

***INTEGRATION, EFFECTIVENESS
AND ADAPTATION IN
SOCIAL SYSTEMS
A Comparative Analysis of
Kibbutzim Communities***

DANIEL KATZ

*Department of Psychology
University of Michigan*

NAPHTALI GOLOMB

*Management Training Center
Rupin Institute (Israel)*

I

The kibbutz system furnishes a new model of community life which emphasizes both the integrated group and the integrated individual. It is a way of life which includes within the framework of its community the full personality and avoids the fragmentation of the individual which is characteristic of most organized societies. It is a total-inclusion system in which members live, raise children, work and produce and grow old and die. A kibbutz is in fact a micro-cosmos society. It is a community which strives with considerable success to integrate technological achievements with social achievements. The discrepancy between technical advance and social progress is the crucial dilemma of modern industrial society. The kibbutz system thus is of interest not only in its own right, but in relation to more conventional social structures.

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Part II of this article will be published in the February 1975 issue of Administration & Society.*

ADMINISTRATION & SOCIETY, Vol. 6 No. 3, November 1974
©1974 Sage Publications, Inc.

Students of comparative social organizations will be very limited, however, in their understanding of the kibbutz system if they take the traditional sociological approach with its descriptive categories derived from formal structural analysis. Often its assumptions are those of closed-system theory. Kibbutz members themselves raise questions about the applicability and relevance of much of the past research to the understanding of the kibbutz system and the dynamic issues of kibbutz life. The sociological conceptions emphasize social structural variables of descriptive character and minimize motivational and personality considerations based upon more explanatory propositions. Yet the kibbutz system is a small system based upon voluntarism, informality, face-to-face interaction, and direct democracy. There are no formal sanctions for coercing people, and there are no material incentives for maximizing individual effort. The branch teams in farm and factory are autonomous groups. The complex network of vertical and horizontal committees cutting across the community is maintained by shared expectations and norms and by the referent power of leaders and subgroups. The main social forces shaping the social realities of the kibbutz are the group forces of a socialpsychological character. The motivational dynamics of the individual in the system are crucial. Hence an approach which accepts motivational forces as *givens* or *constants* is inadequate for a study of the kibbutzim. What is needed, then, for better understanding of the kibbutz is a theoretical attack designed to deal with the integration of the individual into his group and his community, to study motivational and cognitive processes and interpersonal relations—in brief, a socialpsychological approach. Often, however, psychologists, in their concern with personality variables, neglect the social context which conditions and helps to determine human behavior. Research needs to be guided by a theory which will take account not only of the integration of the individual into his community, but of the integration of the community itself and of the relationships of the community to the larger social systems in which it is embedded.

In recent years, a new approach which cuts across traditional areas of academic specialization has been winning support in the behavioral sciences, namely, open-system theory.¹ It is especially appropriate for the study of kibbutzim in that it deals with the human inputs into a social system, the specific internal processes of the system, the outcomes and the relations of the system to its environment. It is concerned with feedback processes which regulate the system and coordinate subsystems and with the underlying communication mechanisms of types of feedback. The degrees and kinds of openness which permit adaptation to outside forces

are considered in relation to the coding and filtering mechanisms which preserve system identity. An open system functions not to maintain a steady state of a static character, but rather a state of dynamic equilibrium. Thus, open-system theory would deal not only with the three levels of our analysis, but also with their interdependence. The three levels are:

- (1) The Individual Level—The motivations and beliefs which attract the individual to the system, which hold him in the system, and which relate to his performance in that system.
- (2) The System Level—The internal system processes and the integration of the system as a system, system effectiveness and the effects of the system upon the behavior of its members.
- (3) The Supra-System Level—The relation of the kibbutz to the movement of which it is a member and to the larger Israeli society.

For a study of kibbutzim, open-system theory needs some specification to encompass the three levels of analysis. Specifically, this elaboration must take into account three crucial problem areas:

- (1) The degree of integration-disintegration.
- (2) The degree of effectiveness.
- (3) The adaptation and creative modification of values.

Every crucial problem area of a kibbutz is operationally perceived as a criterion measurement—that is, integration, effectiveness, and creative modification are yardsticks for the evaluation of the individual, of the system, and of its relationships to its social environment. These three criteria can thus be used at all levels of analysis. Moreover, they need to be used over a time sequence and their dynamic determinants ascertained. They may differ in their degree of realization at the different levels. Consequently, it may be that the kibbutz cannot reach maximum or optimal solutions at all levels simultaneously. The March-Simon model of “satisficing” may, under certain conditions, be the more appropriate model (March and Simon, 1958). March and Simon show that, in general, systems have built-in constraints which predispose them toward a satisfactory solution rather than an optimal outcome.

In examining the three criteria as they apply to the various levels of analysis, one can expect to find considerable overlapping between the individual and the system level in the specifics of integration and effectiveness. In kibbutz life, there is much less separation between goals and the means for their attainment than in formally organized systems.

The roles of the kibbutz member are much more likely to be expressive of his personality than is the role behavior of a person living in industrial society. The formal role differentiation making for segmentalization of the person is not a common occurrence in the kibbutz. Furthermore, the goals of the kibbutz system are deemed to be the same as the goals of the individual members. There is an organic feedback loop between the individual and the system with no intervention of coercive mechanisms through which the system controls its members.

The implications of our mode of analysis will become clearer if we describe the application of criteria to the three levels of analysis.

INTEGRATION

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

The major interest here is the degree to which the individual is fully integrated into the social system in relation to his own needs and capacities. On the negative side the apathetic, anomic, uninvolved person shows not only lack of system integration but poor personality integration as well. He is outside the system in a psychological sense with no channels of personality expression to compensate for his social isolation. The rebellious person, on the other hand, can be alienated in some respects from the major system but can still be active and expressive in his rebellion. In the kibbutz, this theoretical problem of the disaffected system person who is still a well-integrated personality is not likely to arise because of the closeness of the system to the individual. Hence alienation, as well as apathy, are indications of the failure of system integration.

Another measure of poor system integration is the degree of conflict the individual experiences between his system roles, or between his personal needs and aspirations, and his functional role as a worker. Women in the kibbutzim have some of the same frustrations between their work roles and their aspirations as in other societies, but the problem is recognized and solutions are being sought (Rosner, 1967).

On the positive side, we speak of good integration of members into the system if they are bound in, in four ways: functionally, socioemotionally, normatively, and ideologically.

- (1) Functional integration refers basically to two factors: (a) whether the individual has a meaningful work role in the system, and (b) whether membership in the system brings a materially satisfying way of life.

- (2) Socioemotional integration refers to the affective attachment to the system and includes identification with the community, attraction to fellow members, and positive conditioning to the social environment.
- (3) Normative integration has to do with the acceptance of norms of behavior which are shared with others and which are consistent with the values of the system. These shared norms, then, are the legitimized expectations of the behavior of members. Thus the individual will conform to what he perceives as legitimate institutional demands, without feeling coerced.
- (4) Ideological integration refers to more generalized values of the kibbutz movement and furnishes the broader legitimation for system norms.

The kibbutz cliché of thinking is to overestimate the normative and ideological forms of integration and to underestimate the other types. But all four are important in achieving maximum integration. Deficits in one form can be compensated for by another, but in the long run integration suffers if one type is absent or weak. The kibbutz does lack the material type of reward available to people in Israel outside the kibbutz. No one can profit at the expense of his neighbor. Nevertheless, material progress and material rewards are not without significance. People share in the common fruit of their labors and their joint efforts lead to greater returns.

These four types of integration can be separated for purposes of analysis, but in reality they exist in combination and interact with one another. Economic success is functional, or instrumental, but will add to socioemotional integration. Further, a work role that is weak in functional meaning to the individual can be strengthened by its socioemotional characteristics. In discussing kibbutz farming as an integrating mechanism, we will see how it involves functional and socioemotional features as well as ideological ones.

