that meeting tonight." Immediately after I left David I went across the street to Roger, who is in the same business, and I talked to him the same way. Roger had a doubled-barreled incentive for coming. First there was David's purpose and secondly Roger wanted to make sure that David would not take away any part of his business. (1969, 95-97)

Since Alinsky saw society as a compromise between competing self-interested individuals in the public sphere, conflict was inevitable, and a pluralist polity was the means by which compromise was reached. Because poor people are at an initial disadvantage in that polity, the organizer's job is to prepare citizens to engage in the level of public conflict necessary for them to be included in the compromise process (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b). Reflecting the conflict orientation that is necessary for working in the masculine competitive public sphere, Alinsky contended that the only way to overcome the inertia that exists in most communities (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 70) was to "rub raw the resentments of the people in the community" (1971, 116), relying on symbols and images that reinforced a "successful forceful masculinity." The male-dominated world of sports and the military provided images and metaphors for building teamwork and for igniting competition and antagonism against opponents "to win" a particular movement campaign (Acker 1990, 152). To engage in the level of battle necessary to win, "the rank and

file and the smaller leaders of the organizations must be whipped up to a fighting pitch" (Alinsky 1969, 151). Alinsky treated the neighborhood as a public sphere arena, engaging small-scale conflicts within communities against unscrupulous merchants, realtors, and even entrenched community organizations, to build military-like victories and a sense of power (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 54, 65). Alinsky's involvement in 1960s' Rochester with the organization FIGHT, pressing for Kodak to support an affirmative hiring and jobs program, is illustrative. FIGHT began with a drawn-out negotiation process, and then Alinsky escalated to confrontational rhetoric and pickets. When Kodak reneged on a signed agreement, Alinsky and FIGHT organized a proxy campaign for Kodak's annual meeting. Forty members of FIGHT and Friends of FIGHT attended the meeting, demanded that Kodak reinstate its original agreement by 2:00 P.M., and walked out to 800 supporters in the street. They came back at 2:00 P.M. and were told Kodak would not reverse its position. Applying a military metaphor, the FIGHT leadership came out and told the crowd: "Racial War has been declared on Black communities by Kodak. If it's war they want, war they'll get." Threats of a major demonstration in July and further escalation of the conflict produced a behind-the-scenes agreement at the 11th hour (Finks 1984, 213-21).

Unlike the Alinsky model, women-centered organizing defines human nature from an ethic of care. This ethic is built on years of caretaking work in the family and the expanded private sphere, particularly in community associations (Stall 1991). The women-centered model begins with women's traditional roles in mothering, not inherently linked to biological sex but derived from a "socially constructed set of activities and relationships involved in nurturing and caring for people" (Glenn, Chang, and Forcey 1994). These activities and relationships become transformed by "community othermothers" in the Black community who build community institutions and fight for the welfare of their neighbors (Collins 1991). Building on Collins's work, Naples describes "activist mothering" as a broadened understanding of mothering practices "to comprise all actions, including social activism, that addressed the needs of their children and the community" (1992, 448).

Rather than a morality of individual rights, women develop a collectivist orientation (Robnett 1997) and learn a morality of responsibility connected to relationships (Gilligan 1977). Their activism is often a response to the needs of their own children and of other children in the community (Gilkes 1980). As Collins explains,

> Community othermothers' actions demonstrate a clear rejection of separateness and individual interest as the basis of either community organization or individual self-actualization. Instead, the connectedness with others and common interest expressed by community othermothers models a very different value system. (1991, 131-32)

Women-centered organizers view justice not as a compromise between self-interested individuals but as a practical reciprocity in the network of relationships that make up the community (Ackelsberg 1988; Haywoode 1991; Stall 1991).

Leavitt (1993) describes how concern for their children's welfare led a group of African American women in late 1980s' Los Angeles to focus on rehabbing the existing tot lots in their public housing development. In Nickerson Gardens, as in public housing across the country, women make up the overwhelming majority of grassroots organizers. This all-women tot-lot committee testified at housing authority hearings, conducted a community survey, and eventually secured funds and participated in the design and the construction of two play areas in their community.

Within the women-centered model, the maintenance and development of personal connections with others that provide a safe environment for people to develop, change and growth are more immediately important than conflict to gain institutional power (Kaplan 1982). For women, community relationships include the social fabric created through routine activities related to the expanded private sphere, such as child care, housekeeping, and shopping (DeVault 1991), as well as through social arrangements they make to protect, to enhance, and to preserve the cultural experience of community members (Bernard 1981). These communities of relationships serve as "free spaces" offering arenas outside of the family where women can develop a "growing sense that they [have] the right to work—first in behalf of others, then in behalf of themselves" (Evans and Boyte 1981, 61; 1986).

For the women of Wentworth Gardens Chicago public housing development, the basement self-service laundry is a "free space." In 1968, a group of women resident activists created and now continue to manage their own self-service laundry, providing both on-site laundry facilities and a community space that serves as a primary recruitment ground for community activists. The ongoing volunteer work of women residents during three decades has assured the self-service laundry's continued success. In addition, the women gained skills and self-confidence to further develop the community, leading them to open an on-site grocery store and obtain other improvements to their housing. A Resident Service Committee, made up of Laundromat volunteers, meets monthly to resolve problems and allocate self-service laundry profits to annual community festivals, scholarship funds, and other activities (Feldman and Stall 1994). Free spaces such as this resident service committee and the self-service laundry exist between the residents' individual private lives and large-scale institutions, grounded in the fabric of community life (Evans and Boyte 1986).

Power and Politics

Both models appear to have internally inconsistent understandings of power and politics. These inconsistencies are rooted partly in how each thinks about human nature, but they are also affected by how they deal with the public-private split. The Alinsky model sees power as zero-sum but the polity as pluralist. The women-centered model sees power as infinitely expanding but the polity as structurally biased. Understanding both the differences between the models and their seeming inconsistencies requires looking at how each deals with the public-private split.

