

Education for Cooperating in the Histadrut Labour Federation and Israeli National Frameworks, 1940-1960: Theory, Partial Success and Causes of Failure

YUVAL DROR

Introduction: Definitions and Theoretical Background

In this paper, we present as a case study the history of education for cooperation in 1940-1960, the transition years between the earlier period of the Histadrut (General Federation of Jewish Labor in Israel) and Jewish settlement, to the present period of the State of Israel. We set out the theory, its practical applications and the reasons for failure, as indicated by educational theory and research. We also want to draw from the historical case study conclusions relevant for education for cooperative and communal living today. Of the various definitions of the term 'cooperation', we have chosen that of the International Labour Office in 1956: "A cooperative organization is one of a varying number of people contending with the same economic difficulties who are united, on the basis of equal rights and duties, by a common will to resolve these difficulties together . . . Members transfer to their enterprise one or more of their economic activities, as their needs dictate, and making collective use of its services for their financial and moral benefit."¹ Alexander Barzel, a philosopher who studies collective living, defines cooperation in terms of togetherness, beginning with a level that preserves individual separateness, with defined and limited areas of cooperation, through degrees of cohesion that unite the individual with some group members in some areas, to the comprehensive togetherness of the commune and the kibbutz, in which cooperation relates to all aspects of life. Other investigators have classified various coopera-

Yuval Dror is dean of Oranim, The School of Education of the Kibbutz Movement at the University of Haifa and is a member of Kibbutz Hamadiya.

1. *Cooperation: Basis and Development* (Geneva, International Labour Office, 1956), Lesson 2.

tives as producer, consumer and combined purpose organizations. These have been subdivided further according to activities (credit, insurance) or according to membership (farmers, middle class).

Researchers studying the cooperative movement in Israel, and education relating to it, address the entire spectrum of organizations within the *Hevrat Ovdim* (Workers' Association) of the Histadrut not only within the kibbutz and the moshav, but also within workers' housing projects and other urban associations.² This article will, therefore, proceed along the same lines in discussing the Israeli cooperative movement through the 1940's and 1950's, but will focus on the attempt to prepare urban youth for the highest degree of cooperation in the kibbutz and the moshav, or, failing that, for the cooperative organizations of the city.

According to the ILO document of 1956, education for cooperation "has as its purpose to lead people towards the cooperative path through education at various levels such as youth movements, university and school cooperatives, information to the general public, and developing cooperative leadership".³ A similar survey carried out in 1951 for the meeting of the General Council of the Cooperative Union in the Israeli Ministry of Labour is more explicit. It mentions education in cooperation for members and executives of cooperative unions; professional training for workers in cooperatives; teaching of cooperation in the schools; explaining cooperative values to the public; and practical work among members of the student and working youth movements.⁴ This article will concentrate on activities with youth: instruction in elementary and secondary schools and practical work with these age groups, all designed as preparation for lives of full cooperation.

Education for cooperation in the Hebrew settlement period (1940-48) and in Israel (1948-1960) was carried out under the auspices of the Histadrut, the umbrella organization of the national labor

2. Alexander Barzel: "Work—A Social Value of the Cooperative Community", *Hakibbutz*, 9-10 (1983/4), pp. 239-258. Abraham Zabarski, "Cooperation", (Tel Aviv, Hevra, 1932). Isaac Gelfet, *Essays on Collective Economics*, (Tel Aviv, Hamshbir Hamercazi, 1939). Our definitions are taken from the most important works on cooperation in Israel from the 1930's, since they are used in education for cooperation as discussed in this article. Later definitions by Abraham Daniel, *Cooperation—Vision and Realization*, (Tel Aviv, Am Oved, 1972); and Dov Ben-Meir, "Cooperation", from *The Histadrut Lexicon*, Tel Aviv, Am Oved), pp. 339-352 are based on these.