Moreover, functional, socioemotional, normative, and ideological involvements are the sociopsychological sources of integration. For commitment to the community, these sources have to be tied to the community system in that it is the kibbutz that is the agency responsible for insuring the satisfaction of needs. Thus it is not enough to have people finding gratification in their work or in their attachment to their physical environment. They conceivably could find similar meaningful work roles in other systems or they could still like their surroundings in a non-kibbutz setting. Hence, mechanisms of integration develop which link the individual to the particular community through symbols reflecting a common way of life, a common history, and a common fate. We shall

discuss these mechanisms in the following description of socioemotional integration.

Socioemotional integration refers to the identification of the individual with his community, to his rootedness in his environment, to his sense of belonging to his group. There are many mechanisms which operate to produce integration of this sort. In the first place, physical separation of the community from the surrounding society makes possible the emotional attachment to a physically bounded space, its people and its objective environment (buildings, land, hills and valleys, trees). Furthermore, physical boundaries are critical for a contra-culture which could be overrun by the many constant forces from the dominant society. Kibbutzim that did start in the outskirts of urban centers were not able to survive in the setting when the cities grew and enveloped them. It is extremely difficult to set up a cooperative commonwealth in an urban backyard of a capitalistic community. The development and preservation of system identity requires boundaries and, in this case, physical separation in order to provide the necessary conditions both for cultural distinctiveness and for emotional identification with the new system.

Second, ceremonials, festivals, public singing and dancing, and celebrations of the birthday of the kibbutz all provide the basis for an affective conditioning to the community. Nor should the heavy social reinforcement of these occasions be underestimated. The interstimulation of people engaged in common celebrations builds up in a circular fashion. The Hora dancing includes all members of the community in a common joyous dance, in contrast to modern individual dancing. Kanter includes these types of group activities as one of the mechanisms making for communal commitment, and her study of American utopian communities reports that such commitment is associated with the success or failure of the system (Kanter, 1968).

Third, decision-making also can contribute heavily to the emotional cohesion of the group, though there are occasions when it may detract from group solidarity. The continuity of personal association is paralleled by the historical continuity of the culture which, as one of its forms of expression, has made Hebrew its accepted language. The feeling of togetherness and sense of community grow out of a common way of life and a common history and are fostered by symbolic and functional activity. The result of these many processes has been the creation of a cultural island.

Socialization practices for the second and third generations which emphasize the distinctiveness of kibbutz culture are productive of integration for those who have not selected themselves for the kibbutz.

The commitment of the children growing up in the kibbutz will differ in some respects from that of the founding kibbutzniks, but the strength of their attachment may be just as great. The use of peer groups to develop a collective sense of responsibility in communal activities and growing up in a psychologically rewarding environment with unique characteristics tie the younger generation to their communities. This is attested by the fact that the great majority of the kibbutz second generation, after contact with the outside world through service in the armed forces, returns to the kibbutz—either to their own community or to the kibbutz of the spouse. The low attrition rate is all the more remarkable in view of the greater affluence and the more comfortable way of life outside of the kibbutz and the greater variety of stimulation provided by the urban environment.

It should also be noted that farming as a way of life helps to bind the individual to his community. The general trends in most societies toward urban concentration can obscure the real attractions of farming as an occupation. People leave the land in good part because of the difficulty of competing as small farmers and because of the economic rewards and stimulation of the city. Those who take jobs in factories and in many service organizations in the city are not, however, moving to more gratifying work. In fact, many farmers in Western countries cling to their farms long past the point of economic solvency. Apart from monetary considerations, farming holds many intrinsic satisfactions. The individual can shape and control his environment, can watch the results of his labor take form, and can have direct experience with the world of nature. In other words, his work can be an integrating pattern in which his needs for accomplishment, for individuality and for aesthetic enjoyment of nature, can all find fulfillment. The kibbutzim have presented a contra-cultural trend in societal development in utilizing farming as an important means for mobilizing the energies of people of a relatively high level of education for community living. This has been accomplished by avoiding the extreme of the individual farmer working on his own and the opposite extreme of the large-scale farm with its hierarchical organization. The kibbutzim with their cooperative farming teams provide ample opportunity for meaningful interaction among the members. Yet every individual is a key performer and his individuality is not lost in routinized fragmented role-taking. Thus the kibbutz has utilized the natural advantages of farming in a social framework of mutual support and responsibility as a mechanism of integration. In addition, of course, the ideology of the founders placed a high value upon a back-to-the-land movement so that we are dealing with a combination of forces the relative weights of which are difficult to ascertain.

In a voluntary system like the kibbutz, then, there is a state of instability in integration if there is insufficient coverage of all four types of involvement. It is well known that many kibbutz members who are strong in their ideological integration are weak in functional integration or in socioemotional integration and in time some of them may depart from their kibbutz. As we have already indicated, one problem for women in the kibbutz is their functional integration.

Thus the kibbutz as a voluntary, all-inclusive society faces special problems in the integration of its members. It must be especially attractive to recruit and hold members because joining a kibbutz is a crucial act which has to take into consideration one's whole life span. Joining a kibbutz is not like joining other organizations such as business enterprises, public agencies, labor unions, and so on. Potential members, in reaching a decision to join, must explore factors transcending the usual considerations involved in entering other organizations. They must be prepared to accept the kibbutz as a way of life where they will establish their families, raise children, and become full-fledged participants in the community. There is the implicit commitment to perpetuate the system from one generation to another and to insure its growth. This means that the self-selection process, while it does not guarantee integration, can work to facilitate the binding-in of members possessing common values and prior commitment. Self-selection, however, does not assure functional integration, as the history of utopian communities attests. In the past, some American utopian groups have attracted people with a common ideology but with no experience and little capacity for farming or business activities. In spite of their attractiveness as intellectual discussion centers, they failed as economic enterprises.

In Israel, there is an uneven state of competition between the kibbutzim and the larger society in attracting and holding members. The kibbutz as a voluntary system cannot hold its members against their wishes and they are always free to move to the larger society. They are prepared to manage for themselves, even in urban environments. Dissatisfied kibbutz members thus have the alternative of moving to the cities, but dissatisfied urban dwellers, in most cases, lack the socialization and training which would make the kibbutz a realistic alternative for them. This one-sided state of affairs operates to reduce the growth rate of the kibbutzim, but it also works to increase the degree of integration of self-selected members into the kibbutz system.

SYSTEM LEVEL

At the level of the system, we are interested in the unity and cohesiveness of the kibbutz community. Do the groups such as the work teams, educational groupings, and age groups crosscut or overlap all along the system in relation to their values, cultural backgrounds, and political orientations? If cleavage exists in the system, then there is the fear that, in such a small community where relationships are so close, the break will be intensified strongly. It may lead to personalization of issues and may split the community into rival parties. This has happened on a few occasions in the past.

Diversities and differences of groups making up the kibbutz are not inevitably a force making for disintegration. Diversities and differences are helpful in breeding a cross-fertilized social system, nourished by varying cultural streams in reference to age, sex, country of origin, profession, and status. Experience indicates that the best communities seem to be those which became melting pots of people from many cultures. In the long run, these communities seem preferable, because of the richness of their cultural base, to those deriving from a mono-culture with members coming from a single country of origin. Although this is commonly accepted as a sound generalization, it is nevertheless true that melting-pot processes may temporarily cause difficulties before adequate communication is achieved.