For the Alinsky model, power and politics both occur in the public sphere. When power is zero-sum, the only way to get more is to take it from someone else—a necessity in a masculinized public sphere structured around competition and exploitation. Alinsky was adamant that real power could not be given but only taken. This view of power as zero-sum, modeled after predominantly male political and economic elites, means that one is either advantaged or disadvantaged, either exploiting or exploited (Acker 1990). Thus, poor communities could gain power through public sphere action—picking a single elite target, isolating it from other elites, personalizing it, and polarizing it (Alinsky 1971). The 1960s' Woodlawn Organization (TWO) was one of Alinsky's most famous organizing projects in an African American neighborhood on Chicago's south side. When TWO was shut out of urban renewal planning for their neighborhood, they commissioned their own plan and threatened to occupy Lake Shore Drive during rush hour. Not only did they get agreement on a number of their plan proposals; they also controlled a new committee to approve all future plans for their neighborhood, shifting control of urban planning from city hall to the neighborhood (Finks 1984, 153; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987a.

In women-centered organizing, power begins in the private sphere of relationships and thus is not conceptualized as zero-sum but as limitless and collective. "Co-active power" is based on human interdependence and the development of all within the group or the community through collaboration (Follett 1940; Hartsock 1974). The goal of a women-centered organizing process is "empowerment"—a developmental process that includes building skills through repetitive cycles of action and reflection that evoke new skills and understandings, and in turn provoke new and more effective actions (ECCO 1989; Kieffer 1984). Empowerment includes developing a more positive self-concept and self-confidence, a more critical worldview, and the cultivation of individual and collective skills and resources for social and political action (Rappaport 1986; Van Den Bergh and Cooper 1986; Weil 1986).[2] In the case of the Cedar Riverside Project Area Committee, an organization dedicated to planning resident-controlled redevelopment of a counter-culture Minneapolis neighborhood, tensions developed in the 1980s between those who emphasized building power as an outcome and empowering residents as a process. One woman organizer compares her approach with that of the lead organizer:

> I disagree with Tim, but he's a very empowering person. Tim is more Alinsky. For me, the process, not the outcome, is the most important. . . . The empowerment of individuals is why I became involved. . . . I was a single mother looking for income, and was hired as a block worker for the dispute resolution board, and gained a real sense of empowerment.

Power, for this organizer, is gained not through winning a public sphere battle but by bringing residents together to resolve disputes and build relationships within their own community.

In practice, both models must operate eventually in the public sphere. But the public-private split still influences how each relates to politics. The Alinsky model sees community organizations as already in the public sphere and, consequently, already part of the political system. The problem was not gaining access—the rules of politics already granted access. Rather, the problem was effectively organizing to make the most of that access. Alinsky believed that poor people could form their own interest group and access the polity just like any other interest group. They may have to act up to be recognized initially, but once recognized, their interests would be represented just like anyone else's. Because Alinsky did not question the masculine competitive structure of the public sphere and the self-interested personalities required of its participants, he did not see a need for dramatic structural adjustments in the political system. The system was, in fact, so good that it would protect and support the have-nots in organizing against those elites who had been taking unfair advantage (Alinsky 1969; Lancourt 1979, 31-35; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 17-18). When the IAF-trained Ernesto Cortez returned to San Antonio to help found Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) in 1973, he began with the traditional strategy of escalating from negotiations to protests to achieve better city services for Latino communities. Soon after their initial successes, COPS turned to voter mobilization, winning a close vote to change San Antonio's council from at-large to district representation. From there they were able to control half of the council's seats, bringing over half of the city's federal Community Development Block Grant funds to COPS projects from 1974 to 1981. Eventually, COPS found that its political lobbying and voter mobilization tactics outpaced the effectiveness of confrontation and protest (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 121-123). Heather Booth's Citizen Action project has taken this pluralist organizing approach to its logical extreme, focusing its energies entirely on voter mobilization in cities and states around the country (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 153).

The women-centered model approaches politics from an experience and consciousness of the exclusionary qualities of the public-private sphere split, which becomes embedded in a matrix of domination along structural axes of gender, race, and social class and hides the significance of women's work in local settings. This matrix has historically excluded women from public sphere politics and restricted them through the sexual division of labor to social reproduction activities centered in the home (Cockburn 1977; Kaplan 1982, 545). As a consequence, women have politicized the expanded private sphere as a means to combat exclusion from the public agenda (Kaplan 1982). Cynthia Hamilton (1991), a community organizer in South Central Los Angeles, described a primarily women-directed organizing campaign to stop the solid waste incinerator planned for their community in the late 1980s. These low-income women, primarily African American and with no prior political experience, were motivated by the health threat to their homes and children. They built a loose, but effective, organization, the Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles, and were gradually joined by white, middle-class, and professional women from across the city. The activists began to recognize their shared gender oppression as they confronted the sarcasm and contempt of male po-

litical officials and industry representatives—who dismissed their human concerns as "irrational, uninformed, and disruptive" (Hamilton 1991, 44)—and restrictions on their organizing created by their family's needs. Eventually, they forced incinerator industry representatives to compromise and helped their families accept a new division of labor in the home to accommodate activists' increased public political participation.

