

NEW SOCIAL INITIATIVES - CONFLICTS AND COEXISTENCE
OF THE STATE AND SOCIETY

by

Peter GYÖRI

Institute of Sociology
of Hungarian Academy
of Sciences, Budapest
October 1988

Paper to be presented at the international conference
on "Voluntarism, Non-governmental Organizations (NGO's/
and Public Policy" organised by Ministry of Science and
Development, in Jerusalem, Israel, 22-24.05.1989.

Peter GYÖRI: New Social Initiatives - conflicts and
coexistence of the state and society

ABSTRACT

In Hungary, as in other countries /but on special basis in
the background/, social needs have transformed and multiplied,
their nature and content have changed very rapidly during the
last ten years. Partly this process, partly the deep crisis
and reform phenomena in the general political, economic and
social life have a remarkable effect on the state social
services and the voluntary organizations.

In the general part of my paper - after giving some necessary
definitions and dimensions of analysis to understand special
hungarian circumstances - I try to summarize the concrete
forces and social mechanisms which worked against and limited
the new voluntary initiatives and the non-governmental
organizations:

- too rapid and violent processes of social "mobility";
- forcefully establish an ideology and value-orientation
explaining all phenomena of everyday life;
- the trends to homogenize values, norms together with
repression, marginalization or neutralization of
alternative values;
- denouncing various groups lifestyles altogether;
- forced collectivism, spirit of overcollectivizing,
creation of eye-wash communities;
- insecurity and fear caused by repression;
- overinstitutionalization;
- the elimination of a social concept, the network of
mutual solidarity.

In the next part - using this framework - I attempt to analyze the
features of the voluntary-based new social initiatives in a
post-stalinist, over-controlled system - from an empirical
sociological viewpoint. What kind of personally connections
and continuities are among these initiatives? What is the
importance of the professionals "ghetto" of Budapest? What
is the meaning "being" different" in the life in these

initiatives? The difficulties of self-definition, of self-description, the mechanisms of marginalization and the ambivalence of institutionalization /from the side of initiatives and of institutions also/. Finally, there are some quite new phenomena and changes which raise not only new conflicts, but new alternatives also in the coexistence of state and society.

Peter GYÖRI: New Social Initiatives - conflicts and coexistence of the state and society

/One sentence....: Various forms of communal /social/ initiatives want to emerge, to be realized, again and again, under the established conditions; they are born and fail living their peculiar lives./

/Various communal /social/ initiatives.../

Eviding the expected systematic way of discussion, relative freely, sometimes even repeating myself, other time seemingly digressing from the matter in hand, obviously leaving many questions open, I make an attempt to sum up my subject.

First, we should overcome a quite trivial, but nevertheless difficult problem; to quasi define the scope of social movements and phenomena we are going to discuss. Our list /see Appendix/, including a lot of of seemingly differing elements, might be helpful at this point. Upon a brief review of this list, a phenomenon might promptly be defined whereby the communal forms discussed do not constitute one single group of social phenomena but we should rather speak of an amorphous conglomerate of movements, phenomena whereby the single constituents relate to other group of phenomena on the ground of some characteristics of well-defined partial agglomerates while other phenomena may be related to them on the basis of other characteristics. /To take a rather extreme case: various societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals relate, on the basis of the forms and content of their associations to the so-called social associations while some initiatives taken by the houses of culture

towards sessions of mental hygiene, relate to them on the basis of the selected problems, overlaps of the group of problems./

However, it would be inconsiderate to solve our problems by defining some specific indicators of various initiatives forming the base of classifying them within one larger group.

First, we should observe some standpoints which may come up again and again in course of our analysis offering the possibility for various groupings and typologies.