Differences among groups can be helpful if these differences focus on only one issue and are not cumulative across many crucial questions affecting the system. If, however, members of a group differ from members of another group on a series of issues, there is reinforcement of their divergent approaches and polarization of the community is a likely outcome. In the kibbutz, for example, the differences between the younger and older generations could become a critical problem if the young people were not readily absorbed into the management structure. Hence, divergencies in values of the generations need not be reinforced by their occupying different positions in the decision-making hierarchy as is true in the United States. Nevertheless, the kibbutz is vulnerable to polarization of opposed groupings in that it is separated from the larger society with relative lack of outside communication and with many relationships among the same people in the community. As has been already noted, differences in points of view can become intensified through personalization. The very closeness of the community, however, can be its own remedy. Since one has to live and work with people with whom one has disagreed, there is the practical necessity of keeping communication channels open. This is consistent with the observation of

Newcomb (1947) that the breakdown of communication increases autistic hostility.

If we look at the four bases of integration (functional, socioemotional, normative, ideological), then we have a means for evaluating the unity of the kibbutz. In the first place, functional arrangements work in the direction of integration. Groups within the community are not split along lines of material reward, since they share equally in the outcomes of system functioning. Moreover, though there are some differences with respect to the meaningful character of jobs, these are relatively minor compared to most societies. Differences do exist in that service roles are seen as less rewarding psychologically than other positions and carry less status—a differentiation which runs counter to the old utopian concept of egalitarianism. One solution has been the rotation of less desirable jobs, which does not occur in conventional societies where people are bound into intrinsically unrewarding tasks. Nevertheless, as professional and specialized roles develop, the kibbutz may face more of a problem in the future than it has in the past.

Second, socioemotional attraction to a subgroup is not likely to be a cause of friction between groups as in ethnic divisiveness in the United States. Opportunities for friendship patterns are provided by the small work groups and other associations in the kibbutz. It is not necessary for a member to love every one of his fellows in the community. What is necessary is that socioemotional attractions and repulsions do not become channelled along lines of functional groups or ideological factions. Again, the nature of kibbutz arrangements does not facilitate such divisiveness.

Third, for community cohesiveness, there should not be conflicting norms for different groups. There are a number of devices which minimize normative conflict. For one thing, norms governing behavior derive very closely from the participation of all members of the community in the interpretation of accepted practices. For another, the rotation of officers for all activities prevents cleavage between the manager and rank and file members. Again, it is possible that normative conflict may assume more importance in the future with increasing professionalization.

Fourth, though there may be ideological differences in the kibbutz among its members, there are seldom strong group differences based upon commitment to discrepant value systems. Some kibbutzim in the past did split on political issues and actively carried the fight through to a separation into two communities. This, however, is a great exception in the history of the kibbutzim. Probably the greatest source of value conflict has to do with the distribution of resources between the economic and social subsystems. There are those who want to see any surplus reinvested

in farming and production, and those who would give more emphasis to utilizing the returns for a better way of life. Since this is a relative question of emphasis, it does not make for disintegration of the community at the ideological level.

Another reason why ideological conflict is not a major source of divisiveness in the kibbutzim is the nature of the ideological beliefs of many members. They see their values as capable of being operationalized rather than as existing on a symbolic level with little reference to experience. Particularly striking to the observer visiting the kibbutzim is the highly pragmatic orientation of a people committed to ideological doctrines. He finds ideologists who not only discuss all types of issues at considerable length, but who are also heavily task-oriented; when it comes to practical problems, their words resemble those of the graduates of an American engineering school. They have a capacity for immediately translating an issue into its problem characteristics, identifying the dimensions of the problem, and moving ahead to its solution.

The explanation of this orientation has three sources. The original migrants who founded the community were a highly select group with respect to their varied experiences, intellectual sophistication, and motivation to build their own communities. A second reason is the nature of the objective environment. The circumstances facing the settlers were harsh, but capable of transformation. To survive required a high degree of sacrifice and pragmatism, but meaningful attacks upon economic problems yielded substantial returns. Hence, efforts at problem solution were rewarded. The third reason has to do with the nature of the ideology. The beliefs themselves were more functional than those of religious utopias which are often of a negative, prohibitive character. The ideas of cooperative effort and sharing, and of the full use of human resources in attacking community problems, whether economic or social, were not so much symbolic ideals as highly useful weapons.

This is not to say that the average member of the kibbutz of either the old or the new generation is a model of integration in fusing the Marxian ideals of theory and practice. Most members probably would show a gap between their declared values and their operational values. And the younger generation would be less concerned with the older expressed values and would be more involved in the operational norms of the system. Nonetheless, the values of the kibbutz system, like most democratic ideologies, would have more objective reference and receive more pragmatic testing than the codes of revealed truth, absolutistic morality, or symbolic traditionalism.

Basically, then, most kibbutzim show a high degree of community integration compared to other social systems. There are no economic lines of cleavage. There are some problems of conflict associated with work roles but these are relatively minor. There is a heavy sharing of norms about the many roles and activities of members. Though there are some differences in values, there is a great deal of ideological agreement based upon both self-recruitment into the system and choices made to remain within the system. The fact that roles are not as divorced from personal expression as in a complex formal organization does permit more personalization of conflict between people and more carry-over of differences from one setting to another. But by and large, the differences that do occur do not accumulate and reinforce one another along group lines.

The real test of kibbutz integration, however, is to be found in its turnover and growth. Net growth furnishes a critical operational measure of kibbutz integration in attracting and holding people, especially since the utopian community is a small contra-culture group. If there is group unity and a correspondence between individual needs and values and group norms and ideology, then people will not leave the system. Moreover, it should be attractive not only to its older members, but also to the new young people who come to visit and to do volunteer work.

INTEGRATION WITH THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

No community can remain closed to its larger social environment, namely, the society in which it exists. The kibbutzim interact with society, are affected by it, and in turn affect the larger culture. The drastic changes occurring in Israel in the last decade necessarily have led to adaptation processes on the part of the kibbutzim in relating to the larger system. Yet the kibbutzim in some ways represent a contra-culture to the culture of Israel, which legitimizes private enterprise, formalized religion, and large-scale organizations. The question is whether the kibbutzim might meet the fate of the utopian communities of the nineteenth century.

Can the kibbutzim reach a dynamic equilibrium between integration and separation with respect to the larger society? One fact which argues that that outcome is probable is the pluralistic character of Israeli society. Pluralistic society is the breeding life-space of utopian communities. Israeli society has many different social forms in its farming, industry, and military establishments. The military represents not only some traditional patterns, but also a citizens' army and an internal Peace Corps. A tolerance, then, for different organizational forms and for different value

systems does exist in Israel today. Within this pluralistic framework, however, there must be an openness across subsystems so that, for example, the kibbutzim will accept new members from other sectors of Israeli life and, in turn, allow its members the freedom to leave the kibbutzim for other subsystems. The autonomy of a subsystem does not permit it to keep its borders closed.

The concept of pluralistic society has two dimensions. One refers to the tolerance for various social forms such as cooperative communities, and publicly and privately owned and operated farms; the other refers to the number of relatively independent power groups having the same essential social form. The kibbutzim exist in a society which is pluralistic in both senses. Israeli society has many private enterprises with no domination by one or two industrial giants. Moreover, it is unusual in the variety of types of social structures it legitimizes. At one extreme is the privately owned and operated company. At the other extreme is the communal cooperative of the kibbutz. In between are still other forms. The moshavim are cooperative communities with family-owned farms. There are publicly or governmentally owned and operated enterprises. In addition, the labor movement owns some plants which are run as conventional, private, profit-making businesses. But the labor movement also has cooperative units of an industrial or service character, owned by individual workers who operate them with considerable autonomy with respect to the Histadrut, or overall labor organization. The Histadrut not only is in private business, but also is the administrative tent for various types of cooperative enterprises. Capitalistic and socialistic forms are thus intermingled in Israeli society. The 1960 contributions of the various sectors of the domestic economy are illustrated in Table 1. In the United States, private enterprise contributes over 80% of the gross national product. In Israel, 95% of the workers belong to labor unions. In the United States, only 28% of the workers are union members. The pluralism

TABLE 1
THE SECTOR DISTRIBUTION OF ISRAELI ECONOMY

| Net Domestic Products of Israel in 1960 | |
|--|------|
| State Sector | 21.1 |
| Labor-controlled sector | 20.4 |
| Total Public | 41.5 |
| Total Private | 58.5 |

SOURCE: Sixth Report of the Falk Institute, Hein Barkay.

of Israel is thus much more favorable to the survival and growth of cooperative communities than is that of the United States.