Leadership Development

Leadership is another characteristic of these models that shows the influence of the public-private split. The Alinsky model maintains an explicit distinction between public sphere leaders, called "organizers," and private sphere community leaders. One goal of the Alinsky model is to develop those private sphere community leaders to occupy positions in formal organizations that can extend their leadership beyond the community into the public sphere. For Alinsky, the organizer is a paid professional consultant from outside the community whose job is to get people to adopt a delegitimizing frame (Ferree and Miller 1985; Gamson, Fireman, and Rytina 1982) that breaks the power structure's hold over them (Bailey 1972, 46-47). Advocates of the Alinsky approach contend that organizing is a very complex task requiring professional-level training and experience (Bailey1972, 137; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b, 53). The Alinsky model also maintains a strict role separation between outside organizers and the indigenous leaders that organizers are responsible for locating and supporting (Lancourt 1979; Reitzes and Reitzes 1987a). New leaders have to be developed, often outside of the community's institutionally appointed leadership structure. However, the focus is not on empowering those individuals but on building a strong organization and getting material concessions from elites. Organizers have influence, but only through their relationships with indigenous leaders (Lancourt 1979). It may appear curious that Alinsky did not emphasize building indigenous organizers, especially since the lack of indigenous organizing expertise often led to organizational decline after the pros left (Lancourt 1979).[3] Tom Gaudette, an Alinsky-trained organizer who helped build the Organization for a Better Austin (OBA) in Chicago, explicitly discouraged his organizers from living in the neighborhood, arguing they had to be able to view the community dispassionately in order to be effective at their job (Bailey 1972, 80). But when viewed through the lens of the public-private split, it is clear that the organizers are leaders who remain in the public sphere, always separate from the expanded private sphere of community. Because the organizers remain in the public sphere, they are the link that pulls private sphere leaders and their communities into public action. Both the location of the organizer as outside of the local community and the elevation of rational, dispassionate role-playing contribute to the gendering of this role. This is similar to the distancing characteristic of the masculine role, whether as scientist, father, or organizer. This may also be why Alinsky lacked confidence in women organizers, since he so emphasized the ability of the organization to effectively compete and engage conflict in the public sphere.

There is less separation between organizers and leaders in the women-centered model because women-centered organizers, rather than being outsiders, are more often rooted in local networks. They are closely linked to those with whom they work and organize, and they act as mentors or facilitators of the empowerment process. Private sphere issues seem paramount with these organizers. They find they need to deal with women's sense of powerlessness and low self-esteem (Miller 1986) before involving them in sustained organizing efforts. Mentoring others as they learn the organizing process is premised on the belief that all have the capacity to be leaders/organizers. Rather than focusing on, or elevating, individual leaders, women-centered organizers seek to model and develop "group centered" leadership (Payne 1989) that "embraces the participation of many as opposed to creating competition over the elevation of only a few" (ECCO 1989, 16). Instead of moving people and directing events, this is a conception of leadership as teaching (Payne 1989).[4] Analyses of women-centered organizing and leadership development efforts also underline the importance of "centerwomen," or "bridge leaders." These leaders use existing local networks to develop social groups and activities that create a sense of familial/community consciousness, connecting people with similar concerns and heightening awareness of shared issues (Robnett 1996, 1997; Sacks 1988). These leaders can transform social networks into a political force and help translate the skills that women learn in their families and communities (e.g., interpersonal skills, planning and coordination, conflict mediation) into effective public sphere leadership. Robnett argues that "the activities of African-American women in the civil rights movement provided the bridges necessary to cross boundaries between the personal lives of potential constituents and adherents and the political life of civil rights movement organizations" (1996, 664). Thus, ironically, gender as a "construct of exclusion . . . helped to develop a strong grassroots tier of leadership . . . women who served as 'bridge leaders' who were central to the development of identity, collective consciousness, and solidarity within the civil rights movement" (Robnett 1996, 1667). Although bridge leaders were not exclusively women, this "intermediate layer" of leadership was the only one available to women at that time (Robnett 1996).

Since the late 1950s, Mrs. Hallie Amey, a bridge leader now in her 70s, has been a key activist and a center person in nearly all of the Wentworth Gardens organizing efforts discussed earlier. Mrs. Beatrice Harris, another woman resident activist, provides some insight into the dynamics of Mrs. Amey's leadership role:

> She's the type of person who can bring a lot of good ideas to the community. . . . And she's always there to help. And she's always here; she's always doing things. And she's always pulling you, she's pushing you, and she's calling you, "We've got to do this!" She makes sure you don't forget what you have to do. Early in the morning she's on the phone, "Mrs. Harris, what time you coming out?" That was to say, "You gonna do it without me having to ask, or you giving me an excuse." (Feldman and Stall forthcoming)

By closely examining the work of women-centered leaders, such as Mrs. Amey, we can learn how potential constituents are persuaded to act, how consensus and trust are formed, and action is mobilized (Robnett 1997).

The Organizing Process

Finally, these two models adopt organizing processes that reflect the influence of, and different conceptualizations of, the public-private split. Within the Alinsky model, the organizing process centers on identifying and confronting public issues to be addressed in the public sphere. Consequently, the organization needs to be public and traditionally masculine—big, tough, and confrontational. Door knocking is the initial strategy for identifying issues. Those issues then become the means of recruitment to the organizing effort. The organization bills itself as the best, if not only, means of resolving those issues. The "mass meeting" is the means for framing issues and celebrating gains. Important to the process of building up to the mass meeting are cumulative victories—beginning with an easily winnable issue, and using the energy it generates to build to bigger issues. The public activities of the mass march, public rally, explicit confrontation, and celebrated win are all part of building a strong organization that can publicly represent the community's interests. The annual convention is the culmination of the Alinsky organizing process. The first convention of the East Toledo Community Organization (ETCO) in 1979 was preceded by flyers emphasizing the city's neglect of the east side of Toledo, broken promises from officials, the victories of initial organizing, and the growing unity in the community. ETCO mailed packets across East Toledo that produced 500 registrants for the meeting. At the meeting itself, the 500 to 1,000 people gathered passed 13 resolutions covering dangerous rail crossings, park maintenance, utility complaints, service shortages, truck traffic, and many other issues (Stoecker 1991).