3. *Cooperation*, (ILO) Lessons 9-12

4. Y. Ben-Dror, "Cooperative Education—A survey in preparation for the General Council of the Cooperative Union, 6 December 1951," from the Labour Archives of the Lavon Institute (hereinafter "LA") collection of the Centre for Cooperation, Tel Aviv, 700/IV 319.

movement, founded in 1920. It was a labor union that also attended to the social and cultural needs of its members. Directly responsible for the education of children and youth was the Workers' Stream, a system of kindergartens, schools and teacher training administered by the Education Centre. In education for the cooperative movement, the Workers' Stream worked with the Histadrut departments concerned with cooperation, particularly with the central marketing organization, Hamashbir Hamercazi, and with the Consumers' Cooperative Union Supervisory Board. The Workers' Stream, established in 1921, functioned as part of the Education Department for the Jewish community as a whole, and, under the British Mandate, it enjoyed almost complete autonomy. Between 1948 and 1953, when the National Education Act became law and prestate education streams ceased to function, education for cooperation in what had been the Workers' Stream went on under the Cooperative Union in the Ministry of Labour. The transfer of education from Histadrut to public control was no coincidence, and occurred at a time of substantial growth. On the eve of the establishment of the State, the Workers' Stream educated a quarter of the Jewish pupils in the country, while after 1950 it educated half of them. The labor movement, which held power in the Jewish settlement period and in Israel during the first three decades of statehood, imparted its values and methods to the entire state educational system. Hence the importance of education for cooperation extends outside the boundaries of Israeli socialism in the 1940's and 50's.⁵

Education for cooperation in this period has been surveyed by examining Education Centre publications, and those of the Centre for Cooperation in the Labour Archives (Lavon Institute) in Tel Aviv, as well as relevant material in the cooperative and educational journals of the time. The material from these sources will be described and analyzed at three levels: theory, partial realization, and reasons for failure.

Theory includes two basic documents relating to the Young Workers' Association (1942) and to the Young Cooperative Union (1949), as well as the ideas of leaders in the Workers' Stream in education and of the Histadrut cooperative movement, as they emerged in various discussions and publications.⁶ They related to teaching and

5. Shimon Reshef, *The Labour Movement School System in Pre-State Israel (1921-1939)*, (Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University by Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1980). See Y. Ben-Dror, *ibid*.

6. LA Centre for Education collection, 215/IV; LA Centre for Cooperation collection 319/IV; A. Zisling, "The Young Workers' Society—a Proposal", letters on communal education problems, 1/117, (April 1944); 30-32. The Young Cooperative Union (a proposal), LA 697/IV 215. The Cooperative Union, LA, 80/IV 215.1949; *Cooperation in the*

training for cooperation in schools or in the youth movement, for future cooperation in the kibbutz, the moshav and the city, and present participation in producer or consumer cooperative unions.

As to *partial realization*, we cannot find out how many of the young people who learned cooperation or experienced it in school or in the youth movement actually joined a kibbutz, a moshav or other cooperative union. Hence partial realization will relate only to the teaching of cooperation in schools and the establishment of cooperatives there to provide a practical educational experience.

In retrospect, 40 years later, historical data and background of research on the cooperatives seem insufficient means for locating the *reasons for failure* in teaching cooperation, and in the functioning of cooperatives established to further the teaching process. We must consider the historical process whereby the Workers' Stream schools and the Histadrut cooperatives became state institutions at the time when emphasis was shifting from settlement to nation. We shall also require a varied theoretical and investigative background of value- and society-oriented education that will be detailed in the latter part of this article.⁷

The Theory of Education for Cooperation

Educators in the Workers' Stream and Histadrut concerned themselves little with education for cooperation. They dealt mainly with organizing youth in cooperative unions. As early as the 1920's, however, local forms of cooperation were taught in the Workers' Stream schools, in civics classes or in lessons about the Histadrut. Only in the 1940's, however, was an attempt made to systematize the subject. Two of the creators and supervisors of Workers' Stream education, Dov Zisleh and Yehuda Ehrlich, convened two significant meetings in 1943 and in 1946. On September 8, 1943, representatives of the Education Centre, the governing body of the Workers' Stream schools, met for the first time with those of the Histadrut cooperative organizations, Hamashbir Hamercazi and the Consumers' Cooperative Union, and formulated an educational approach. In elementary schools, emphasis was to be on practical cooperation, while in vocational and other secondary schools the subject would follow special

School (Tel Aviv, Teachers' Cooperative Library by Educational Centre, Hamashbir Hamercazi and Consumer Cooperative Supervisory Board, 1947)

7. Harold Silver, *Education, Change and the Policy Process* (London and N.Y., Falmer Press, 1990) shows this trend in educational history.

curricula, complemented by teacher training programs.⁸ For various reasons, subsequent meetings that were to have developed those programs were delayed. Meanwhile, theoretical and practical instruction in the secondary schools increased, while the elementary schools continued to focus on cooperation in practice.

