The agricultural sector of Israel's Jewish population is not very large; nevertheless, the role of agriculture in the political life of the country is of the utmost importance. Seven of the sixteen members of the present cabinet (July, 1956) are members of kibbutzim (collective agricultural settlements). Twenty-six of the seventy-five Jewish members who support the government coalition—the 120-member Knesset (Israeli Parliament)—are members of kibbutzim or moshavei-oudim (co-operative agricultural settlements). David Ben-Gurion, Israel's outstanding leader, who is the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, retains his affiliation with a kibbutz and declares himself to be an agricultural labourer. Recently, for example, he relinquished all his official positions and left for a year and a half to do agricultural work in a kibbutz in Israel's pioneering frontier area, the Negev. The Minister of Finance, the Director General of the Ministry of Defence, and the Secretary General of the Histadrut (Federation of Labour)—three of Israel's key positions—consider themselves members of kibbutzim and take pride in their past as agricultural labourers. The Chief of Staff of the Israel Defence Forces, a most popular figure with the youth of the country, was born and raised in a co-operative agricultural settlement, and his father, himself a farmer, is a member of the Knesset.

A third of all the kibbutzim and most of the moshivei-oudim are connected with Mapai (the Israel Labour party), which is the principal partner in the three dominant coalitions in Israel: the government, the executive of the Jewish Agency, and the executive committee of the Histadrut. The policy of Mapai is influenced to a great extent by the collective sector, and many of its leaders and active members come from that sector in the not very distant past.

This is a revised edition of a paper submitted to the round-table of the International Social Science Association, Geneva, Sept., 1956. It was written when I was a graduate student and research assistant at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and I am indebted to Professor Ben Zion with whom he edited for the excellent background of democracy in Israel and an analysis of the political parties of the party. See B. Aizenstark, "The Role of Parties in Israeli Democracy," Journal of Politics, Vol. 11, 1955. This paper deals with Jewish agriculture only. Arab agriculture in Israel and political life are so fundamentally different from Jewish agriculture that they require separate discussion.

As at Dec. 31, 1954, the Jewish population in Israel totalled 1,526,009, distributed as follows: urban, 1,161,030; rural, 360,671. In special homes for immigrants, 4,342. The Jewish population of 360,671 was distributed as follows: moshavim (agricultural settlements not on private ownership), 61,610; moshavei-oudim (co-operative agricultural settlements), 5,118; kibbutzim (collective agricultural settlements), 78,113; other kinds, 133,062, including special kinds of kibbutzim and moshavot (new immigrants' settlements) and special kinds of moshavot (collective agricultural settlements). The kibbutzim and moshavei-oudim together constitute what is generally referred to as the collective sector of Israel's agriculture, distinct from the "private sector" groupings in moshavot, that is, settlements based on private ownership.

It is a Kibbutz ed farming type, and the as cattle, poul- ters or kitchen prepares a natural dining hall. This in on during the day and assigns members to gers of the branches. Members designated as-leaves, etc. are appointed by the branch secretaries for the administration of the work-group. The connection of control in the coordinator, and all other positions are appointed by the general assembly of the branch. In general the parties, there is little competition and other social channels of communication between the groups do not arise; there is an informal and efficient organization in the sphere of the community and is soon after it has amounted to a full social control in one Kibbutz and result from gaps in the larger work situations with other Kibbutz.


6. In the communal showers, where the gathering of members after work has a social character, discussions concerning work are held. In the late afternoon, after work and shower, members meet on the big lawn, generally situated in the center of the Kibbutz, where again one of the main topics of conversation is work. See E. Shwartz, "Social Factors in the Development of Legal Control: Case Study of Two Israeli Settlements," Yale Law Journal, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Feb., 1955), pp. 471-480.

Would it be true, then, to say that an agrarian group has seized the administration of government in Israel and is leading her in the direction of a policy that will suit its own interests? Here we have to differentiate between two questions. During the pre-state (pre-1948) period there was no such seizure, but there was a marked accord between the general interests of the Yishuv (the Jewish community in Palestine) as a whole and the interests of what has gradually emerged as the principal agrarian group—the group of collective settlers. In the years since the establishment of the state of Israel, this harmony has been considerably reduced. Agrarianism appears increasingly as a political group, and at the same time there is a noted decline in its over-all influence and importance. But whereas this decline is rather rapid in the social and economic life of the country, it is not yet serious within the political sphere. At the present moment, therefore, a temporary gap exists between the economic significance of Israel's agricultural sectors and their political position.