In the Alinsky model, the organizer is not there just to win a few issues but to build an enduring formal organization that can continue to claim power and resources for the community—to represent the community in a competitive public sphere pluralist polity. These organizations typically have traditional decision-making structures that mirror the male-dominated public sphere structures they confront. The organizer is supposed to build the organization from the community's preexisting formalized organizational base of churches, service organizations, clubs, and so forth. In many cases, the community organizations created also spawn community-based services such as credit unions and day care centers. This is not a process to be taken lightly or with few resources. Alinsky often insisted that, before he would work with a community, they had to raise $150,000 to cover three years of expenses (Lancourt 1979). When Ed Chambers took over the IAF from Alinsky, he required $160,000 just to cover start-up costs for a serious organizing project (IAF 1978). For Alinsky, the organization itself was part of the tactical repertoire of com-

munity organizing. Dave Beckwith, an Alinsky-influenced organizer with the Center for Community Change, also argues for the centrality of the organization:

> If an organization doesn't grow, it will die. . . . People naturally fade in and out of involvement as their own life's rhythms dictate—people move, kids take on baseball for the spring, they get involved with Lamaze classes, whatever. If there are not new people coming in, the shrinkage can be fatal. New issues and continuous outreach are the only protection against this natural process. (Beckwith n.d., 13)

This emphasis on building formal organization reflects, and can be attributed to, the public sphere emphasis and the gendered assumptions of the Alinsky model. Operating within the rules of the existing masculine competitive structure where there are only winners and losers means valuing competition even within the organization, a separation between leaders and followers, and a gendered distinction between maintaining relationships and achieving goals. To believe or to act otherwise would require questioning the entire social structure, including its gender components, and would undermine the gendered assumptions within the Alinsky model regarding human nature and conflict.

The presence, and partial restriction, of women in the private sphere leads the women-centered organizing model to emphasize a very different organizing process formed around creating an ideal private-sphere-like setting rather than a large public sphere organization. The process begins by creating a safe and nurturing space where women can identify and discuss issues affecting the private sphere (Gutierrez 1992). This model uses the small group to establish trust and build "informality, respect, [and] tolerance of spontaneity" (Hamilton 1991, 44). The civil rights organizer, Ella Baker, was dubious about the long-term value of mass meetings, lobbying, and demonstrations. Instead, she advocated organizing people in small groups so that they could understand their potential power and how best to use it, which had a powerful influence on the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (Britton 1968; Payne 1989). Small groups create an atmosphere that affirms each participant's contribution, provides the time for individuals to share, and helps participants listen carefully to each other. Gutierrez and Lewis affirm that "the small group provides the ideal environment for exploring the social and political aspects of 'personal' problems and for developing strategies for work toward social change" (1992, 126). Moreover, smaller group settings create and sustain the relationship building and sense of significance and solidarity so integral to community. Women in Organizing (WIO), a 1990s' urban-based project, organized low-income, African American teenage mothers to gain self-sufficiency and political empowerment. One of the organizing staff described the effort of this "Young Moms Program":

> Our work is about connecting women with each other, about transforming their experience in terms of working with mixed groups of people of different races, about building the confidence of individual women and building the strengths of groups. . . . All of

our work is really about leadership development of women, of learning more of how consciousness develops, of how we can collectively change the world.

While WIO did help these women organize an advocacy meeting with public officials, the meeting was preceded by nearly five months of training that addressed less traditional issues such as personal growth and challenges in parenting, as well as more traditional organizing issues (Stall 1993). Engagement in practices of storytelling, potluck meals, and instructional roundtables helped the teen moms begin to redefine their relationship to power and to advocate for the societal supports they needed to succeed.

Because the women-centered model focuses less on immediate public sphere action, a continuing organization is not as central in initial organizing. In place of the focus on organization building are "modest struggles"—"small, fragmented, and sometimes contradictory efforts by people to change their lives" (Krauss 1983, 54). These short-lived collective actions (e.g., planting a community garden, opening a day care center, organizing a public meeting) are often begun by loosely organized groups. The organizing efforts of the African American women in South Central Los Angeles, described earlier, functioned for one and a half years without any formal leadership structure. Their model depended on a rotating chair, stymying the media's hunger for a "spokesperson" (Hamilton, 1991, 44). If empowerment is "a process aimed at consolidating, maintaining, or changing the nature and distribution of power in a particular cultural context" (Bookman and Morgen 1988, 4), modest struggles become a significant factor. Engagement in modest resistance focused on the expanded private sphere allows women to immediately alter their community and gain a sense of control over their lives.

Attention to modest struggles is necessary to understand the more elusive process of resistance that takes place beneath the surface and outside of what have conventionally been defined as community organizing, social protest, or social movements. Research on New York City co-op apartment tenants in the 1980s found that the tenant leaders were almost always women, the majority were African American and were longtime residents of their building and their community (Leavitt and Saegert 1990). These women leaders used skills learned in sustaining their own families in the larger sphere of the building. For example, women tenants often met around kitchen tables and in preparing and sharing food with neighbors fostered social ties that extended the practical solidarity of family caretaking to the entire building. Women residents "equated sharing their dish with the recognition of their role" and trust was nurtured in the context of personal relationships. "They made building-wide decisions with the same ethic of personal care that they applied to friends and family." Members of tenant associations discussed rent payment and eviction issues in terms of the situations of each tenant involved and searched for alternatives that supported residents' overall lives as well as ensured that good decisions were made for the whole building (Clark 1994, 943). In a time of shrinking resources, the formation of low-income tenant cooperatives is a form of modest

resistance. In this case, strong tenant associations, rooted in rich social networks and on a gender-based response to home and community, were essential to making co-op ownership possible.