Various initiatives studied by us may be differentiated by:

the overall character of activities by the groups in question

- partly on the ground of the field of these activities; the task of their initiatives /social, people suffering from some serious illness, people under specific conditions, reinforcing and disseminating cultural, communal traditions, preserving natural and man-made environment, etc./

- partly safeguarding and reinforcing specific interests; what sort of mobilizing potentials and forms they have /a quite large scale can be observed in this respect from the explicit self-interests and safeguarding the interests of other groups up to the total lack of safeguarding of any sort/;

the social character of activities; here a large spectrum can, also be observed from financial support of people left out of social welfare /SETA, religious communities/; supporting some socially jeopardized

x Poor-supporting Found

Groups /Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies, Society of Large Families, Pensioners' League/ through re-socialization of people of limited social integration /AD clubs, therapeutic communities for drug-takers, workshops teaching lifestyles, Association of Disabled People or Abaxis/, up to the preservation of minor or major social and cultural environment, defense of cultures and communities.

the grade and level of organization, "institutionalization." Different levels of organization can be distinguished in established groups, on the basis of friendship, professions, comradeship, small organizations and associations, basic cells of institutions whereby organizational levels are partially overlapping and integrated, partially distinguished.

the character of institutional relationships. I mean a significant standpoint: on one side, an initiative was born and functions today within a large institution, in its centre, or outside of it, on the peripheries; on the other what is the grade, level of institutionalization dependence or independence in terms of the initiatives in question.

the range and "movement" features. Here, again, we can observe a very large scale: from ad hoc "associations among roommates", actions of neighbouring communities, linked to the local communities, through small enterprises, to nation-wide organizations, associations and cultural actions, nation-wide or not strictly local movements, actions of political colour.

x Anti-alcoholics Club, "Anonymous"

* Grade of legality: let us cite the official terms of this scale: "supported, tolerated, and forbidden", which partly define some status for various initiatives; however, it is quite complicated to define movements, overlappings, frontier lines, processes between these terms, some mixed status, a selective qualification of functions, targets and tasks within the framework of these terms.

* stage of initiatives: the first idea, preparatory works, organizing, shaping, growth, disintegration, stagnation, regeneration, decline, etc. These stages may show significant differences, on the other hand, single, separated stages might refer to the dynamics of the concepts presented in terms of a limited period of time /institutionalization, becoming independent, changes in organizational levels or stages of legality, etc./;

* space/time relations of the emergence of an initiative discussed constitute a natural and not only formal standpoint; some causal differences /year, settlement, part/ have their significance in this respect and they relate to important aspects.

* finally, but not finishing the possible concepts, a differentiation by stage of participation is also important. A scale may be established from the direct self-assisting groups through self-organized groups assisting other parties to the institutionalized initiatives, and this distinction can also refer to various factors of lay and professional aspects and their respective proportion.

Undoubtedly, a question may be raised at this point: if this diversity, such an extended scale of various aspects is valid, how can we interpret all of them within the framework of one group of social phenomena? A more differentiated elaboration of our term: "communal initiatives" might be helpful to get an answer.

These initiatives are communal /however incidental, sporadic, limited they might be, as they often are, and even if they cover just a few people/ inasmuch as their establishment and activities usually aim at human associations, relatively small groups, which may be interpreted and considered as meaningful, rationalistic within the framework of everyday activities, and/or they aim at changing the situation of such a group/or group of problems/. Obviously, individual interests, motivations, and orientations are behind such communal initiatives; they give birth to them, shape them; however, they aspire after realization through human associations, within and not outside of their associations; not via individual ways.

We can consider these activities shaped within collectives as initiatives. for they extend the established definitions of everyday life; overcome activities and roles dominated by outside restrictions and determinations; they are based on choices and decisions extending individual choices and participation, activities pursued by its members are based on such sovereign choices. This is to say: when compared to forms and contents shaped by the dominant determinations, these movements "produce something new" and at the same time constitute free associations of human beings.

/...even among the established conditions.../

It is of extreme importance that here we refer to an especially sophisticated interior context, texture, the basic constituents of social existence.

Processes which worked against such organization during the previous decades; "the established conditions" should be considered in that respect.

In order to clearly present forces working against these processes, it may be helpful if we are to define two general basic conditions for establishing and functioning of such organizations:

- autonomous human being,
- civic society as a /free/ formation of association and cooperation of autonomous human beings.