I. THE PRE-STATE (YISHUV) PERIOD

The social and political life of the pre-state period (1878-1948) was distinguished by the influence of one dominant set of values: the Zionist ideology which extolled agricultural, physical, and productive work. Zionist leaders described the Jews in the diaspora as a minority of the middle classes, engaged in marginal or tertiary occupations, such as trade, free professions, and clerical work. The solution of the Jewish problem was envisaged as the establishment of a complete Jewish society in Palestine, a society which would be self-sufficient in all its economic and social functions. The establishment of such a society would necessitate the transfer of Jews from the tertiary sector to the secondary and primary sector, and, in particular, to agriculture. The central slogan was "reverse the occupational pyramid," which was also called "productivization." An immense prestige was attached to agriculture.

Agriculture was preached also by the Socialists, who since 1904 have played an ever increasing role and, since 1918, a central role in the Yishuv and its leadership. They have created two new social forms, the kibbutz and the moshav-ovdim, which combine Zionist pioneering values with Socialist ideology. Because of the agricultural character of these social institutions (no kibbutz or moshav-ovdim has yet been established), the prestige of this "just," way of life came to be attached also to agriculture.

Because the period was "idealistic" in character, political life was integrated with these pioneering and Socialist values, and the political hierarchy was largely built on its affinity to them. As a result, during the last 6 years before the state, collective agriculture constituted the strongest and crystallized group in the Yishuv and it emerged victorious in the struggle.

For a full comparative study of the pre-state (Yishuv) and Israeli society, see S. Eisenstadt, The Absorption of Immigrants (London, 1954); and Alkin, "The Role of the Parties in Israeli Democracy," 515-17. See also N. Bentwich, Israel (New York, 1954).
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Many leaders—heads of political and other institutions and party activists—were recruited from the pioneering sector, that is, mainly from "kibbutzim." The moral superiority of this group was recognized by the Yishuv as well as by a large segment of Jews abroad.

In addition to these ideological factors, there were other factors that helped place the collective agricultural group to its pre-eminent position in society, and hence also to the top of the political hierarchy. In the early stages of the agricultural settlements served as the principal means of holding Jewish landholdings in Palestine and thus of broadening the social basis of the Yishuv. The renewed Jewish settlement of Palestine in 1878-82 with the establishment of a few scattered holdings, and it gradually expanded by the establishment of additional agricultural and mixed settlements throughout the country. When the mandate over Palestine was conferred on Great Britain, the proposed international boundary between Palestine and Syria was redrawn so as to include three Jewish agricultural settlements which had been established in the far north of the country. The present political boundaries of the state of Israel, except for the Negev and central Judea, are almost identical with the limits of the Jewish agricultural settlements in the pre-state period.

In the second place, the agricultural settlements served as major bases for the Jewish underground forces that were raised in the country when its development and growth caused tensions between the Jews and the British mandatory government. Haganah constituted the principal component of the underground forces. These factors, both of them connected with what might be called the "national policy" of the Yishuv, increased the prestige of the collective agricultural settlements. The establishment of each new agricultural settlement, an enlargement or consolidation of an existing kibbutz or moshav-ovdim as a national achievement. A considerable part of the national budget invested during this period in Palestine by Jews, was invested in agriculture, and the pick of the Jewish youth who immigrated into Palestine, filled the diaspora, as well as of the second-generation settlers in the country, to these settlements.

In the final analysis, the interests of the Yishuv and those of collective agriculture were largely similar. This identity of interests, as we have seen, was based on the congruence of the predominant values and the political culture of the Yishuv with the values and economic needs of the collective agricultural settlements. Thus agriculture was elevated to its pre-eminent position in the Yishuv's political life without arousing the antagonism of other social groups, as trade unions and the urban middle class.

Position and Structure of the Agricultural Group

During the pre-state days, agriculture was composed of three major groups: kibbutzim, moshavot, and moshav-ovdim. Whatever has been said thus far, holds equally to kibbutzim, and, with minor reservations, to moshav-ovdim, whereas the moshav-ovdim illustrate the opposite aspect of our thesis.

Mr. Efron is a graduate student and research assistant at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Acknowledgement is given to Dr. Y. Garber-Talmon for very helpful criticism of earlier drafts of this paper.