CONCLUSION: SEPARATE MODELS, LINKED ISSUES

This article represents an attempt to get behind the scenes of social movements—to look at the community organizing that provides the foundation for effective social movement work. We have elaborated two models of community organizing that have developed both from the gendered positions of their founders and their consequent experientially derived conceptualizations of the public and private spheres. Although we do not see the qualities or values of the Alinsky model or the women-centered model as inherently linked to biological sex, community organizing is shaped through the specificity of men's and women's action within particular historical circumstances and periods. In fact, gender as an exclusionary construct has shaped the development, strategies, and often the goal or outcome of organizing efforts (Acker 1990; Robnett 1996). Since the most recent phase of the women's liberation movement in the United States did not develop until the late 1960s and early 1970s, notions of feminism and the equal representation of women were not considerations in early Alinsky model organizing efforts. Men were the key organizers and thus this model, at least in its ideal form, reflects the experiences and interests of men in our society. As a result, the Alinsky model sees the community as part of the market-driven, exchange-based public sphere needing to be organized to effectively compete with other public sphere interests. The model emphasizes self-interest, confrontation, professional organizers, and formal organizations. The women-centered model, developed by women and primarily engaged in by women for other women and children (increasingly women in female-headed households), mirrors "the traditional pattern of gender differentiation found in American families [in which] [i]t is women generally have the primary responsibility for caring for families, neighbors, and friends" (Taylor 1996, 123). This model views the community as an extension of the private sphere needing to be organized to build and maintain its own relationships and resources. It thus emphasizes relationship building, coactive power, indigenous organizers, and informal organizational structures.

This analysis shows that gender structures produce different social movement experiences for men and women, distinct spheres of action, and distinct activist personalities. It is not just an understanding of the community organizing work that women or men do to which our analysis contributes, but to the kinds of organizational structures that they build, the kinds of leaders they develop, the kinds of tactics they employ, and the integration of these elements into a distinct community organizing model. For example, studies of women-centered organizing challenge dominant male-centered assumptions about leaders as formal spokespersons and positional leaders (Barnett 1995; Sacks 1988) to include the organizing of women

in grassroots community groups as a significant dimension of leadership (Barnett 1995, 204). In closely examining women-centered organizing, we find behind-the-scenes leaders who have specialized or valuable resources including time and commitment, unique strategies, ties to others in school and church organizations, and a sense of community (Barnett 1995). This is a more multidimensional view of leadership, informed by women-centered organizing that produces "distinctively communal and participatory organizations" (Barnett 1995, 204). In addition, by focusing on women-centered organizing, we can learn how a consensus is formed, action is mobilized, and potential constituents are persuaded to act. An examination of women-centered organizing helps us to see "how mobilization takes place in day-to-day community work" and "who is likely to do such work" (Robnett 1997, 132).

What are the implications of these two models for the future of community organizing? The women-centered organizing model has had an enormous impact on the field of community organizing and has, in fact, dissolved part of the boundary between the public and private spheres. Within the field, women-centered organizing has transformed the traditional organizing agenda so that issues formerly considered "private"—violence against women (Park 1997; Wittner 1997), toxic waste disposal (Krauss 1997), and postpartum depression (Taylor 1996)—have, through women-centered organizing, been moved from the realm of private troubles to public issues, in many cases transforming the agendas, the constituents, and the strategies of traditional organizing. Community organizing is committed to democratic goals and is supportive of humane ends. With the greater influx of women into the Alinsky model of community organizing and the popularization of feminist goals among men and women, there is evidence that the inclusion of sexuality, emotionality, and procreation in community organizing is slowly transforming its gendered logic and practice, the sexual division of labor among community organizers, and the issues that community organizations are willing to address (Stall 1986).

There is still a pronounced difference between the logics of the public and private spheres in society, however. The corporate and government sectors show no signs of becoming less competitive, and there are continuous conservative cries to preserve a private sphere protected from the brutalities of public life. In this context, the weaknesses of one model are the strengths of the other. The masculine confrontational style of the Alinsky model, which must assume prior community bonds so it can move immediately. into public sphere action, may be disabling for certain grassroots organizing efforts, "particularly in domains where women are a necessary constituency" (Lawson and Barton 1990, 49). Imagine trying to employ the Alinsky model organizing young moms who are socially isolated and exhausted from the daily grind of trying to make ends meet. The de-emphasis on relationship building in the Alinsky model will mean that, where neighborhoods are less and less communities, and the people in them are less and less empowered, the community can engage the battle but not sustain it.

The strengths of the women-centered model are in building the relationships that can sustain a struggle over the long haul. The social role of motherhood is still im-

portant for women's activism, since "women essentially remain responsible for much of the 'emotional work' of family and community life" (Taylor 1996, 170). And while we have argued that the women-centered model can span the boundaries between the public and private spheres—making personal issues into public issues—we are concerned that the model cannot, by itself, transform the public sphere. One criticism of consciousness raising in the women's movement is that it did not translate into action very effectively (Cassell 1989, 55; Ferree and Hess 1985, 64-67; Freeman 1975). In a discussion of one example of women-centered organizing—postpartum support groups—Taylor argues that "the postpartum support group movement poses a clear challenge to gender oppositions by opening its arms to fathers and husbands and by urging fathers to become more involved in raising their children" (1996, 178). Note that Taylor uses "urging" and not "forcing" or "making." Women-centered organizing can move private sphere issues such as health, housing, and sanitation into the public sphere. But once they are so placed, their resolution is subject to the competitive, masculine, zero-sum processes of that sphere.

Thus, the women-centered model, and community organizing in general, faces a "paradox of empowerment"—the need to organize simultaneously at the personal and structural levels (Rappaport 1981). As we move into the next century, if women-centered organizing succeeds in rebuilding community bonds, aspects of the Alinsky model may again become applicable. Some social workers are trying to resurrect the profession's community organizing roots (Specht and Courtney 1994) and are calling for a return to the Piven and Cloward (1979) empowerment model. But how do we combine the models? The specific answers to that question are beyond the scope of this article, but we have recommendations for further research that, if done collaboratively with real community organizing efforts, could inform both the practices and the theories of community organizing.