"Autonomous human being" as a concept is an individual, multicoloured social phenomenon by itself, concentrated on the level of human beings. The essence of this phenomenon is, in my view, the power over one's own individual /choices, decisions/ being. A necessary, but not satisfactory condition for the existence of this power is that the existing social mechanisms should "delegate" the satisfactory quantity and quality of possibilities for such choices and decisions onto the level of individuals. Further, a safe, fearless self-image and role-acquisition, and inherent in them, identity and teleological assumptions, possibilities and perspectives are also necessary, in order to exercise this individual power.

A "civic society" is a formation, and "field of play" of communities of autonomous human beings where the rules of "the game", which may be calculated in terms of balancing individual choices and self-limitations, aimed at mini-

malizing offenses against individual and collective interests, and at the same time offer space for associative roles, associations, cooperations of the autonomous human beings, for the free association of people.

This is to say that "autonomous human beings" and "civic society" are altogether an expression of the specific, balanced operation of distribution in power, of exercising public and individual authorities.

/It might not seem necessary to briefly define these terms; although I do so in order to present what do I mean by these commonly used terms presenting them through relatively very simple explanations. Nobody possesses the "ultimate" elaboration of the tremendous literature about these terms./

From a realistic standpoint let us consider the definitions of these condition as an ideal-typical marginal situation which can be reached or gradually abandoned, although in real life these conditions exist in a differentiated manner, partially in fragments and sometimes "distorted."

Let us now turn back to a question: which concrete forces, social mechanisms worked against and limited such organization of communities. Here we discuss the two kinds of mechanisms together, -- for they have a nature in common -- which have resulted in liquidation of functioning associations, existence, survival, and the ones preventing the birth and survival of such organizations. Discussing them in common is especially justified as the process we are facing here is not some destruction of an

ideal or quasi idealistic starting situation, or not even the "freezing" of such a state, but rather: 1. Terminating formations which are often distorted or fragmentary, and 2. Obstacles in further development or establishment. maturation of these formations or their not even real, only potentially existing preconditions; 3. A complex of counter-processes acting against potential organizations and 4. against potential conditions.

/Forces against the two preconditions -- "autonomous human being" and "civic society" -- for the communal initiatives discussed should be separated for our analysis./

As the main causes or background for counter-forces and mechanisms in the period analysed, factors as follow are usually pointed out: one-party system, central planning system, exaggerated centralization, cult of the personality, dictatorship, overall modernization. The most important feature of these -- in my view -- has been a trend aspiring for total power and a total mass society.

The essence of these trends has been that institutions, means, methods, values, ideologies, operations of one single-centred power have extended their authority, through various hierarchy levels of the political, economic, social system, and they have even reached the lowest organizational levels of society: small communities, families, privacy, conscience, values of individuals. By doing so, they aimed at the most traditional, most sophisticated, and most sensitive contexts and features of society, attempting to change them. /The famous verse of Gyula Illyés is the very expression of standing value related to these trends./

x "One sentence about tyranny", Gyula Illyés, 1956.

Indeed, it is very hard to explore and explain the causes of this trend. It might be assumed that determinations inherent in a general trend of modernization have been together with the ones inherent in the specific way of modernization characterizing the Eastern European countries, as well as geo-political, ideological, economic factors and causes inherent in the specific social structure of these countries.

I cannot overtake here the task to analyse these constituents, but rather point out some of the more important manifestations and forms of these processes and trends in terms of our subject.

Among the counter-forces working against the development of autonomous human being, factors as given below should be mentioned:

≡ too rapid and violent processes of social "mobility", re-structuration, changes in status; they willily tried to separate people from their traditional, historic roots, norms, value systems, roles, and developed at least temporarily, one sort of anomy.

≡ A trend to forcefully establish an ideology and value-orientation explaining and defining all phenomena of everyday life and the surrounding world determined from the outside, and covering all facets of life joined the phenomena discussed above.