6. In the communal showers, where the gathering of members of a work group has a social character, discussions concerning work are held. In the late afternoon, after work and shower, members meet on the lawn, generally situated in the center of the kibbutz, where again, one of the main topics of conversation is work. See R. Schwartz, "Social Factors in the Development of Legal Relations: Case Study of Two Israeli Settlements," Yale Law Journal, Vol. No. 4 (Feb. 1954), pp. 471-490.
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6. In the communal showers, where the gathering of members after work has a social character, discussions concerning work are held. In the late afternoon, after work and shower, members meet on the big lawn, generally situated in the center of the Kibbutz, where again one of the main topics of conversation is work. See R. Schwartz, "Social Factors in the Development of Legal Control in the Kibbutz," Yale Law Journal, Vol. No. 4 (Feb. 1954), pp. 471-490.
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and to the struggle of Jewish workers for greater opportunities for employment; more and more Jewish labour began to be employed in the moshavot, and this particular problem lost much of its acuteness. In this case, again, Jewish agricultural labourers from the collective sector represented the broad national interest as well as their own interests. Nevertheless, almost up to the establishment of the state, Arab workers were employed occasionally in the moshavot, particularly during the harvesting seasons when agricultural labour became scarce and especially since they were considerably cheaper than Jewish labourers. Even moshavot that were originally established for idealistic motives underwent during the years a transformation of their Weltanschauung, and economic considerations became predominant in their policies.

For all these reasons the prestige of the moshavot was low as seen by the collective sector, and this attitude had its repercussions on a major part of the Yishuv. The moshavot were conceived as being "reactionary"—obstructing the establishment of a new society—and inasmuch as they did not employ Jewish labour they were presented as obstructing the Zionist cause. Their economic motivation was considered irreconcilable with the pioneering considerations which were mainly evaluative and sometimes political in character.

The special position of the moshavot was clearly reflected in the results of the struggle for membership in the general elite. Only a few personalities originating in moshavot achieved general recognition by the Yishuv. Their share in the organized division of Jewish National Fund land and Zionist Funds was minor. They did not attract the young people; on the contrary, they lost many of their second and third generation. Some of the sons of moshavot farmers left for the city or took up urban occupations; some of them joined kibbutzim and moshavei-ovdim; only a minority continued the way of their fathers as farmers in the moshavot. Many moshavot gradually transformed into semi-urban settlements and townships.

The special case of the moshavot demonstrates clearly that collective agriculture established its elite position in the Yishuv, and also furthered its own interests, only because of its readiness for national service and its immediate connection with the pioneering-collective, that is, the dominant, ideology. The moshavot were not fully integrated with these aspirations, their prestige was low; their influence on Jewish national politics was restricted, and their share in the elite and in the publicly allocated funds was minor.

One of the special characteristics of Jewish agriculture in Palestine was the total absence of a permanent agricultural proletariat. The kibbutzim and moshavei-ovdim operate on the principle of self-work, that is, all work is done by the farmer and members of his family. Even though violations of this principle are known to have occurred, it is still true that there was no need for a permanent agricultural wage-worker either in the kibbutzim or the moshavot. During the harvesting seasons the kibbutzim receive additional labour in the form of volunteer labour camps made up of high-school students and members of youth movements which are ideologically close to kibbutzim. Toward the close of the pre-state period certain units of the kibbutzim were specialized in kibbutzim, where they engaged alternately in agricultural work and in military training. Groups of young people

The mixed farming systems such as collective consumption household kitchen and communal dining for children during the day, the manager of the educational system assigns to the managers of the power needs. The one night, the manager of the communication between the particular management positions of the different work coordinator, active roles are appointed by the general assembly. Generally speaking, the work situation of the channels of communication between the particular work groups are not formal and informal significant events in the community soon after in the Kibbutz. In Israel, see: S. N. N. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul in Israel, "A Kibbutz," New York, 1957.

Mr. Garber is a graduate student and research assistant at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Acknowledgement is given to Dr. Y. Garber-Talmon for very helpful criticism of earlier drafts of this paper.


It should be noted that both kibbutzim and moshvei-ovdim are based on the struggle of Jews owned by the Jewish National Fund (a land-holding public corporation) and more Jews that they are financed by voluntary contributions, controlled by the particular problem movement, supported now by the state of Israel, and devised to further cultural labourers' agricultural settlement in such a manner as to avoid misuse and spae as well as theft in land-holdings. In the moshavot, on the other hand, ownership of the state, Arab is mainly vested in individual farmers, but in some cases it is vested exclusively during the Jewish National Fund or other public or private landlords.  