First, we need to understand whether there are times when one model is more viable than the other. Robert Fisher (1984) showed a seesawing between more militant and more community-building periods of community organizing that seem to correspond to progressive and reactionary periods in history. Reactionary periods such as the 1980s also force social movements into "abeyance" (Taylor 1989) where maintaining community bonds and providing emotional support become paramount, since public sphere action seems ineffectual. In these periods, the women-centered model sustains the possibility for future public sphere action. Second, we need to learn whether certain circumstances might call for certain organizing models. Will the women-centered model be more effective in communities whose social relationships have been destroyed by disinvestment, where the targets are far away, and where government is ineffectual? In such circumstances, the Alinsky model may be impractical because it depends on preexisting relationships and its success depends not just on confronting the enemy but on being able to extract real concessions. Conversely, will the Alinsky model be more effective in relatively stable communities confronted with an immediate threat perpetrated by an identifiable villain? In these cases, the ability to confront the villain, and make believable

threats of consequences, is crucial. Third, we need to investigate the existing examples and the future implications of women engaging in the Alinsky model of organizing and men engaging in women-centered organizing. Is there a fundamental bias in the Alinsky model that prevents women, or men, from fully acting on feminist principles without radically altering the model? What is the impetus for men to practice the feminist values demanded by the women-centered model? Finally, what might this gender bending mean for the transformation or integration of the two models and for the future direction of protest movements?

The gendered biases of social movement theory have led to a neglect of not just women's work in social movements but of an entire substructure of action, based in informal groupings, predominantly of women, engaged in building the relationships necessary to sustain long-term struggles. We need to correct these biases to recognize social action that may not immediately appear as such, because it provides a foundation for the social movement action more typically studied.

NOTES

1. Alinsky, along with Fred Ross, helped organize "educationals" in California that used a popular education process to support organizing. These educationals produced the first woman organizer hired by Alinsky and the first organizing effort targeting women specifically (Finks 1984, 68-71).

2. Within Afrocentric community models, power is reconceptualized. There is not a retreat or lack of attention to the importance of power as domination, but it is essential to create Black female spheres of influence to confront oppressive social institutions (Collins 1991, 223).

3. The distinction between a trained expert and the devaluing of indigenous expertise is similar to the gender structures that have built the medical profession (Oakley 1993), although the Alinsky model does concentrate on building indigenous expertise rather than maintaining community ignorance. Sometimes indigenous organizers did develop. Fred Ross's work in the Southwest, for example, produced an indigenous organizer by the name of Cesar Chavez (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987b).

4. The civil rights leader Ella Jo Baker throughout her life modeled group-centered leadership, stating that "[s]trong people don't need strong leaders" (Cantarow 1980, 53). At one point Ms. Baker shared, "I have always thought what is needed is the development of people who are interested not in being leaders as much as in developing leadership among other people" (Baker 1973, 352).

REFERENCES

Ackelsberg, Martha. 1988. Communities, resistance, and women's activism: Some implications for a democratic policy. In *Women and the politics of empowerment*, edited by Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Acker, Joan. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4:139-58.

Alinsky, Saul. 1969. *Reveille for radicals*. New York: Vintage.

———. 1971. *Rules for radicals*. New York: Vintage.

Bailey, Robert Jr. 1972. *Radicals in urban politics: The Alinsky approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, E. 1973. Developing community leadership. In *Black women in white America*, edited by Gerda Lerner. New York: Vintage.

Barnett, Bernice McNair. 1993. Invisible southern Black women leaders in the civil rights movement: The triple constraints of gender, race, and class. *Gender & Society* 7:162-82.

————. 1995. Black women's collectivist movement organizations: Their struggles during the "doldrums." In *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new women's movement*, edited by Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Beckwith, Dave. N.d. *Introduction to organizing*. Toledo, OH: University of Toledo, Urban Affairs Center.

Berg, Barbara J. 1978. *The remembered gate: Origins of American feminism: The women and the city 1800-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bernard, Jessie. 1981. *The female world*. New York: Free Press.

Bookman, Ann, and Sandra Morgen. 1988. *Women and the politics of empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brandwein, Ruth A. 1981. Toward the feminization of community and organizational practice. In *Community organization for the 1980s*, edited by A. Lauffer and E. Newman. Special Issue of *Social Development Issues* 5 (2-3): 180-93.

————. 1987. Women and community organization. In *The woman client*, edited by Dianne S. Burden and Naomi Gottlieb. New York: Tavistock.

Breines, Wini. 1989. *Community and organization in the New Left, 1962-1968*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Brittan, Arthur. 1989. *Masculinity and power*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Britton, John. 1968. Interview with Ella Baker. Moorland-Springarn Collection, Howard University, Washington, DC, 19 June.

Bryan, Mary Lunn McCree, and Allen F. Davis. 1990. *100 years at Hull-House*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 1990. *Women's movements in the United States: Woman suffrage, equal rights, and beyond*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

————. 1993. Beyond resource mobilization? Emerging trends in social movement theory. *Sociological Quarterly* 34:217-36.

Caldwell, Agnes. 1994. We are not afraid: The influence of social reproduction on women's mobilization in Northeast Ireland. Paper presented at Annual Meetings of the Midwest Sociological Society, St. Louis, MO.

Cantarow , Ellen. 1980. *Moving the mountain: Women working for social change*. New York: The Feminist Press.