≡ One of the main factors of that trend, which is especially important for our discussion has been the idea of forced collectivism. The main feature of it has resulted

in excluding individual competence over goals, norms, values, lifestyles, the withdrawing all of them from under the authority of individual human beings, and elevating them onto the competence level of larger communities, defined from the outside -- beyond withdrawing decisions and choices from under the authority of individuals. This trend turns upside down the process between individuals - small communities - larger society, through means of power and authority whereby the multicoloured value-structures are forced /or at least were attempted to be forced/ into an essentially homogenized, hierarchized /from the top to the bottom/ system.

An indispensable precondition and means of a total authority, beyond that trend, has been to develop fear in the minds of individuals. This repression effecting individuals can be manifested and realized in very different ways. The direct, everyday fear goes together with insecurity. Insecurity and fear may fill the realms, delicately operating processes ins-and-outs of everyday spheres of social mechanisms which are momentarily not yet reached by the institutionalized means of power mechanisms.

Fear and insecurity in this situation on the one side, and over-institutionalization on the other, are mechanisms, phenomena complementary to each other. Their common root is: a stage whereby individuals are deprived from the possibility to individually decide upon various factors belonging to the microsphere of individual existence. /Some everyday example for how these factors have been delegated into the institutions beyond the control of individuals: withdrawing of reproductive conditions for individuals' existence, via a system of

wages and prices, and determination of goods to be consumed, whereby a quite significant part of them -- e.g. apartments -- are taken into the system of re-distribution, via deprivation, some means and possibilities for reproduction on the level of individuals, families and economy through deprivation or centralizing them into organizations; the great processes of changing individual producers into masses, of wage-earners; trends whereby micromechanisms of working within the large organizations are regulated from the outside; homogenization and forcing people into single, one-centered distribution system of information, opinion, and disseminating values, systems of manipulating consciousness, and on the other side, the withdrawal of possibilities and channels of influence, realization of these processes and centralizing them into the "competent" specialized institutions; elevation and transfer of various systems characterizing small communities, family socialization, education, transmission and transfer of knowledge, family and humanistic assistance into the large organizations such as day care centers, nurseries, preschool and school systems, day-time homes, all-day schools, leisure activity centers, boarding schools, public catering, the system of old-people's homes, system of welfare workers, or welfare workers visiting old people's apartments, the system of social security, centralized system of apartment building, and so on, and so on. /Institutions listed do not raise a problem by themselves; what makes them contradictory, it has been the process whereby they are separated at the time of their birth or while already functioning from the direct human needs, and they cannot be penetrated and controlled by individuals. Due to these features we can

call the trend as over-institutionalization. Instead of extending human autonomy, they often limit its scope.

All of these trends have obviously their negative impact on communal organizations. Among the retarding factors in this respect there are some means and mechanisms, direct and indirect, acting precisely against the development of small communities.

¶ A case in this respect is how various forms of organizing small communities have been terminated or significantly reduced, made empty, formal /such as leagues, reading circles, youth organizations, various cultural and religious clubs and associations, circles, societies, cooperatives, bodies, action-groups, forms of corporate systems, professional organizations, charitable systems, etc./ and the developing various political, legal limitations or limitations by state-administrative or police force.

Beyond the direct limitation of organizing autonomous communities, there have also been indirect means operating. These are the trends to homogenize values, norms, interests, Weltanschauung, ideology, together with repression, marginalization or neutralization of alternative values.

A rather common, extreme but often not recognized means of this intervention has been denouncing various groups altogether, and also the lifestyles followed by them. Various communities have become denounced this way, from the smallest until the largest ones during the last decades /such as the institution of family, the community of nation, class-aliens, leftwing and rightwing, veterans

of 1919 and kulaks, social democrats and working-class aristocracy, lumpenproletariat, interfering and cosmopolitan intellectuals, professionals, useless bureaucrats, parasites, skilful entrepreneurs, the ones who became rich "without work", the undeserving poor, the apolitical petty bourgeois, counter-revolutionary elements, nationalists, revisionists, physicians who accept bribes, the imperative engineers and foremen, "difficult people" /innovators/, self-employed shopkeepers, middle men, the ones who swap, the ones who give bribes, deviant elements, craftsmen working without a State permission, the ones who often change their workplaces, the commuting workers, gipsies, earlier the Jews, Swabians /German-speaking Hungarians/, Slovaks, recently the "Greens", blues, the ones who stand up for the preservation of natural and man-made environment, the opposition, the alternatives, punks, tramps, "youth in general", vagabonds, etc. etc./.