The fact that the kibbutzim are not as contra-cultural in Israel as they would be in the United States does not mean that the more balanced society represents a harmonious state of affairs. As counter forces approach equality, the situation that develops resembles more a tug of war than integration. A pluralistic system thus has built-in sources of system strain. The kibbutzim would not like to see the balance in Israel shifted toward the private sector. On the contrary, their members view their subsystem as a microcosm of the larger society toward which the larger structure should move. They wish to modify Israeli institutions in the direction of egalitarian and cooperative values. In turn, some of the proponents of private property and traditional modernization would like to see the decline of the egalitarianism of the cooperative movements.

The fourfold bases of integration at the individual level still have some relevance for the relationship of the kibbutz to the larger society. The subsystem will be tied into the larger structure if it can furnish needed products and services to the national state and in return can receive the resources it needs. In other words, functional interdependence is an important aspect of societal integration. As will appear in greater detail in subsequent discussion, the kibbutzim, though dependent upon Israel for their well-being, make contributions of critical importance to the economic and political life of Israel.

Socioemotional attraction to the Israeli people as a whole is fostered by threats and dangers to Israel. The continuing conflict with Arabs has unified the people of Israel so that distinctions between kibbutzniks and non-kibbutzniks are of less importance. Though there are differences in norms governing behavior in the kibbutz and in other parts of Israel, norms associated with the assumption of national roles are the same. The members of the kibbutz are staunch supporters of the national state. They play active political roles in voting and serving in office. Their young people willingly accept the required years of military service, and the kibbutzim furnished more than their share of volunteers in combat units in the Six Days' War. Normatively, the people of the kibbutzim are tied into the national system as responsible citizens.

Ideologically, there are real differences between the values of the socialist direct democracy of the kibbutz and those of other parts of the Israeli society. But there is agreement on such ideological goals as democracy, humanitarianism, equality of opportunity and upon the need for an independent homeland for the Jewish people.

The basis for the relationship between the kibbutzim and Israeli society is one of social exchange, and this concept will be elaborated in more detail later. In brief, however, there is a trade-off between the resources and autonomy permitted to the kibbutzim and their contributions to the economy of the nation, to its defense system, power structure, cultural revival, and so on. In contrast to the utopian communities, which were concerned only with their own salvation and tried to be fully isolated from the larger society, the kibbutzim are integrated into Israel through their multifunctional roles. Kibbutz members have participated in significant roles in Israel far beyond their proportion in the population. This heavy contribution was obvious in the prestate period, but its vitality and dynamics in serving Israel in the poststate period are nonetheless still true if one consults objective records.

There is a swinging pendulum of trends in the adaptation of the kibbutzim to the changes that occur in the larger society, and also in the adaptation (radiation) of the larger society to the kibbutz way of life. The equilibrium between the Israeli society and the kibbutzim is dynamic, and it is related to the qualitative and quantitative changes in the role of kibbutzim. Three periods should be noted.

In the prestate period, the majority of the people in the larger society recognized the kibbutzim as an elite group serving the larger society, and kibbutz members were perceived with pride. In the early years of Israel's statehood, however, there were drastic changes of attitude in the large society toward the kibbutzim. These communities during this period were perceived as an outmoded social form, and as contradictory to the normalization needed for the economic growth of Israel. The role of kibbutzim in the past was respected. As Israel gained its statehood, people thought that the role of voluntary organizations, and especially the kibbutzim, had passed. Many saw the kibbutz as being quite rigid and unadaptive to technological innovations. Its basic foundations, they believed, prevented it from competing with the family farm and private industry. Jewish people, having thirsted for 2,000 years to gain their statehood, achieved their goal. The reaction was to believe that the state, through its institutions would solve all problems. There was no need for the roles of voluntary organizations and this was especially seen as true for the kibbutzim. In this period, the pendulum was at the lowest point in comparison to its heights in the prestate period. Also expressed was the ideological justification that egalitarian principles were contradictory to the normalization of Israel's economy.

Over time, it became more and more clear to the objective observer that the kibbutzim were no less adaptable than other social forms and were

capable of meeting the needs of accelerated environmental changes in modern Israeli industrial society. The interesting phenomenon is that they have reached a creative modification of the kibbutz human organization which is still consistent with its major values.

Consequently, in the third period, which carries us into the present time, the kibbutzim are seen as playing an important role in modern Israeli society. But there have been qualitative and quantitative changes in the roles of the kibbutzim in Israel compared to the prestate period. Thus, the pendulum is again swinging toward the top, but not following its previous path. The kibbutzim are now seen in a more differentiated way, both with respect to their contributions to various areas of life, and to the societal inputs provided by Israel. A more balanced approach is in evidence. This approach, both by the society at large and by the kibbutz people, is necessary for recognizing that subcultures are less strong and thus more adaptive to the larger society. The parts played by the subsystem and the supersystem must be seen in the right proportion. In Israeli society and its governmental agencies, people realize the importance of voluntary organizations in contributing to the functions of a structured, institutionalized society. Never can a state solve its problems without the help of many diversified forms of voluntary organizations. Israel has become more sober and after so many centuries of oppression, has already passed the period of emotional drunkenness which occurred with the achievement of statehood.

During the past five years, the kibbutzim have kept pace with the larger society by an average annual growth rate of three percent. The prevailing dynamics of growth of egalitarian communities in the inegalitarian pluralistic society of Israel is the survival model of gradual growth that preserves its percentage share in population growth of the past years. This corresponding rate of population increase can be viewed as a *satisficing* solution to the built-in dilemma of a contra-culture surviving in a dominant culture.

The hypothesis would be that it cannot grow disproportionately compared to the larger society without creating great system strain. Yet it would be unsafe to project parallel growth curves for the years ahead because the assumption of a pattern of stable relationships between the size of a subsystem and the larger system is questionable in the dynamic society of Israel. There are some facts which contradict it. The limitations of water and land are now much greater than in previous years and affect the urban areas less heavily than the rural sections. To continue their growth rate, kibbutzim must accordingly develop in new economic directions. Then, too, the influx of Oriental Jews has affected the

composition of the kibbutz and non-kibbutz populations differentially. Whereas Oriental Jews comprised only 10% of the population of Israel in 1948, they are now a little more than 50% of the population. But in the kibbutzim of 1969 they are only 7% or 8% of the membership. In short, there are dynamic forces affecting the society and its subsystems in different ways so that evenness of growth across the system may require a self-fulfilling prophecy on the part of many leaders.

We have jumped from the kibbutz as a community to the larger Israeli society and neglected the integration between these levels achieved through the larger groupings and movements such as regional cooperation, the kibbutz movements, the overall kibbutz federation, and the labor movement. These interstitial networks operate as a two-way street through which the kibbutz becomes involved in the larger society and in turn is strengthened by its belonging to larger groupings. In some respects, the kibbutz is a cultural island in its physical separation, in its relatively high degree of autonomy, and in its own norms and practices, but it is an island with many bridges to nearby islands and to the mainland.

Regional cooperation, though not the major basis of societal integration, is significant in its own right. In addition to linking several kibbutzim together in establishing and maintaining a common high school, regional cooperation takes other interesting forms. In a given geographical area, the kibbutzim will maintain common facilities for processing and marketing agricultural products. This arrangement will also include the moshavim or cooperative farms in the area. Kibbutzniks are thus brought together, not only with their fellows from other kibbutzim, but also with outsiders from the cooperative farms. The economic cooperation which results benefits both groups.