Cassell, Joan. 1989. *A group called women: Sisterhood and symbolism in the feminist movement*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, Helene. 1994. Taking up space: Redefining political legitimacy in New York City. *Environment and Planning* 26:937-55.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1977. When women get involved in community action. In *Women in the community*, edited by Marjorie Mayo. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

COMM-ORG: The On-Line Conference on Community Organizing and Development. 1998. http://uac.rdp.utoledo.edu/docs/comm-org/cohome.htm

Cott, Nancy F. 1977. *The bonds of womanhood: "Woman's sphere" in New England. 1780-1835*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Daniels, Arlene Kaplan. 1987. Invisible work. *Social Problems* 34:403-15.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the family: the social organization of caring as gender work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duster, Alfreda. 1970. *The autobiography of Ida B. Wells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Education Center for Community Organizing (ECCO). 1989. *Women on the advance: Highlights of a national conference on women and organizing*. Stony Point, NY: ECCO.

Evans, Sara M., and Harry C. Boyte. 1981. Schools for action: Radical uses of social space. *Democracy* (summer):55-65.

———. 1986. *Free spaces: The sources of democratic change in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Feldman, Roberta M., and Susan Stall. 1994. The politics of space appropriation: A case study of women's struggles for homeplace in Chicago public housing, edited by Irwin Altman and Arza Churchman. Human Behavior and Environment Series, *Women and the Environment* 13:167-99. New York: Plenum.

Feldman, Roberta M., Susan Stall, and Patricia A. Wright. 1997. The community needs to be built by us: Women organizing in public housing. In *Community activism and feminist politics*, edited by Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Beth B. Hess. 1985. *Controversy and coalition: The new feminist movement.* Boston: G. K. Hall.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Frederick Miller. 1985. Mobilization and meaning: Toward an integration of social psychological and resource perspectives on social movements. *Sociological Inquiry* 55:38-61.

Finks, P. David. 1984. *The radical vision of Saul Alinsky.* New York: Paulist Press.

Fisher, Robert. 1984. *Let the people decide: Neighborhood organizing in America.* Boston: Twayne.

Follett, Mary Parker. 1940. *Dynamic administration.* New York: Harper & Row.

Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The politics of women's liberation.* New York: David McKay.

Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, and Steven Rytina. 1982. *Encounters with unjust authority.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Garland, Anne White. 1988. *Women activists: Challenging the abuse of power.* New York: The Feminist Press.

Giddings, Paula. 1984. *Where and when I enter: The impact of Black women on race and sex in America.* New York: William Morrow.

Gilkes, Cheryl Townsend. 1980. Holding back the ocean with a broom: Black women and their community work. In *The Black woman*, edited by L. R. Rose. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

———. 1988. Building in many places: Multiple commitments and ideologies in Black women's community work. In *Women and the politics of empowerment*, edited by Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gilligan, Carol. 1977. In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review* 47 (4): 481-517.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano, Grace Chang, and Linda Rennie Forcey. 1994. *Mothering: Ideology, experience, and agency.* New York: Routledge.

Gutierrez, Lorraine M. 1990. Working with women of color: An empowerment perspective. *Social Work* 35: 149-154.

Gutierrez, Lorraine M., and Edith A. Lewis. 1992. A feminist perspective on organizing with women of color. In *Community organizing in a diverse society*, edited by Felix G. Rivera and John I. Erlich. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hamilton, Cynthia. 1991. Women, home, and community. *Women of Power* 20 (Spring): 42-45.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1974. Political change: Two perspectives on power. *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly* 1 (1): 10-25.

Haywoode, Terry L. 1991. Working class feminism: Creating a politics of community, connection, and concern. Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, New York.

hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics.* Boston: South End.

Illich, I. 1982. *Gender.* New York: Pantheon.

Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF). 1978. *Organizing for family and congregation.* Franklin Square, NY: Industrial Areas Foundation.

Kaplan, Temma. 1982. Female consciousness and collective action: The case of Barcelona 1910-1913. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 7 (3): 545-66.

Kieffer, Charles H. 1984. Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. In *Studies in empowerment: Steps toward understanding action*, edited by Julian Rappaport, C. Swift, and R. Hess. New York: Haworth.