Denunciations of this sort -- which can sometimes reach the level of a general hysteria and hate -- might theoretically be perceived as negative community definitions. However, by virtue of this quality of theirs they aim at denouncing, refuting, or neglecting assumed lifestyles covered by these terms, and at the same time they call attention to the dangers of self-definition of any community on the level of everyday practice. They act towards separating, deintegrating society instead of forming small communities.

At the same time, in the spirit of overcollectivizing related to homogenization, creation of eye-wash "communities" has been going on, determined from the outside. In connection with these formations it is no wonder that we

can so often hear: "we should fill the established, existing forms with real content", as raising the problem or as an invitation. /Just for the sake of some example: formations of this sort may be found among the major political movements, social organizations, corporate systems of economic parties, various professional chambers, associations from the monopolistic and bureaucratized organizations until the forms of local popular representation, of workplaces, educational institutions and their democratic forms, through the movement of Red Cross, until the 'Communist' or unpaid voluntary work, network of social activists, movement of the socialist workers' brigades, various cultural movements /such as "Fly Peacock" = based on popularizing folk songs, "One workshop - one school", "Clean Courtyard-Neat House", "For the Reading People", "Actions for Recycling", "Give Life to Years" /of Old People/, "Offer Your Hands", "Our Future is at Stake", etc./ It would be worth to return to the problem of these formations and to their double-faced character.

What is especially important, in terms of our subject matters: the social initiatives in terms of the trends indicated, is partly the direct and partly indirect repression of horizontal relations and a network of mutual solidarity within that, and how these processes meet -- through this repression and other factors the elimination of a social concept or its maximized oversize whereby social functions are withdrawn from the spheres of everyday life and are taken into the realm of laws and functions of society-at-large.

*

Two important, although quite complex steps of analysis still remain at this point of our discussion. Firstly, the common use of this term "trend" is not undesignated for the presented processes, in my view, have not emerged altogether, at the same time and of a steady power, but rather operate as phenomena of changing intensity, in various combinations -- still continually. This time we cannot elaborate this point, and another analysis will also remain: what characteristic and important periods can we establish considering changes in the trends presented.

*

/"... they want to reborn, again and again, in renewed forms: they are born again and sometimes fall..."

It should be emphasized again that deep wounds, injuries were caused within the delicate texture and context of our society as a result of the effects and counter-forces discussed /on the level of individuals, small communities, within the network of values, behaviour, attitudes, cooperation, and solidarities/.

At the same time, we must emphasize again, that it is not about the destruction of an optimal condition but rather about the freezing, retarding of a never matured and established but just germinating, starting process; what is more, in many cases or even in most of the cases, it was about hindering processes which have otherwise never started. A process of "nip them in the bud" can be related partly to some functioning or started realities before World War II., partly to the movements between 1945 and 1948, and partly to movements that appeared in 1956.

Our emphasis is on "nevertheless", or "in spite of", although we do not deny the relative importance of features inherent in the speeded up moments and slow, long-range processes of historic times which are arguing, categorically opposing each other /see in this respect the latent antinomy of István Bibó and István Kemény./ Not everything can /could/ be eliminated or hindered.

Without polishing and trying to gloss it over, we should see, in a realistic manner, that there have been alternative value-movements, "counter-cultures", alternative groupings, models of lifestyles, and ideologies existing in the stage of continuous change, emphasis, intensity, in changing forms. Changing fields -- culture, economy, society, socio-political field -- cannot be separated from each other. What is more, when we analyse their separations and differences - for example, when analysing micro-level histories of some initiatives and individual life stories of the people participating in them -- connections, overlappings, building from and on each other seem to be the most important and emphasized aspect.