Kibbutzim are collective agricultural settlements, organized on the prers. Even mosha of common ownership of the means of production, combined with a war went during the in which the community rather than the family is the predominant economic consideration respect of consumption and education. They are based on considerabl all these reason solidarity and on intensive identification with Socialist and Zionist valutive sector, and kibbutzim constituted important centres of the underground forces afichou. The moshi secret caches of arms. They also bore the major burden of the establishment of a motivated policy of settlement. A great part of the Yishuv's geneach labour they originated in the kibbutzim, which preserved an intense connection with the motivation.

Moshvei-ovdim are co-operative agricultural settlements, organized on the basis of individual holdings of land and individual ownership of the special position livestock, and most implements, and considerable co-operation in culturre struggle for mem marketing, and purchasing. The moshvei-ovdim were considered by tating in moshav of the group of collective agriculture, and as often as not also by them as an organized as second-class members, because of the relative "backwardness" minor. They did in pioneering activity and because of the existence of individualistic elements in their co-operative structure. Their share in the élite was rase left for the ci minor. Their share in land, in capital allocated by various Zionist agendizm and moshv in manpower was also of secondary importance. Until the formation of the state onlv only 64 moshvei-ovdim were established as against 137 kibbutzim numbered into semi- 

During the last thirty years before the establishment of the state, special case of moshav played an entirely different role. In their organizational they conform closely to agricultural villages in other countries. They are, only because up of small farms and medium-sized holdings (mostly orange groves to the vineyards). These farmers are not Socialists; on the contrary they are not attached to the principles of private enterprise. Any co-operative arrangements have existed or that might exist are based on purely commercial and economic factors élite and in the over, the moshavot did not participate fully in the Zionist endeavour to the special c a "complete society." The older moshavot employed Arab labourers, but total absence of in effect a thin colonizing stratum employing "native" labour. Thus, the moshvei-ovdim of contrary to the avowed Zionist aim, which was to further a mass reby the farmer Jews to Palestine to take up physical labour and other primary occupation are kno so as to correct the imbalances in the occupational structure of Jewish for a permanen However, due to the increase of tensions between the Arabs and the moshvei-ovdim  

*For a recent study of kibbutzim and their structure, see: J. Garber-Talmon, "Labour in the Differentiation in Collective Settlements" in Scripta Hierosolymitana, III (Jerusalem, 1954) and H. Infield, Cooperative Living in Palestine (New York, 1944).

**On moshvei-ovdim see: J. Garber-Talmon, "Social Differentiation in Commune in Palestine," British Journal of Sociology, 1951; and Ami Assaf, Moshvei-Odim and Ground forces w (Tel-Aviv, 1954) (Hebrew).
who intend to form a kibbutz often serve a two-year apprenticeship in an existing kibbutz, and thus constitute an important labour factor. All these various sources of manpower are of a temporary nature, and do not create a typical agricultural wage-earner.

Moshavei-ovdim utilize these sources to a somewhat more limited extent. Since the land is owned by the Jewish National Fund, any possibility of accumulating several farm units in one hand is eliminated, and as a result each farm unit remains small and is gauged to the possibilities of one farmer and his family. In times of crisis, such as prolonged illness, the principle of mutual help among the members of the moshav-ovdim is acted upon.

In the moshavot, which are based on the principle of private enterprise, there is no limitation on the size of individual holdings, and there are medium-sized farm units. No ideological barrier to the use of hired labour exists. During the picking season there is need for a considerable number of seasonal workers. Nevertheless, even in the moshavot no Jewish agricultural proletariat came into existence, if we include in the meaning of that term agricultural labourers who wander from one place of employment to another according to the seasons of the year, and hands who live permanently on the farm. The labour problem was solved in the moshavot in the following ways: First, a substantial number of small farms even in moshavot can be worked by the owner alone. Secondly, until the 1930's the moshavot used to employ a considerable number of Arab labourers (there was an agricultural proletariat in the Arab sector). Thirdly, many members of the early kibbutzim served long periods of apprenticeship in moshavot, thus functioning in the capacity of temporary agricultural labourers, until they established their own settlements. In addition, during the first few years of their settlement on the land and before they were consolidated, many young kibbutzim and moshavei-ovdim used to send some of their members to do "outside work" as agricultural labourers in neighbouring moshavot. Finally, a few scattered agricultural labourers were to be found in the moshavot. However, it would be futile to inquire into the political influence of the agricultural proletariat in pre-state days, because as a group it was non-existent.