At a study session for Workers' Stream teachers on October 25 and 26, 1946, however, an educational approach was formulated. There would be two courses. 15- to 16-year olds would study movements and individual cooperative enterprises in this country, while in their last two years of school, 17- and 18-year-olds would learn about the cooperative movement worldwide in their social studies program. Teaching would follow the inductive method, "from fact to law, from the concrete to abstract, from reality to theory . . . from our enterprises to the world scene".⁹

The labor press, notably *Hameshek Hashitufi*, the organ of the Histadrut cooperative movement, related occasionally in the 1930's and 1940's to the need to educate for cooperation, providing practical experience. This was understood as adult education mainly, while from time to time there would be an article about the education of youths for cooperation in Europe.¹⁰ A single contributor, a Mr. Tsfoni, formulated an original plan in 1933. He proposed a cooperative youth movement. Unlike those in Europe, it would not be supervised by adults. Members would develop Working Scout Tourism as well as a regional geographic museum, on a cooperative basis, focusing on "the interrelationship of nature and geography, of society, economics and history." These activities would, the author contended, "breathe life into the Workers' Stream schools and the youth movements, bringing them closer to all that interests society and the working class in this country." Affiliated with them, one could establish "cooperatives for school supplies, sporting goods, books, cooperative savings for young people, etc.." Tsfoni's theoretical proposal was based on European textbooks on cooperation, but oriented toward Palestine under the Mandate and the 1925 attempt to introduce

8. Meeting of representatives of cooperative institutions and of the Education Centre, 8 September, 1943, LA, 1324b/IV

9. *Cooperation in the School*, *ibid.* 3-10, 24, 25

10. From a comprehensive bibliographic survey of the Labour Movement press, 1920's to 1940's: A. Lina, "Cooperative Education in Finland", *Hapoel Hatsair*, XIII/40 (1920), pp. 12-13; K.T., "Education Issues in the Community", *Hameshek Hashitufi*, I (1933), pp. 68-69; Y. After, "Cooperation and Education", *ibid.*, pp. 288-289; Y. Shpan, "The International Cooperative School", *ibid.*, p. III (1935), p. 228; "The Cooperative Education Question", *Yediot*, Consumer Cooperative Supervisory Board, III (1940), pp. 2-3; "Cooperative Education", *Hameshek Hashitufi*, XII (1943), p. 131.

Scouting to children of Histadrut members. In 1930-31, these Scouts merged with *Noar Oved* (Working Youth), the main Histadrut youth movement.¹¹

All cooperatives in Israel have functioned within the Hevrat Ovdim of the Histadrut since the 1920's. In 1942, in a proposal entitled "Young Hevrat Ovdim", Aaron Zisling of Kibbutz Ein Harod, later Israel's first Minister of Agriculture, suggested that the organization foster producer and consumer cooperatives for youth. He put forth this idea in other Histadrut forums and in the educational publication of the kibbutz movement. Membership was offered not only to youth groups and children in all Labour Stream schools, to the Noar Oved, and to the other Labour Zionist youth organizations, but also to youth with different political orientations that were in general agreement with Hevrat Ovdim principles and objectives.

The new organization's purposes were active work, development of production, independent management with mutual help, independent marketing, and use of profits in keeping with group decisions. Zisling's list of possible products included collections of songs, poems and essays, flowers, and butterflies as well as pet animals for households or the "children's corners" in the kibbutz. He also specified the uses of earnings, first to cover expenses, then for new equipment and technical books, and for prizes for outstanding work groups. He envisioned funds and efforts for travelling exhibitions, for buying books and pictures, and for regular contributions to worthy causes.

To run Young Hevrat Ovdim, Zisling suggested four independent institutions in which representatives of the Hevrat Ovdim, the Histadrut Educational Centre, and the Noar Oved youth movement would participate. The General Committee would meet annually and the Council quarterly. The Directorate would carry out the decisions of Committee and Council, and the sales committee of each unit would market its products. In the margin, as it were, Zisling, kibbutz and labor movement veteran that he was, reiterated the goals of education for work, independent management, cooperation and mutual help, and "planting the roots of the Hevrat Ovdim by uniting the Histadrut youth group members as producers."¹²

Secondary school teachers attending sessions of the Education Centre in 1946 did not even relate to Zisling's proposals: they re-

11. Tsfoni, "Cooperation Among the Youth", *ibid*, I (1933), pp. 26-29. For material on the Working Scouts, see Mordecai Naor, *Perpetual Motion, 60 Years of Working and Student Youth*, (Tel Aviv, Mercas Hanoar Haoved v'Halomed 1984), pp. 18-19.