A steady process of individual movements, social groupings; of their continuous changes -- birth, start, ending, death, liquidation -- can be observed which sometimes suffered great injuries /both on the individual existential level and on the level of the organization of communities and development of the sophisticated interior textures of society/, but it stands up again and again, is reborn, sometimes with distorted and changed values, but at least to some extent in new clothes, forms, and composition, with new frontier lines /goals, participants, etc./

Without these movements, a major part of social initiatives cannot be understood. Who, why, for what does start such hopeless ventures? Where do the inner forces come from, how can they feel moved to endeavor, how can they find associates for it? How can they fight, succeed or fail throughout? It should be understood from this point of view that these social initiatives were not just born as Pallas Athene burst out of the head of Zeus.

Flow, continuity and discontinuity of ideas is an important matter. /They aim at maintaining values of communities, groupings, collectivity, changing society, alternative lifestyles and models./ Continuity/discontinuity of forms, shaping these processes is of extreme importance. Last, but not at least, personal continuities or their discontinuities, destructions, which embody them, which give birth to them are also very important.

≠

Just as a detour, I would like to mention a group of phenomena /without attempting some generalization/, which is quite important in this respect, although it is beyond the scope of factors discussed so far.

When we examine the sociological background of initiatives discussed, a group of phenomena appears, phenomena which were mainly not analysed from our point of view. It is the relative isolation and specific place of our capital, Budapest, not as an ecological, but rather as a social organizational system of Hungary. In my view, one subject in this respect should not be neglected within this social organization: it is the peculiar organization

and place of intellectuals and professionals of Budapest.
their significance which often goes beyond their inner micro-networks, their impact, the specific circles /substrate/ of this group /intellectuals, practitioners of various art forms, researchers of social sciences, university students, etc./, their changing but nevertheless continuous organizations utilizing this continuity.

Emphasizing again only one factor of it, one sort of "ghetto" character influences the potentials of these organizations from two opposite sides.

A relatively rich network of personal connections, or possible connections, assumed identical values, overlapping and contacts between values, a continuous innovation of these systems, their recharging or inheritance strengthen their potentials, on one side; to define our assumption on a rather general level: these are the constituents that offer a creative lifestyle in a group to this quasi group. We can hardly miss the informal, sometimes formal position as a carrier of values of this lifestyle group differentiated internally, and what a radiating impact it has.

On the other side, the cast-character inherent in the "ghetto like" organization, some sort of lack of outside relations, and the separation between value systems shared by this group and the ones shared by the other strata of society, which have continually survived through historic times weakens this potential.

Our more limited field of study; the so-called social initiatives may also be interpreted within this framework.

For:

- they are born, partly within this lifestyle group,
- or are partly born outside of this circle, but they want or can join this group,
- or they are born outside of it, but they may join it as a reference system,
- partly they move or stay on the peripheries of these loose circles;

and all of these relations have their manifold impact on their values, organization, bases. This group of phenomena may also assume some specific emphasis, within lives of the so-called initiatives of social type, content, because, inherent in their specific ghetto/character, these initiatives -- which are often oriented towards positional changes in quite different lifestyle groups within the same society while they assume solidarity or at least a minimal stage of tolerance on the side of other lifestyle groups outside of these contacts -- must face and fight various tensions day after day. This is one of the reasons why some initiatives, originally of social content turn gradually into a less social version. This turn sometimes constitutes a process, but often is limited at the very start, as to the social character and goals of such initiatives.

■

When presenting concrete cases, I shall return to the case stories of new and new starts and separations. /Although they cannot substitute an outline of a general and also valid overview of time-related processes at this point of our analysis; -- however, I am not yet satisfactorily prepared for its description./

Now I am going to point out primarily some features of the processes, initiatives analysed. I am also aware of the fact that these features cannot be generalized unconditionally, literally, and in every respect, to all of the relevant initiatives, although their frequency and weight are considerable.

.. X

We have already known most features of the initiatives in Hungary and they have also been defined /see at this point especially the works of L. Solyom, E. Bilecz, M. Szabó, E. Hankiss/. Here I am presenting or describing only some features I often met in course of analysing initiatives within small communities of a strict social goal.