II. The State of Israel

Changes in Values and Social Structure

Since the establishment of Israel in 1948, tendencies which were already discernible in the later pre-state period, and especially in the thirties and forties, have grown rapidly. Israeli society is undergoing a change in values which is evidenced by a general weakening in the intensity of its attachment to values in general and by an increasing severance of political action and ideological attachment. The clear domination and the great power of collective-pioneering values have been declining. Individualistic economic values are now becoming prominent. Ideological and elite groups have been transformed into groups which are mainly interested in the fulfilment of particular interests. The collective agricultural group is no longer an
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group. The share of agriculture in the national income has gone down from 18.5 per cent in 1939 to 17 per cent in 1950 and to 12.9 per cent in 1954. This decline is also expressed in the diminished share of the group in national expenditure. In 1953 not less than 32 per cent of the total investments were still devoted to agriculture. In 1954 the sum was reduced to 27 per cent, in 1955 to 22.5 per cent.

Recently, a great number of special privileges accorded to agriculture have been subjected to public criticism. These privileges are presented as anachronistic relics from a time when agriculture was the privileged occupation in a nation. There is public sentiment against the income tax regulations according to kibbutsim, co-operatives, and agricultural marketing associations. The government has recently abolished subsidies on certain agricultural products but some other products still qualify for such subsidies. Agriculture receives considerable sums in the form of long-term and short-term loans on convenient terms from public institutions.

The youth of Israel and the new immigrants, the two main sources for manpower increase in agriculture, no longer look on agriculture as the foremost occupation. Although there has been an increase in the number of persons gainfully engaged in agriculture, there has been a slow but steady decline in the percentage: in 1955, 15.3 per cent were gainfully employed in agriculture as against 19.5 per cent in 1939.

In the political élite, agriculture is still strongly represented, at least numerically. In pre-state days, many a politician was recruited from the agrarian group, he retained his intimate connection with it, and his political status was justified by this connection. Generally, there was no conflict of loyalty between his immediate agricultural group and the broader organizations he served, such as the party or the nation, primarily because there was a considerable measure of harmony of interests between them, as already noted. Agriculture has vanished entirely. Others have become prominent among many, and still others have disappeared from the scene and thus from major political groups which are in the present state of affairs. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to conclude that agriculture has vanished entirely. In the state of Israel two types of agrarian politician are distinguishable. First, there are the representatives of agricultural groups, that is, of particular agricultural interests, who participate in the various political bodies such as the party headquarters, the Knesset, and the government, on behalf of their group. Second, there are individual farmers, who are connected with the general membership in a large number of general interest groups such as the state which are a symbol of the agrarian interests of kibbutzim and moshavot, and of the political significance of the agrarian movement. However, this peculiar support of agrarian interests is considered to be a temporary phenomenon and without real political significance. The political significance of the agrarian decline has been a slow but steady process in the social significance of agriculture. The manifest primacy it held in the collective consciousness and the individual ideological position is being diminished. A fewpositions to the erstwhile reversed their former occupation and are still quite a few politicians who have adopted new professions. The state encourages the development of the Jewish state in order to ensure a sufficient labor force and to maintain national security.
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The concept of agrarianism is not straightforward. It is often associated with the idea of the "general interest," but it is their specific task to watch over that part of the body politic which they represent while they are engaged in generating a sort of general synthesis and in controlling the principles on which sources and rewards are to be allocated.

Second, there are individuals who, for reasons of personal history or ideological commitment, are connected with agriculture and retain in many instances their membership in a kibbutz or moshav-ovdim. They attach a certain importance to such a symbolic connection, but they represent, in effect, other and general interests (the party, which in most cases has also an urban wing of the state) which are today frequently in conflict with agrarian interests.

A second group of agrarian politicians is, nevertheless, sympathetic to the kibbutzim and moshav-ovdim and predisposed in their favour, sometimes for sentimental reasons and frequently because the kibbutzim have strong representation in the party secretariat (central committee) and status. However, this predisposition should not be misconstrued to include support of agrarian interests. Gone are the days when the average politician considered it his duty to come to the assistance of agriculture almost without reservation and without reservations.