All kibbutzim belong to one of five organized movements or federations. There is a high degree of cooperation among the communities in these movements, and a large movement can support research and training centers for its members. In this fashion, some of the advantages of technical, specialized, and professional training present in a larger system can be realized by the participation of the small communities in their movement. Each movement has its own bank to provide economic assistance and loans. Other services, such as the skills of architects for designing new buildings, are also provided. Moreover, decisions about the allocation of manpower are made at the federation level. Applicants for membership from the outside are assigned to given kibbutzim. If a new kibbutz is set up, the manpower to be furnished by individual communities is discussed and decided by the federation. Finally, though the ideological differences between the movements are no longer as great

as during the founding years, the values of a given kibbutz receive support both in their maintenance and their operation through interaction in their own movement. The movements also serve to tie the kibbutzim to the larger society as well, as will appear presently in our discussion of the labor movement.

The kibbutzim have moved toward even greater cooperation through a single federation, which is the organization of the five movements or federations. The overall organization has many educational, research, and training institutions. The major centers are Oranim, a teachers' college for kibbutz educators; the Rupin Institute for agriculture; Rehovot, for graduate training in agriculture; and the Economic Advisory Research Center. The Rupin Institute, an institution of higher education for managers, agricultural workers, and other technicians, illustrates how the federation ties the kibbutzim into the larger society. For this Institute, in some of its operations, is officially an agency of the Israeli government though operated by the federation. The government contributes to the budget of the Institute, as in the case of the Kibbutz Management Center, which is a joint venture of the Ministry of Farming and the federation. The Institute utilizes many faculty members from the universities of Israel. As part of its technical assistance program, the government sends foreign students, mainly from Asia and Africa, to the Institute for special programs of study. Thus this federation activity provides a network of communication and activity connecting the kibbutzniks with the larger society. Similarly, at Oranim the federation maintains a teachers' training college primarily for kibbutz teachers, which also has government support, utilizes lecturers from Israeli universities, and links kibbutz people to Israeli society.

All members of the kibbutzim are also members of the labor movement in Israel. The founding fathers were in the majority of cases Socialists, many of whom were active in the labor movements in their own country, and later in Israel. They helped to establish the fairly powerful labor organization known as the Histadrut, and some officers of the Histadrut came from kibbutzim. Again, this involvement of kibbutzniks in activities outside their communities ties them into other systems. It furnishes ideological reinforcement for their value orientation and in turn relates outside labor to the kibbutzim as a source of support. In fact, the social exchange means that there is more ideological input into the labor movement from the kibbutzim than from the labor movement into the kibbutzim.

The relationship between the labor movement and utopian communities finds reflection in political activities. Many kibbutzniks are

members of one of the labor parties. They are not merely formal members but activists, and frequently stand for election to public office. In the past, Parliament members from kibbutzim held about 15% of the seats and about a third of the Cabinet posts in spite of the fact that they constitute only 4% of the population. Hence, the activities of the kibbutz members in the labor movement and in the related political parties involves them heavily in Israeli society. Elected and appointed political officers maintain their kibbutz membership and make possible effective communication in the kibbutzim about national affairs. Though these people have held strategic positions in government, they have not utilized their posts to advance the kibbutz cause, though they are sometimes subject to criticism by some kibbutzniks for the divorcing of their two roles.

We have made passing reference to the support of kibbutzim values from their ties to their own movement and to the labor movement. The ideological integration of the kibbutz member thus has a broad base because he is not only tied to the norms of his own community, but he is also identified with the values of collectivities which transcend his immediate group. He has a sense of belonging to the socialist movement in his country and to related ideological groupings the world over. The interest of kibbutzniks in Japanese groups attempting to set up cooperative commonwealths is a case in point. There has been another trend, however, not as universal, but still not particularistic in its implications, namely the identification with Zionism—belief in the necessity of a Jewish homeland to preserve the physical and cultural integrity of the Jewish people. This was an important force in founding the kibbutzim and in the ideological integration of their members. Continuing immigration into Israel of refugees helps to sustain this stream of influence. The younger generation of kibbutzniks were relatively less affected by this type of value orientation, but the continuing threat of the Arabs to the existence of Israel has made Zionism more salient for them as well.

EFFECTIVENESS

The criterion of effectiveness is broader than the concept of efficiency as efficiency is usually measured. It refers to the degree to which a system mobilizes and utilizes internal and external resources to achieve its objectives (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967). Thus, it not only includes

production measures and work performance, but encompasses the degree of successful operation of all functions of the system.

THE INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

At the individual level, effectiveness is a matter of an individual's achievements in reaching given goals. This includes both performance in his work role and in his many citizen roles. It reflects both his energetic inputs and their meaningful direction and application with respect to accomplishment. In the kibbutz, there is no basic discrepancy between the objectives of the individual and those of his community. Individual members determine group goals in the direct democracy of the community. If people are responsible in carrying out agreed-upon role assignments, if they produce above expectations, and if they show innovative acts of their own beyond role requirements toward group accomplishment, then both individual measures of production, when aggregated, and genuine group indices should be highly correlated. Nevertheless, the correlation will not necessarily be so high that one is justified in neglecting to measure both individual and group levels. Individuals may be highly effective in meeting task and social requirements, but the arrangement of roles can affect system outcomes. There can be better group synchronization in one community than in another.

THE SYSTEM LEVEL

The criteria for measuring economic effectiveness are twofold: how well do the kibbutzim do over the years in utilizing past performance as a standard, and how well do they do compared to other social forms in Israel? The first criterion shows marked achievement in the great strides taken toward economic well-being. From conditions of deprivation, the kibbutzim have moved fairly steadily toward a good standard of living as the profitability of their economic enterprises has grown. Though still not affluent communities, there is little resemblance between the early days of existence at the subsistence level and the present thriving way of life.

Does the kibbutz economic subsystem compete in its farm and industrial products in Israel's market with products of other social forms? In the case of farming, the comparison is with private farms and with the "Moshav" social forms, which are family-owned farm villages based upon cooperative marketing and purchasing, and mutual aid. In the case of industry, the comparison is with private industry and with labor industries

of two types: industries owned by labor unions as a holding firm, and cooperative plants owned mostly by the workers employed.

What are the strengths, limitations and weaknesses in farming and industry in relation to other economic systems? There is little doubt that the kibbutz economic subsystem tends to be quite efficient in farming. As to the relation to outside industry, kibbutzim are less experienced, but there are strong indications that they are competitive with private industry in certain types of products. The impact of industrialization does raise problems which are still to be fully explored and analyzed in a search for solutions. Economically successful factories could threaten the social fabric of the system. Hence the kibbutzim must be selective in the types of plants they introduce and in the manner in which the plants are organized to avoid disruption of the present way of life. On the other hand, it is also critical to have industrial enterprises that are economically proficient and can compete in the marketplace.

The kibbutz economic subsystem is an integrated economic entity which operates basically as an autonomous unit within the existing monetary system of Israel's economy. Being an egalitarian society, the inner economic relationship of kibbutzim with their members involves no monetary transactions.

The kibbutz subsystem products are transferred to its environment in exchange for input resources to insure its survival and growth.

Since the kibbutz economic subsystem functions without individual material drives (incentives), it must rely on group-oriented drives to increase the kibbutz standard of living and to insure its economic growth. Under such different material motivational forces, can the kibbutz system be competitive? In agricultural production the answer is clearly and definitely in the affirmative. Kibbutz farm products have fared well in the marketplace both within and without Israel. Compared to the private sector of farming, kibbutz agriculture is more efficient according to official statistics. In industry, which only recently has become a considerable part of kibbutz economic effort, the statistics on competitive efficiency are incomplete. Again, however, the available information furnishes an affirmative answer to the question of ability of the cooperative to hold its own in economic proficiency. With many commodities the demand for kibbutz products is greater than the supply. Manpower is the limiting factor rather than market. A study by S. Melman (n.d.), moreover, compared a matched sample of six kibbutz plants with six factories in Israel run along traditional lines and found the kibbutz plants superior in productivity, and in profit as a percent of capital invested.