The term, "being different" might even be simpler and more general -- although it is even less "scientific" -- than the other ones such as "autonomous", "alternative", "new" "transitory", "spontaneous". This feature of "being different" is the very one, sensed and reacted by the political spheres, official circles in sophisticated ways, manifested in a great variety of walks of life on the everyday level. The reason for such a sensibility, why such an elevated level, degree of sensibility has been manifested on the side of authority has been that such initiatives make explicit for the power groups, force an established authority /the "appointed" and the "competent" institutions/ aspiring for totality, to face the very fact that there have been walks of life, realms of reality which are "not satisfactorily controlled", and could not satisfactorily taken under their influence within the systems of social movements, organizations, communications, value-systems, spheres of consciousness.

An impact of reactions, instinctively quick and sensitive -- however, as it has been emphasized, structurally regular -- has been overpoliticization, oversized, exclusion, an aggressive defense mechanism seeking enemies, scapegoats, etc. /Refuting "being different" under such conditions have entered even the minor, everyday spheres of life and it has been extended over the frontier lines of relations between authority and society./

This sensibility on the side of power results, on the one hand, in the fact that even a minor feature is interpreted as a challenge, or as an initiative. /Not only on the side of power groups reacting to them./ Hence, some initiatives to be born or just born often assume an interpretation, meanings, and significance often far beyond their simple self-centered goals. Within a vacuum developed as a result of monopolistic values these initiatives can indeed be considered as significant /on the ground of continuity, by virtue of their overall messages and meanings, while their specific demonstrative character presenting values should also be considered./

An overcontent resulting from the factors discussed above appears in the official reception, inner movements and values of initiatives and circles; in their self-evaluations and also in image formation by the social environment. This includes at least as many, if not more disadvantages, negative elements, as positive reaction just as in case of developing an overcontent the main roles belong to primarily negative constellations.

However, "being different" indicates value-structures, lifestyle, experimental life styles, extended

beyond the roles of subjects deprived from their citizen's roles as expected by authorities, consensual norms and behavioral roles influenced by authorities beyond the momentary gestures, or at least indicates their possibilities.

Under the established conditions even the mildest and most elementary experiment for self-definition of self-description -- which is an aspect, inherent in being different -- is interpreted as "being different" when seen it from the outside. /In parentheses I indicate that I am not going to discuss here the more familiar and rather explained indicators of "being different" in terms of the specific political forms, different communicative forms of these initiatives, the aspiration for independence, equality, lack of fear, and aspiration for developing a balance between private and "political" spheres on the level of individuals and collectives./

Some aspects of "being different" that may be considered pathological should also be mentioned. In a society which deviates and marginalizes differences of any sort in their mechanisms and spirit a rather complex and multifold relation develops between "being different" and marginalized situations.

On one side, we can observe a direct marginalization pushing units /people and organizations/ into the peripheries, because they are different; they are denounced on the mere ground of being different /differing behaviour, lifestyle, thinking/.

However, where being different, where differing values separated from the dominant everyday patterns are often presented verbally as to be not normal /"I am crazy", - I am different/ even the less direct mechanisms are satisfactory for causing confusions of self-esteem.

On the other hand, through the sophisticated mechanisms of social situations and organizations people who were previously or are actually in a situation of crisis, either on an individual or social /family, career, orientation, health, etc./ basis, or experience disturbance in their ways of living; their life-stream is broken, or eventually face some personality disturbance, disorder, or have more or less become marginalized, or used to be in a marginalized situation, people deviating from the "normal" standards are often grouped around such initiatives.

To turn back to the phenomenon of overcontent -- influencing the inner life of initiatives -- a considerable result of various initiatives inherent in social goals -- there is an aspiration for a "quasi model" character. This is the assumed goal and value character of the idea -- /in our impoverished and vacuum like social environment -- that a self-centered initiative /like a "gesture" must have some significance beyond itself, which may be started via this initiative, or at least it should start some trends of this sort within the society-at-large or a well-defined segment, group of it: organic, parallel, or model taking movements, organizations. /By which participants are assuming some sort of awareness of their mission, of which impacts are also manifested in the joints of inner and outer factors./

On the other side, the aspiration for a quasi model in its quality to be recognized as a model by authorities, the "competent" institutions; that they "have to recognize" such qualities of the initiatives in question -- this way including partially some sort of mixing with the power groups, or at least a manifestation of might be acceptance as valid as possible, and various indications of this quality through strategies of the initiative in question /such as the "bombing" of bureaucrats, correspondence, aspiration for entering mass media, presenting proposals, an aspiration for a professional legality as wide as possible, etc./.