The political significance of agriculture is, therefore, declining, but so far a decline has been a slow and minor process. A greater decline is noticeable in the social significance of agriculture. In this respect agriculture has lost a number of the social roles it held during the pre-state period. A struggle is taking place between the collective-pioneering values whose influence has been strong, and the individualistic economic values which now strive for a legitimate position and perhaps even for superiority. In this way also ideological emphasis on agriculture in general, and on its collective branch in particular, is lessening. A further reduction of its political significance is foreseen in terms of representation in the Knesset, the Jewish Agency, and various party headquarters, is, therefore, to be anticipated. At the moment there are still quite a few politicians left over from pre-state days who owe positions to the erstwhile pre-eminence of agriculture. Some of these reversed their former outlook and have become representatives of more marginal bodies and interests and their attachment to agriculture has been eroded. Others have become representatives of agriculture as one pressure among many, and still others are destined to disappear sooner or later from the scene and thus to make place for the representatives of the new non-agrarian groups which are in the ascendant.

Furthermore, it would be a misconception to conclude that the appeal of agriculture has vanished entirely and that it has lost its value. Even today agriculture is considered to be one of the important branches in the development of Israel's economy, albeit not the only important branch. Even today the sentiment of the city youth is attracted by agriculture because of its pioneering elements. Most of the youth movements adhere to the pioneering ideals, and they educate their members to take up a collectivist or co-operative attitude. The state encourages these activities by various means. The army, for example, has a Service which stipulates that every soldier has to serve in the Kibbutzim, New York, London, Routledge

6. In the communal showers, where the gathering of the work has a social character, discussions concerning the future and the past, the big and small, generally situated in the center of the Kibbutz is one of the main topics of conversation. The big and small, generally situated in the center of the Kibbutz is one of the main topics of conversation. In the late afternoon, after work and shower, members go on a Kibbutz, New York.
one year of his army service in an agricultural settlement. Although this provision is not as yet fully operative, a good many units (called nahal) do live in agricultural settlements, and their members, after the completion of their compulsory service, have even established new agricultural settlements of their own, some of them in the arid southern Negev.

Changes in the Composition of the Agrarian Group

The changes in Israeli society and values have not only altered the position of the agrarian group as a whole, but they have also affected its various subgroups in diverse ways.

The moshavot, most of them organized in the Farmers' Federation, have reached full legitimization. With the establishment of the state, relations with the Arab sector ceased. The ascending economic values of this social framework of individualistic agriculture based on private enterprise became more significant. As the political isolation of the moshavot was overcome by linking themselves with the General Zionist party,10 they have not thereby achieved greater political power, because this party comprises other crystallized groups, such as the Israel Manufacturers' Association, importers and exporters, and merchants, landlords, whose interests do not always coincide with those of farmers and growers.

As explained earlier, the kibbutzim were most severely struck by the causes which affected the position of Israel's agriculture. Most of the land that were withdrawn were taken away from kibbutzim. The fallen parties were mainly theirs. And last but not least: the mass immigration which, from "under-developed" countries did not fit into their collectivist way of life, and relatively few immigrants were absorbed by the kibbutzim. The moshav-ovdim, on the other hand, were successful in increasing their members and settlements considerably through the absorption of immigrants. At the time the state was established, there existed 157 kibbutzim and by the end of 1955 the number had risen by 86, whereas to 64 moshav-ovdim in 1948 not less than 198 were added in the same period of time.11

Just as, for historical reasons, agriculture as a whole retains a disproportionately strong position as compared with its declining social and economic importance, so the kibbutz movement is over-represented as compared with the moshav-ovdim. Only four of a contingent of twenty-six agrarian supporters of the government coalition in the Knesset are members of moshav-ovdim; the sixteen-member cabinet, two have an attachment to kibbutzim and more are members of kibbutzim and may be looked upon as their representatives, whereas there is not one minister who is a member of a moshav-ovdim. This disproportion served as the background for a serious clash which took place recently within the ranks of Mapai (the Israel Labour party) which has a leftist or left-wing political orientation. They are more concerned with the moshav-ovdim movement (a great majority of which belongs to Mapai who insisted on the appointment of one of their members as Minister of Agriculture) than organizing them. They are absolutely willing to accept the kibbutzim post. This time the moshav-ovdim movement (a great majority of which belongs to the General Zionist party) did not succeed, but it is making more progress, as the moshav-ovdim are becoming more powerful.