The idealistic but realistic people of the kibbutzim are deeply concerned with the productive proficiency of the kibbutz as a means for survival and growth. When they have an economic failure, they perceive it as a hard indication of the malfunctioning of their system as a whole. If economic failure continues, it will inevitably affect the social system adversely and an individual's sense of feeling in his relation to that system. Kibbutz people perceive effectiveness measurement data as giving important indications of the working of the social system since a great interdependence exists between economic and social subsystems. If the social subsystem is not functioning well, people are not properly motivated and productivity suffers.

There may be some time lag in the effect of the interdependence of economic and social subsystems. A sound social subsystem furnishes a sound foundation for its economic survival and growth. If not, erosion of the social system will undermine its economic foundation and lead to a high rate of member turnover. Even an originally good social subsystem is placed under heavy strain by economic failure.

Consequently, in this level of analysis, the kibbutz system must be evaluated in terms of the degree that it successfully mobilizes sufficient scarce resources, such as land and water, from the larger society to insure its survival and growth, and still provides its members with an increasing standard of living commensurate with the progress of Israeli society.

The kibbutz does have the advantage of influencing the increasing standard of living of its members in more ways than one. It can give less emphasis to certain types of material goods and passive entertainment and more attention to cultural and educational needs. Thus it can mold and enrich its members' patterns of consumption rather than having these patterns determined by the mass media, as in conventional society. Consequently, the quest for profitability of the kibbutz people in running their daily affairs serves as a means of realization of their system values here and now. Idealistic young people, in trying to realize their dreams, have to cope with the production aspects of their system. There are no magical resources available to them and it is only their effectiveness in production which can assure them the inputs they need.

THE LEVEL OF THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

The effectiveness of the kibbutz can also be evaluated in relationship to the larger society of which it is a part. In the previous section, we were concerned with the kibbutzim themselves, specifically how well they

functioned in improving the way of life of their members. The practical measure of effectiveness would be comparisons over time or comparisons with other social forms. But since kibbutzim are a subsystem of Israeli society, their effectiveness can also be viewed from the point of view of their contributions to Israel in relationship to the inputs they receive from the larger society.

In reference to mobilization of manpower from the cities of Israel and in Jewish communities abroad, the kibbutzim are quite efficient in attracting thousands of youngsters from many sources to join them permanently or temporarily. After the Six Days' War, the kibbutzim were in fact the main communities which absorbed thousands of youngsters from abroad who felt it their duty to help Israel to recover from the wounds of war. In the mobilization of young people, the kibbutzim are a dominating force. They have many types of recruiting forms such as: "Machal"—civilian-military units: "Youth Aliyah"—kibbutz youth scout movements, education of deprived children, and so on. Because of the important role that the kibbutzim play in the settlement of Israel, in the defense system, and in its cultural revival, young people especially from Jewish communities abroad who want to live or spend some time in Israel will often come to a kibbutz.

The degree of effectiveness of the kibbutzim's roles in Israeli society at large is measured from the viewpoint of the larger society. The kibbutzim, cultivating 32% of the arable land, have been responsible in recent years for about one-third of the gross national farm product, while being only 4% of the population. The kibbutzim produce about 7% of the gross industrial national product. Altogether, in terms of gross farm and industrial output, the kibbutzim produced, in 1968-1969, 12% of Israel's products, amounting to a contribution of 951,000,000 Israeli pounds. In the primary (agricultural) and secondary (industrial) sectors of the economy critical for a small, developing nation, the kibbutzim furnish three times the amount which would be expected from their population. Comparable figures for tertiary (service) occupations are lacking and would be difficult to interpret, since the kibbutzim furnish most of their own services for their members. The relatively large contribution of the kibbutzim to the nation's productivity has not lessened their contribution to the defense system, to political participation, and to cultural activities in the larger society.

The role of young members of the kibbutzim in the Israeli defense system can be measured by the terrible losses of kibbutz soldiers in the Six Days' War. Twenty-five percent of the overall Israeli casualties were

kibbutz soldiers, not the 4% expected by population proportions (a ratio of 1 : 6). Kibbutz members, as soldiers, comprise more than 25% of voluntary combat units such as parachutists, pilots, and so on.

In many of the air units of the Israeli Army, kibbutzniks compose 60% of the combat pilots. The screening process for combat pilots is long and arduous; the children of the kibbutz are markedly successful in completing this training program. As more than half the pilot force, they also suffer a proportionate number of casualties in these hazardous roles.² Of the 225 kibbutzim, 67% are on the frontiers of the country and serve as civilian strong points, whereas there are few non-kibbutz communities on the borders.

The defense function of the kibbutzim, which was true in an older period, continues in the present. Since 1967, sixteen new kibbutzim have been established on the Golan heights, two in Sinai and two in the Jordan Valley, to safeguard Israel's borders. After the Six Days' War, kibbutz members in the Beisan Valley and the Jordan Valley continued to cultivate the land under constant harassment and intermittent shelling from the Arabs. Children in these areas live in air raid shelters most of the time. In spite of some casualties and of constant danger, the kibbutzniks maintain their communities and their productive functioning. The great cohesiveness of these communities serves as a shock absorber for the people inland.

The kibbutzim are well integrated in the power structure as has already been indicated. Their members hold a high proportion of parliament and government posts relative to their number.

In the cultural revival of Israel, kibbutz people are taking active roles in all forms of the arts. One will find in the kibbutz population many more poets, authors, painters and sculptors, dancers, and amateur musicians per capita than in Israeli society. The kibbutz creative culture is one of the important fountains of the Hebrew culture renaissance. Many researchers ignore the important variable of the depth of historical culture that bears so much upon people's orientations and behavior. In this respect, the kibbutzim are playing a far greater role in the cultural revival of Israel than are other sectors of the society.

Objectively, the kibbutzim perform an important function as a system for citizenship education. Roughly speaking, of 100 members and candidates who join the kibbutzim over the years, approximately 40 of them remain kibbutz members and 60 leave and move to the cities. The socialization of this latter group in the kibbutzim has a profound effect. A

great many of them play important leadership roles in all realms of Israeli society such as politics, defense, management, labor unions, education, and culture. The kibbutzim have a great impact upon labor unions and Israeli society both through socialization of many of their leaders and through active confrontation with the kibbutz ideology of voluntarism, direct democracy, and egalitarianism.

At this level of analysis of performance, measurements of the diversified roles of the kibbutzim and their important contributions to Israeli society can be defined mechanically by ratio figures based upon the proportion of kibbutz members to the total population of Israel (4%). Using these figures, we find the range of ratios from 1 : 2 to 1 : 8. Moreover, in the changes in Israeli society from the prestate period to the poststate period, the kibbutzim have played a vital part as an elite group.³

The kibbutzim, then, have a highly favorable rate of social exchange with Israeli society. The inputs of scarce resources such as land and water are compensated for by productivity and by many other types of contributions in such areas as defense, government, and culture. Moreover, they attract young people from all over the world to increase Israeli manpower. All in all, the balance seems heavily in favor of the kibbutz.