And by means of all these ways, there is also an aspiration for "assisting the birth" of the parallel initiatives. /It is another question that by virtue of professional, value-oriented and other chauvinism, the "fighting through" models alternative to the original situation is not characteristic of and common for the strategy of pushing them out horizontally and vertically, operates efficiently, here, too./

The most important trap, or problem of this mixing, model forming way has been its ambivalence related to institutionalization. Although it would be a fruitful discussion, here we do not analyse some points of this problem; the dilemmas of being inside and outside the established institutions, being shaped or not, dependence or independence in relation to the outside forces, a defensive but legalizing aspiration for being overshadowed, or unorganized state, etc.

Trends and consequences just opposite to these rather spectacular and more visible discussed phenomena of overcontent may also be observed: when initiatives tend to remain within the less visible, rather informal spheres avoiding the "danger of outside world". Under the given conditions this hiding has some advantages, in spite of its disadvantages. In a paradox way, this situation is also often preferred by the power groups: when this "hiding" on the one side, and "making invisible" on the other, and the interplay between them: a formation of keeping these initiatives invisible is precisely the very condition whereby power relations between citizens and the State are characterized by the fact that power groups can already give up exercising control over every steps, all walks of life of their citizens, but they still insist upon selecting from among manifestations and deciding upon what should be visible and what should not -- and people participating in the initiatives in question may accept this condition for the sake of their existential needs. /To refer to Tamás Pál, we can speak in this respect of "a network of hidden communities" beyond the "hidden network of communities"./

Finally, as a problem, however important, but nevertheless hard to approach which has not especially been explored so far, let me mention some characteristics and mechanisms of how the inner life of such initiatives is formed.

The touchstone of this problem is: to what extent one offers differing values, specific individual assumption of values, norms and forms of human relations /often

different from the dominant patterns/ models of attitudes and behaviour are observed and realized within the framework of these initiatives in question.

In connection with this question, the impacts of culture-at-large are realized in the more sophisticated behavioral codes and methods, means should be separated from the impacts of the rather hard regulations /such as legal forms, rules, problems of financing, etc./ In this respect, we cannot ignore the realization of some negative processes -- beyond the trends of positive direction: the genuine autonomous models of processes which have actually been realized. /When liquidation, destruction, an exaggerated, forced value system and pressure take over the declared tolerance; when totalitarianism prevails instead of free movements, democratic forms are deteriorated to means of the harder manipulations; and communication is strangled by bureaucracy; institutionalization and cohesion are destroyed by dissension; readiness to act is overcome by a deeper apathy and resignation, equality is exhausted by hierarchy, defencelessness and subordination; and openness is changed to closed doors./

#

Our discussion might make clear that the communal initiatives analysed assume the existence of two ideal type -- autonomous people and civic society -- and even if only a partial and distorted version of theirs may exist, it still offers a chance for the births of such organizations -- even if they are only partial and are often distorted.

Appendix

Poor-supporting Found
Society of Large Families
Pensioners' League
Cultural Association of Hungarian Gipsies
Social Workers' Association of Hungary
"Hirscher Rezső" Socialpolitical Association
AE clubs, Anonymus
Association of Disabled People
Association of Mentally Handicapped Children
Sclerosis multiplex-clubs
Lipid-clubs
Communities for drug-takers
Clubs of cancer patients
AIDS Foundation
Blind peoples Foundation
Association against Alcoholism
SOS-Childrenvillage
Actions for special operations
Presbyterian Mission for Tramping Youngs
Evangelical Alcoholic-sawing Mission
Alms-house Foundation
LARES
TOLERANCIA
MINERVA
MENS SANA
PSZICHOTEAM
FILANTROPIA