10For a description of the various political parties mentioned hereinafter, see "The Role of Parties in Israeli Democracy."
11Israel Statistical Yearbook, no. 6, 1955-6.
Agrarianism in Israel's Party System

The agricultural proletariat is beginning to develop in Israel. There is a need for such a proletariat. During the Yishuv period Jewish agriculture was mainly an intensive and mixed agriculture. Since the establishment of the state the need has increasingly been felt for large-scale agricultural production, especially for export, and for new agricultural industries, since the old branches (senders of vegetables, milk, and eggs, for instance) have reached their saturation point. Monocultures such as cotton and peanuts have been introduced, which are produced on what are, for Israel, large farms, a form of agrarian organization almost unknown before 1948.

However, the fact that there now exists a great unskilled agricultural labour constitutes a problem. Although the public authorities endeavour to use the new immigrants as farmers, a growing group of immigrants has emerged for whom only inadequate funds were available and the necessary instruction and tools were not forthcoming. The immigrants themselves do possess the necessary funds, with the result that they cannot be established as independent farmers. In other cases, even though all the prerequisites are available, these new immigrants, who had never been farmers in their lives and, that matter, had never been engaged in agricultural work, have preferred to become agricultural labourers rather than take upon themselves the responsibilities and hazards of independence. In this way an agricultural proletariat has emerged. The labourers live in moshavot and in immigrants' camps, villages, move from cotton- and orange-picking to peanut-collecting and corn harvesting, and are thus employed periodically throughout most of the year in seasonal work. The kibbutzim and moshavot-ovdim continue to use the principle of self-work, but in an increasing number of cases they are obliged to transgress it, both because of the pressure of the authorities to employ the idle labour force and because of a certain weakening of the principle itself, as a part of a tendency toward a decline in social values since the establishment of the state. This process has also contributed to the emergence of an agricultural proletariat. But this new group is as yet far removed from political influence. Like agricultural labourers in other countries, and particularly like those who are also recent immigrants the agricultural workers are politically passive and apathetic and devoid of any pronounced social orientation. They are not necessarily subject to the influence of any socialist or left-wing parties. They are not organized in a separate trade union, but are individually members in the general trade union. Moreover, as long as they are absolutely without political influence, whether as floating voters or as members of a separate organization.

1. Mr. Etzioni is a graduate student and research assistant at the University of California, Berkeley. This paper was written when he was a graduate student and research assistant at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Acknowledgement is given to Dr. Y. Garber-Talmon for very helpful criticism of earlier drafts of this paper.
4. For example, the debate between Leff and Tzafrir on the concentration of control in communal settlements.
6. In the communal showers, where the gathering of members at work has a social character, discussion concerning work, are held in the late afternoon, after work and shower, members meet on the big lawn, generally situated in the center of the kibbutz, to further our one of the main topics of conversation is work. See R. Schwartz, "Social Factors in the Development of Legal Control," Yale Law Journal, Vol. No. 4 (Feb. 1954), pp. 471-490.
Has Israel Agrarian Parties?

At the present time all Jewish parties in Israel have both rural and urban wings. The total floating vote in agriculture (excepting the new immigration) is inconsiderable. Any party which seeks to control the government, or, since the régime is basically a coalition, seeks to increase its share in the government, must turn to the urban electorate. In addition, as compared with the United States or even England, the political life of Israel is still dominated by ideology, notwithstanding the decline in ideological intensity from the pre-state period. Any party that openly declares itself to represent an interest group such as farmers would lose at the polls. For that reason all parties strive for general national interests and general ideology. As a result, and notwithstanding the great significance of the agrarian factor in political life, there is no party in Israel that calls itself or endeavours to be a farmers' or agrarian party.

On the other hand, all the parties have an agrarian wing. Even the right parties such as the General Zionists and Herut run a small number of collective agricultural settlements. These settlements go back to the period when collective-pioneering values were dominant in the Yishuv, and signify that the parties are anxious not to remain outside the accepted forms of pioneering activities. Private agriculture (the moshavot) votes for these two parties, but to all intents and purposes the urban wing is preponderant. City voters form the greater part of their electorate, and their agrarian groups are of little significance.

The Progressive party, Israel's liberal party, has also an agrarian wing composed of two sections: kibbutzim, organized in the Ha'oved Hazioni, a special type of moshavei-ovdim, with greater emphasis on individuality. Nevertheless, the urban wing is dominant in the Progressive party. Among the five Progressive Knesset members there is not one agrarian representative.