The question arises, however, whether disproportionate ratios constitute imbalance and instability according to theories of social exchange. Both parties to an unequal exchange may be adversely affected. Thus there is a certain amount of resentment in some quarters in Israel over the heavy representation of kibbutz members in roles of political leadership. Feelings of guilt can develop in other segments of society over the disproportionate part of the kibbutzim in the defense of Israel. For their part, the kibbutzim can suffer from the overutilization of their human resources by the larger society. The influence of the kibbutzim cannot be extended by many times its own numbers and resources without reaching a critical point beyond which it becomes overextended and weakened. The exact critical point is difficult to determine but it is dangerously close when 4% of the population contribute such a large percentage to combat officers and assume such a heavy role in the defense of borders. Sacrifices for Israel are essential in times of emergency and the sense of mission in the service of the larger society is critical. But on a lifetime basis, the majority of kibbutz members seek their satisfaction from their way of life as members of their own community rather than from participating in activities which are not central to their own subsystem. There can be dysfunctional consequences for the kibbutzim if

their members are physically or psychologically outside their own subsystem for long periods. Moreover, the returns and rewards to the kibbutz must bear some equitable proportion to its contributions. Intended or unintended consequences of neglecting the goals of the subsystem by emphasizing its role as a service mechanism for the larger society can be detrimental. To become a service mechanism as an end in itself is undesirable and is too costly for a voluntary community. The energies of members need to be channeled in good measure into the internal dynamics of the subsystem. In the past, the kibbutzim paid a price for overutilization of their resources in a high rate of membership turnover. A sound equilibrium needs to be preserved between the kibbutzim and the society as a whole.

This is not to say that a sound equilibrium rests upon a mechanical parity of reciprocal contributions. Such a parity is impossible to define because many inputs from Israel and outputs from the kibbutzim differ in essential dimensions and their weights change as circumstances vary. In times of national emergency, for example, the interests of the larger society are paramount. It is critical, however, to evaluate the growth rate of the kibbutzim in relation to the growth rate of Israel. If they lag behind the larger society, then it is necessary to raise the question of reducing the favorable rate of exchange.

There is, of course, a return to the kibbutzim for their contributions to Israel in the influence they exert by virtue of their public offices and leadership roles. They are one of the leading subsystems in Israeli society. Their members can take pride in their role, and the prestige of these communities helps to attract new members. But again, differential influence can lead to negative feelings and active opposition to the influential minority. This is all the more a problem in that, from Israel's point of view, the contribution of the kibbutzim to the values of the society may not always be viewed positively. They may be seen as not facilitating the state of normalization which all segments of Israeli society are seeking.

Moreover, the social exchange between the society and its subsystem of kibbutzim has to be viewed in broad perspective with respect to the favorable ratio we have described in specific terms. Utopian communities like the kibbutzim are something of a contra-culture. Even in a pluralistic society, they may have to make heavy contributions to maintain the tolerance of the society for differences, innovations, and experiments in social forms. For their part, a few kibbutzim have at times been less open to exchanges with the larger society than the overall figures of

participation in national affairs would suggest. They have been completely concerned with their own internal problems and have tightened the boundaries between themselves and the larger social environment. The closed-circuit nature of their operations not only means poor integration with Israel, but also an intensification of their own internal problems. The advantages of interaction with the outside social world are lost. These kibbutzim are cut off from fresh ideas and new information and they lack a sense of pride growing out of the meaningful role of the kibbutz in Israel.

In summary, it should be emphasized that we are dealing with a consistent historical trend from the prestate period, through the poststate period, to the immediate present with its continuing hazards. There have been variations in the nature of these contributions. Before 1948 the kibbutzim fulfilled many functions now carried on by the state. Nevertheless, the kibbutzim have played and are playing a vital role in Israeli society. To meet the accelerated changes in Israel, they have achieved a new equilibrium in their strong contributions to the economy and to many other important areas of life. In size, scope, and diversity of contributions, they surpass any other sector of Israeli society.

CREATIVE MODIFICATIONS OF VALUES

Every system faces the problem of change adaptive to its environment. At the one extreme, structures which try to operate as closed systems can only survive in a highly stable milieu. Feudal institutions were able to carry on over centuries because they functioned in a relatively unchanging world. Even these remarkably enduring institutions crumbled under the influence of trade and other forms of contact across country boundaries. At the other extreme, systems that are fully open to all sorts of inputs become coterminous with their environments and lose their identities. The university which allows contracts for military research to dominate its activities becomes a branch of the government and loses its distinctive function. The individual who is all things to all men and takes on the color of his immediate environment becomes part of other systems and no longer functions as an individual agent. In the dynamic world of this century, the accelerated rate of change places all systems under pressure to modify their values. Unless, however, they can modify their values in accord with their own goals, their integrity is undermined. Even such a strong institution as the Roman Catholic Church is confronted with the

problem of adapting to a changing society without sacrificing its basic value structure. As we have previously noted, the problem of adapting to the larger society has spelled death for many utopian communities which were not able to achieve a balance between change forces and maintenance forces. The kibbutzim face similar difficulties in remaining kibbutzim and yet adapting to change forces.

THE INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

Since the small community of the kibbutz involves all of its members in direct democracy, it is difficult to separate out creative adaptation at the individual level and at the level of the community. Nevertheless, it is important to explore the individual's efforts at creative problem-solving in terms of his personal needs as they are inhibited, facilitated, or otherwise affected by his membership in the community.

In the first place, there is the problem of the inhibition of creative effort for the individual member who becomes part of any social system. Creativity is lodged in the individual's own needs and talents and is difficult to produce by system directives. There is some basis for the image of the creative person as a deviant, with respect to organizational involvement, in contrast to the compliant organizational man. The growth of formal organization can affect the personality pattern of individuals in reducing feelings of control over their own fate and their sense of responsibility over social outcomes of system functioning. As roles proliferate and complex structures become elaborated, the individual becomes a matrix of role commitments. He meets his many obligations by appropriate segmental responses but he lacks opportunities to develop his own values which would impel him toward creative integration.

The groping of the younger generation the world over toward self-expression and self-actualization is a rebellion against the institutional traps of modern society. The surprising fact is that older people have been basically tolerant of the revolt, perhaps because they suspect that there is something wrong in the discrepancy between individual needs and goals and system outcomes. The movement of unrest has many facets, and its strength thus far seems to be in protest rather than reform.

The inhibition of individual creativity by a social system assumes different dimensions in the kibbutz. There is little distance between social goals and the means for attaining them. There is no superpersonal entity of an establishment of the same order as in conventional society. The system is the direct responsibility of the participants and they are the system.

Nonetheless, individuals can be inhibited in attempts to be innovative by their own small groups as well as by a large, impersonal role system. The coercion of public opinion can be stronger in the small community where so much behavior of the individual is visible to his colleagues—where there is little separation of the private and public sectors of activity. Hence, the kibbutz member must channel his attempts to change things within the norms of the community. In larger, less democratic structures, there is a greater range for those who seek system change. Rebels often reject the system in their attempts to break out of it and they give priority to destruction of existing structures. Yet the revolutionary ferment has some potential for new ideas for restructuring social forms. The kibbutz, however, contains the change forces within the system, and by so doing greatly reduces their innovative aspects. Though revolutionary in origin, the kibbutzim are conservative groups in that change within them is more evolutionary than radical.

The challenge for the kibbutzim in the years ahead is adequate provision for the creativity of their young people in a world in which self-expression and self-development are becoming more than slogans. The younger generations in these communities are not immune to change trends in the larger society. They are being affected in two ways. First, some of them want more opportunities in fields of artistic expression. Second, many youngsters are less interested in the old kibbutz ideology and more concerned about practical matters of economic progress. They are more active in the economic affairs of the kibbutz than in social and political matters. The first trend calls for some reformulation of procedures, which in the past have minimized role differentiation. The second can lead to erosion of system values. But overall, the creativity of kibbutz second and third generations lacks the stimulation of the revolutionary youth movement. On the other hand, though restricted, it may be productive of more constructive change.