12. Dov Ben-Meir, "Hevrat Ovdim", See *Histadrut Lexicon*, pp. 141-142.; and Aaron Zisling "The Young Workers' Society, a Proposal".

ferred only to the models they already knew—the cooperative shops in city and moshav schools. These followed the Histadrut pattern of a storeroom from which merchandise was sold to members only. Prices were low because of wholesale purchasing from Hamashbir Hamercazi and because the aim was not to profit but only to meet expenses. Dov Zisleh and Yehuda Ehrlich did mention the need for more varied forms of cooperation. Actual proposals, however, related only to consumer cooperatives, "the cooperative activities of school pupils"¹³ as a means of education towards democratic and social values, to economics and to economy. When Israel became a state, a Cooperative Unions Department was established in the Ministry of Labour under Haim Drabkin, later Darin. A researcher on the cooperative movement from the political Left, he had a special interest in the kibbutz. So too did the first Minister of Labour, Haim Bentov of Kibbutz Mishmar Haemek, who later studied the commune. In 1949 Drabkin organized the Young Cooperative Union, a national youth movement. In this period of "from a class to a nation," the Prime Minister, David Ben Gurion, favored youth organizations that were national rather than sectoral in character. Drabkin's proposal resembled the earlier one by Zisling, now Minister of Agriculture, and was no doubt based on it, with adaptations to new circumstances.¹⁴ The list of activities was similar, with the addition of services like supplementary mail deliveries, cleaning and gardening. Marketing, management and use of profits were almost identical, save for additions regarding local and regional councils, within whose geographical sphere various unions worked together.¹⁵

Partial Realization of Education for Cooperation in the Histadrut and in the State of Israel: 1940-1960.

In contrast to the relative wealth of detail on theories of education for cooperation, there is a dearth of material on its realization, which in itself indicates defects in this area. Cooperation, as taught in the 1920's and 1930's, dealt with its then current kibbutz, moshav and

13. Dov Ben-Meir, "Tsarhanian", in *Histadrut Lexicon*, p. 337; Dov Zisleh, "Introductory Remarks"; Yehuda Ehrlich, "Conclusions"; A. Lipshitz, "Cooperative Activities among Pupils in Schools"; "Keeping Records and Keeping Books in School Cooperative Associations", *Cooperation in the Schools*, pp. 8-10, 24, 25, 13-16, 26-37.

14. Haim Darin-Drabkin wrote seven books during this period, including *Lessons in Political Economy* (with Z. Abramovitch, 1939); *Housing and Absorption in Israel* (1957); *Patterns of Cooperative Agriculture in Israel* (1960, in English). *The Other Society*, dealing with the kibbutz, is his best known work.

15. See the Proposal and the accepted plan of the Young Cooperative Union.

urban versions. A later attempt (1943) to institutionalize it as a subject within the Workers' Stream curriculum called for obligatory instruction in 16 secondary schools, using materials that teachers prepared during a three-week summer session.¹⁶

In fact, such instruction as there was used outdated books written for adults by cooperative movement officials.¹⁷ In 1946 a new seminar on cooperation was planned, with the participation and assistance of Martin Buber, who was close to the kibbutz and the cooperative movement. It was to have dealt with economic geography and the historical development of economic ideas, including cooperation, and to discuss theory and teaching methods in detail. The new material on these subjects was to have been presented at a full seminar course attended by at least one representative of each secondary school. Because of the security situation, this gathering never took place. Instead there was a two-day meeting in which only the final chapters of the new material were discussed.¹⁸ Participants also described what was actually taking place in the classrooms. Ya'akov Bloikopf, after ten years' teaching school at the Ben Shemen youth village, said that the subject emerged in evening discussion groups and as part of agricultural economics, studied by senior pupils. Because of the limited time for social studies in an agricultural school, he had to restrict himself to introductory theory, while emphasizing cooperation within the Histadrut whenever the occasion arose in the classroom. Israel Gur-Arieh of Kibbutz Geva told of his experience there and at Moshav Tel Adashim, and Eliezer Cohen reported a similar situation at Moshav Kfar Vitkin. "Practical" cooperation was taught at the beginning of secondary school. Theory was introduced in political economy, in senior classes, where an attempt was made to show local activities in the perspective of the international cooperative movement's development.¹⁹