Mapai, the dominant factor in all of Israel's coalition governments, is divided based on both its rural and urban wings. Most of the moshavei-ovdim (82.7 per cent in June, 1950) are connected with the party, and so are about a sixth of the kibbutzim. But, on the other hand, the party has broad support among the urban labour and other urban groups. There are eight members of kibbutzim and eleven members of moshevi-ovdime, (the real agrarian representatives among the forty Mapai members of the Knesset. Of the nine Mapai members in the cabinet, two retain their attachment to kibbutzim, but only one, Minister of Agriculture, who is actually a member of a kibbutz, may be considered a genuine agrarian representative. The same situation exists, mutandis, in the religious party, HaPoel Hamizrachi; there also is an urban wing, and an agrarian wing which comprises kibbutzim and moshavei-ovdimm.

The two parties whose voters are mainly recruited from the agrarian are leit-wing parties: Ahduth Ha'avoda and Mapam. Ahduth Ha'avoda nine members in the Knesset of whom seven are members of kibbutzim; Mapam's nine Knesset members, six are members of kibbutzim. In both these parties the agrarian wing is clearly dominant, and in both cases dominance is of the kibbutzim. Of these two parties has almost no moshevi-ovdim in their internal political apparatus. Agricultural products, object to land larger agricultural areas, capitalized in the youth movements, and in kibbutzim only. Mapam, with the vanguard of the revolution, Kibbutz Artzi, it regards as the party for general national interests and general ideology. As a result, and notwithstanding the fact that most parties are reluctant to appom this role, both have urban adherents, and both are cognizant of their appearing to be generalists alone.

To sum up: the further to the right parties go, the greater the singular, of collective agriculture called agrarian parties in thent the interests of agricultrue with them.

In the political life of Israel, a new agrarian party exists. Each ideology, prestige, and the culture to a large extent. But no agriculture, because agriculture as the main channel for rehabilitating the communities and industrialists is becoming something like an al this paper leaves out the Communist agriculture. (...)

*Mr. Eshkol was a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, while he was at the University of Jerusalem. Acknowledgement is due to Y. Garber-Talmon for very helpful criticism.*

2. For a discussion of the community, see K. Davis, Human Company, 1950, pp. 61-64.
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Dominance is of the kibbutz type, that is, of the collective-agriculture type. Each of these two parties has an association of kibbutzim affiliated with it. Almost no moshevi-ovdim belong to either. Both parties are openly progovernment or, in the government with the U.S., still dominated by the small farmers and moshavim. Both attempt to represent all parties in the government. Still, they represent the interests of the new immigrants and those in the government. They generally support policies for cultural products, objects to the curtailment of agricultural subsidies, and demand larger agricultural credit and increased investment in the urban youth movements are indoctrinated to medium-sized settlements of kibbutzim only. Mapam, with its pro-Soviet agrarianism, considers itself to be the vanguard of the revolution in Israel society. Its kibbutz association, Kibbutz Artzi, it regards as the vanguard of the vast. Nevertheless, these two parties are reluctant to appear openly as agrarian parties, for the reasons mentioned above. Both have urban branches, most of whose members are city dwellers, and both are cognizant of the fact that increased strength depends on their appearing to be general parties, not parties representing agrarian interests alone.

To sum up: the further to the left a party stands in the range of Israel's agrarian parties, the greater the significance within it of agriculture, and, in general, of collective agriculture. But even the left-wing parties cannot be called agrarian parties in the full sense of the term, though they do represent the interests of agricultural organizations (kibbutzim) that are bound with them.

In the political life of Israel, agrarianism is of great significance, but no agrarian party exists. Each party has its agrarian wing because, in the ideology, prestige, and the division of the national resources with agriculture to a large extent. But no party is willing to tie its future completely to agriculture, because agriculture as an occupation is receding from its former place as the main channel for rehabilitating the social structure of the people. The agrarian situation is becoming something like an ordinary occupational group. As such, its political significance is decreasing.

This paper leaves out the Communists, because they have only a very limited hold on agriculture.

1. Mr. Etzioni is a graduate student and research assistant at the University of California, Berkeley. This paper was written when he was a graduate student and research assistant at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Acknowledgement is given to Dr. Y. Garber-Talmon for very helpful criticism of earlier drafts of this paper.
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