THE SYSTEM AND SUPERSYSTEM LEVELS

Some of the same problems just discussed are also operative at the system level. How much should the community move toward developing professional roles? In the past, the specialization of labor has not obscured the essential commonality of the roles people play in the community. The rotation of managers has prevented the emergence of a group of specialized bureaucrats. The work roles have permitted individuals to assume their full share of citizen responsibilities. With increasing industrialization and professionalization, the kibbutz must somehow allow

for the specialist and still maintain his primary commitment as a member of the kibbutz. Another aspect of increasing professionalization has to do with the background and training of the individual. Previously, all members had been socialized in a common educational system which tended to insure their acceptance of a common way of life. If, however, people have to get the basic part of their occupational and professional training in institutions outside the kibbutz, they may return to their communities with new sets of norms.

Thus, if future leaders of the kibbutzim are to be trained in conventional universities which are at best neutral toward kibbutz culture, there will be no reinforcement of the basic value patterns of these young people. The kibbutz as a minority contra-culture can easily lose its influence on its potential leaders. In fact, in the present situation, the kibbutz college student is confronted, as a lone representative of the utopian community, by a new academic culture. It is difficult for him, by himself, to achieve an adequate integration of the new and the old, since he is arbitrarily cut off from the resources and support of his own community. There is need, then, to develop kibbutz higher education, not to avoid confrontation, but to provide the means for restructuring the individual's orientation, both with respect to academic and professional growth and with respect to his basic kibbutz values. Such an education could be the bridge between the world of science and scholarship and the world of the kibbutz. To change the figure of speech, it is not so much a matter of bridging a gap but of creating a new synthesis at a higher level which will lead to positive changes in kibbutz values rather than their erosion. Institutional means are critical for such a continuing and difficult task.

One solution is a kibbutz university which will link kibbutz values with advanced training. Such a university should not be a replica of the conventional liberal arts college with its academic neutrality toward social issues and with its many specialized departments organized around the research interests of technical experts. Instead, it would have to be problem oriented so that problem areas, cutting across disciplines, would be the fundamental organizational pattern. These problem areas would be the basic concerns of the kibbutzim, such as kibbutz management, the kibbutz social system, and kibbutz education. In other words, the education would be frankly and explicitly directed toward problems of the kibbutz and the framework would be the values of the kibbutz system. An institution of this sort could furnish advanced training for kibbutzniks for the roles they would play in their own communities and would provide for

mutual reinforcement of the system values, system norms, and system roles.

The system level of the kibbutz provides an opportunity for creative results because of its patterning of the contributions of the individual members. Research findings (Kelley and Thibaut, 1954) indicate that the superiority of the group in problem-solving over the pooled contributions of individual members is due in considerable measure to two factors. First, individuals can detect errors and false approaches more readily in the work of others than in their own performance and thus provide a built-in corrective measure for the progress of the group. Second, individuals can make different contributions to the group, depending upon their own experiences and abilities. The final outcome can be a combination of the strengths of the group members with their weaknesses cancelled out by the corrective measures mentioned above. This group process is greatly attenuated in large, formal structures. In the kibbutz, however, small, informal groups have the capacity for utilizing the diverse contributions of the members. The continuity of the groups, moreover, makes possible the recognition of different abilities and different experiences. Group problem-solving, then, is one of the reasons why the kibbutzim have, in fact, been creatively adaptive over the years.

Moreover, the operations of the kibbutz are not locked into a formalized structure. With no bureaucracy or coercive sanctions to fall back upon, leaders have to be innovative in attacking problems. Hence, they are more receptive to new ideas than are leaders in formalized structures. There are immediate and direct feedback loops to provide information about more effective functioning. With the growth in complexity and size, there is, however, a need for adaptive structures which will both capitalize upon the experience and wisdom of the movement and also provide a means for systematic fact-finding. Research centers have already been established by three movements, but they are in an early stage of development. It already appears, however, that they have great potential for increasing the adaptive function in the future.

Reference has already been made to an issue producing some community divisiveness: the allocation of resources to consummatory gratifications and cultural development versus the investment in improving the technical and economic proficiency of the productive enterprise. The division relates to values of asceticism, self-expression, economic security, deferred gratification, and so on. Its solution calls for creative adaptation to the possibilities of a changed way of life. Asceticism and puritanical

denial may be expedient measures in the initial stages of community survival, but the fact that they are sometimes justified by expediency does not make them basic value principles in their own right. On the other hand, some margin of community resources is a desirable aim, even though it is not a basic value in itself. A reconciliation of the conflict may call for a clearer analysis of what are fundamental principles and what are desirable means and practices. Then, too, some degree of achievement and accomplishment may be basic values which cut across the objectives of economic and cultural progress.

NOTES

1. The development of this theory as it applies to social systems by D. Katz and R. L. Kahn provides a useful framework for the analysis of the kibbutzim.

2. Bettelheim (1969) suggests that the high rate of casualties among kibbutzniks is due to their lack of adaptability in combat conditions. He completely ignores the fact that their casualties are a direct result of their vulnerable positions as junior officers in the most hazardous combat roles. There is no evidence that in such positions kibbutzniks have a higher casualty rate than non-kibbutzniks. The problem then is to explain why more kibbutz young people seek service in combat units, why they become officers, and why they are able to survive training programs such as those for combat pilots. Their lack of adaptability hardly seems a valid answer. They are perpetuating a pattern of leadership set by the older generation, but in a very different context. They have been socialized in citizenship roles and these roles include military service. Nor is their ascension to roles of military leadership automatically guaranteed by conformity to tradition. They must be resourceful and adaptable to move from a collective way of farming to successful competition with non-kibbutzniks who have had the benefits of more diversified experience.

3. Translation of an article published in 1966 in one of the important Hebrew daily newspapers of Israel, "Haaretz," is of interest in this connection. This newspaper cannot be suspected of viewing the kibbutzim too favorably, as it expresses the views of business and professional people who have some ambiguity in their feelings about the kibbutzim.

"The kibbutzim comprise the true elite group of Israeli society. This elite group is characterized by hard work, and they have a sense of personal pride in being members of a kibbutz. They are well-trained in sports, they occupy a big share in the officers of the Israeli Army, and, I would add, today the kibbutz younger generation has suffered a big proportion of casualties in the Six Days' War. They have good interest and respect toward the arts, literature, etc., and it is typical of them to exhibit good norms of behavior."

REFERENCES

- ALLPORT, F. H. (1933) *Institutional Behavior*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press.

- (1934) "The J-curve hypothesis of conforming behavior." *J. of Social Psychology* 5: 141-183.
- ASCH, S. (1952) *Social Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- BETTELHEIM, B. (1969) *Children of the Dream*. New York: Macmillan.
- BUBER, M. (1949) *Paths in Utopia* (R.F.C. Hull, trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- COHEN, E. (1969) "Comparative study of the political institutions of collective settlements in Israel." Hebrew University Department of Sociology Report.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1947) *Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press.
- KANTER, R. M. (1968) "Commitment and social organization: a study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 33: 499-517.
- KATZ, D. and R. L. KAHN (1966) *Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- KELLEY, H. H. and J. W. THIBAUT (1954) "Experimental studies of group problem solving and process," pp. 735-785 in Volume 2 of G. Lindzey and B. Aronson (eds.) *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- MARCH, J. G. and H. A. SIMON (1958) *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- MELMAN, S. (n.d.) "Industrial efficiency under managerial vs. cooperative decision making." (mimeo)
- NEWCOMB, T. M. (1947) "Autistic hostility and social reality." *Human Relations* 1: 69-86.
- ROSNER, M. (1967) "Women in the kibbutz: changing status and concepts." *Asian and African Studies (Annual of the Israel Oriental Society)* 3: 35-68.
- YUCHTMAN, E. and S. E. SEASHORE (1967) "A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 32: 891-903.