Krauss, Celene. 1983. The elusive process of citizen activism. *Social Policy* (Fall): 50-55.
———. 1997. Challenging power: Toxic waste protests and the politicization of white, working-class women. In *Community activism and feminist politics*, edited by Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.
Lancourt, Joan I. 1979. *Confront or concede: The Alinsky citizen-action organizations.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
Lawson, Ronald, and Stephen E. Barton. 1990. Sex roles in social movements: A case study of the tenant movement in New York City. In *Women and social protest*, edited by Guida West and Rhoda Blumberg. New York: Oxford University Press.
Leavitt, Jacqueline. 1993. Women under fire: Public housing activism in Los Angeles. *Frontiers* 13 (2): 109-30.
Leavitt, Jacqueline, and Susan Saegert. 1990. *From abandonment to hope: Community-households in Harlem.* New York: Columbia University Press.
McAdam, Doug. 1986. Recruitment to high risk activism: The case of Freedom Summer. *American Journal of Sociology* 92:64-90.
———. 1992. Gender as a mediator of the activist experience: The case of Freedom Summer. *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1211-40.
McCourt, Kathleen. 1977. *Working class women and grassroots politics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Miller, Jean Baker. 1986. *Toward a new psychology of women.* Boston: Beacon.
Morris, Aldon. 1984. *The origins of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change.* New York: Free Press.
Naples, Nancy A. 1991. Contradictions in the gender subtext of the War on Poverty: The community work and resistance of women from low income communities. *Social Problems* 38:316-32.
———. 1992. Activist mothering: Cross-generational continuity in the community work of women from low-income urban neighborhoods. *Gender & Society* 6:441-63.
———. 1997. *Community activism and feminist politics.* New York: Routledge.
Oakley, A. 1993. *Essays on women, medicine and health.* Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
Oppenheim, Lisa. 1991. Women's ways of organizing. *Labor Research Review* 18:45-59.
Pardo, Mary. 1997. Creating community: Mexican American women in eastside Los Angeles. In *Community activism and feminist politics*, edited by Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.
Park, Lisa Sun-Hee. 1997. Navigating the anti-immigrant wave: The Korean women's hotline and the politics of community. In *Community activism and feminist politics*, edited by Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.
Payne, Charles. 1989. Ella Baker and models of social change. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14 (4): 885-99.
———. 1990. Men led, but women organized: Movement participation of women in the Mississippi delta. In *Women in the civil rights movement*, edited by Vicki Crawford, Jacqueline Rouse, and Barbara Woods. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson.
———. 1994. *I've got the light of freedom.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard Cloward. 1979. *Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, how they fail.* New York: Vintage.
Rabrenovic, Gordana. 1995. Woman and collective action in urban neighborhoods. In *Gender in urban research*, edited by Judith A. Garber and Robyne S. Turner. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Rappaport, Julian. 1981. In praise of a paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 9 (1): 1-26.
———. 1986. Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. Paper presented at Annual Meetings, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
Reitzes, Donald C., and Dietrich C. Reitzes. 1987a. Alinsky in the 1980s: Two contemporary community organizations. *Sociological Quarterly* 27:265-84.
———. 1987b. *The Alinsky legacy: Alive and kicking.* Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Robnett, Belinda. 1996. African-American women in the civil rights movement, 1954-1965: Gender, leadership, and micromobilization. *American Journal of Sociology* 101:1661-93.
———. 1997. *How long? How long?* New York: Oxford University Press.
Sacks, Karen Brodkin. 1988. *Caring by the hour.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Sherrard, Thomas D., and Richard C. Murray. 1965. The church and neighborhood community organization. *Social Work* 10:3-14.
Sherrod, D. 1987. The bonds of men: Problems and possibilities in close male relationships. In *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies,* edited by Harry Brod. Winchester, MA: Allen and Unwin.
Skocpol, T., and M. Somers. 1980. The uses of comparative history in macrosocial inquiry. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22:174-97.
Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review* 51:464-81.
Specht, Harry, and Mark E. Courtney. 1994. *Unfaithful angels: How social work has abandoned its mission.* New York: Free Press.
Stack, Carol. 1974. *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a Black community.* New York: Harper & Row.
Stall, Susan. 1986. Women organizing to create safe shelter. *Neighborhood Works* 9(8): 10-13; 9(9): 10-11, 12.
———. 1991. "The women are just back of everything . . .": Power and politics revisited in small town America. Ph.D. diss., Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
———. 1993. Women in organizing project evaluation. Prepared for Women United for a Better Chicago, unpublished.
Stein, Arlene. 1986. Between organization and movement: ACORN and the Alinsky model of community organizing. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 31:93-115.
Stoecker, Randy. 1991. Community organizing and community development: The life and times of the East Toledo community organization. Unpublished manuscript.
———. 1992. Who takes out the garbage? Social reproduction and social movement research. In *Perspectives on social problems,* edited by Gale Miller and James A. Holstein. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
———. 1993. The federated front-stage structure and localized social movements: A case study of the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood movement. *Social Science Quarterly* 74:169-84.
———. 1994. *Defending community: The struggle for alternative redevelopment in Cedar-Riverside.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
———. 1995. Community, movement, organization: The problem of identity convergence in collective action. *Sociological Quarterly* 36:111-30.
Tax, Meredith. 1980. *The rising of the women: Feminist solidarity and class conflicts, 1880-1917.* New York: Monthly Review Press.
Taylor, Verta. 1989. Social movement continuity: The women's movement in abeyance. *American Sociological Review* 54:761-75.
———. 1996. *Rock-a-by baby: Feminism, self-help, and postpartum depression.* New York: Routledge.
Taylor, Verta, and Leila Rupp. 1993. Women's culture and lesbian feminist activism: A reconsideration of cultural feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19:32-61.
Taylor, Verta, and Nancy Whittier. 1992. Collective identity in social movement communities: Lesbian feminist mobilization. In *Frontiers in social movement theory,* edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Tiano, Susan. 1984. The public-private dichotomy: Theoretical perspectives on women in development. *Social Science Journal* 21:11-28.
Tilly, Louise A., and Joan W. Scott. 1978. *Women, work, and family.* New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.
Van Den Bergh, Nan, and Lynn B. Cooper. 1986. *Feminist visions for social work.* Silver Springs, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Weil, Marie. 1986. Women, community, and organizing. In *Feminist visions for social work*, edited by Nan Van Den Bergh and Lynn B. Cooper. Silver Springs, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1:125-51.

Wekerle, Gerda R. 1996. Reframing urban sustainability: Women's movement organizing and the local state. In *Local places in the age of the global city*, edited by Roger Keil, Gerda R. Wekerle, and David V. J. Bell. Montreal: Black Rose Press.

West, Guida, and Rhoda L. Blumberg. 1990. *Women and social protest*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wittner, Judith. 1997. Reconceptualizing agency in domestic violence court. In *Community activism and feminist politics*, edited by Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.

Susan Stall is a faculty member in the Department of Sociology and Women's Studies Program at Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago. Her activism and research interests include girls' and women's community building, organizing, and leadership development. She is currently engaged in a participatory research project in Wentworth Gardens, a Chicago public housing project.

Randy Stoecker is an associate professor of sociology and a research associate in Urban Affairs at the University of Toledo. He has published extensively on community organizing and development, including Defending Community *(Temple University Press, 1994). He currently moderates/edits COMM-ORG: The On-Line Conference on Community Organizing and Development (http://uac.rdp.utoledo.edu/comm-org) and is doing participatory evaluation research with a community organizing training program in Toledo.*