Neither Zisling's prestate proposal for a cooperative movement among youth, nor its subsequent national version, nor Tsfoni's earlier "working Scout tourism" were ever carried out, *inter alia* because the cooperative movement directed its limited educational means to

16. See note 9 above, as well as the proposed introduction of cooperation as a subject in Histadrut schools, August 1943, LA 1235b/IV 215.

17. E.g., "The Industrial Revolution and Social Theories" from the humanities curriculum adopted in 1940, LA 4500/J 17, 15-16, and the later version: "Curriculum Proposals for the Ninth and Tenth Grades in Secondary Schools, I. Humanities" (Tel Aviv, Education Centre, 1943): 20-21; See also Zabarsky and Gelfet, note 2 above.

18. "Introduction" from *Cooperation in the Schools*, pp. 3, 4

19. "Members' Remarks", *Cooperation in the Schools*, pp. 17-21, 23.

the schools rather than to informal education. There were a few cooperative unions for youth in the mid-1940's. Previously there had been some consumer cooperatives like the one Gur-Arieh established in 1933 at Tel Adashim. He writes:

"It furnished all school supplies from a central store with branches in each class. It was organized as a cooperative union, with an annual meeting, a directorate, auditors, etc. I transacted its business in cash. I tried to introduce as much interest as possible into the accounting, which was essential. The senior class would manage the bookkeeping, and each annual meeting gave rise to lively discussion as to the storekeepers' performance, and especially as to the distribution of profits. Shareholders received dividends, profits were returned according to purchases made, and various sums were set aside for the building fund, for a storeroom cupboard, for the Jewish National Fund, for the school library, for the nature study room, etc. The children took an interest in all these questions, and the cooperative was an important centre for them."²⁰

Most of the material on young people's cooperatives comes from the Labour Ministry publications from the Young Cooperative Union, 1949-1952. Despite general failure, there were isolated successes. A cooperative in a Haifa school, similar to the one at Tel Adashim, was so successful that inspector Zvi Tsimhoni extended the program to the other Workers' Stream schools in the area. It was the agricultural sector in the cooperative union within the Labour Ministry that was active in the cities. This group initiated cooperatives connected with school farming clubs in the 1950's, where the pupils were responsible for certain produce, and acquired a knowledge of farming, along with social and cultural activities. Although the cooperatives and the farming clubs were not in the same schools, they had common educational goals. Since the Labour movement controlled the ministries of agriculture and education, coordination was possible.²¹

Reports show an initial impetus in the establishment of cooperative unions among youth in 1949, with a subsequent rapid decline. In April, 1949, seven schoolchildren's agricultural cooperatives were reported in the Tel Aviv area, besides 17 engaged in knitting, embroidery, carpentry and bookbinding, and four cooperative shops within schools. The agricultural sector had plans for ten more farms

20. See note 12 above and also "Members' Remarks", p. 20.

21. Zvi Tsimhoni's letter to the Education Centre, 8 April, 1949, in LA 15a/IV, 215, 61, 62; Young Cooperative Union/ Agricultural Sector, "Encouraging Agricultural Training in the City (an outline)", LA 80/IV, 215, pp. 165-175; Noah Nardi, "Special Subjects in Education/Agriculture", from *Sefer Hahinuch v'Hatarbut*, p. 1, (Jerusalem, Ministry of Education and Culture, 1952), pp. 94-97.

in urban areas throughout the country, and an additional 15 enterprises in rural communities outside Tel Aviv were anticipated within 18 months.²²

However, a Labour Ministry department protocol on December 6, 1951 reported a decline from 50 units, half of them already active, to 11. "The Department established 11 cooperative groups of school children, some for production and some consumer cooperatives. Great effort was necessary, and the department, lacking an adequate budget, could not meet expenses . . . An instructor resigned, and no replacement has been appointed . . . cooperative education is regressing seriously . . . in view of budgetary difficulties, one doubts whether to spend thousands on youth groups." In conclusion, an ad hoc committee was chosen to deal with the problem, and to arrange funding. Not by chance did the operative conclusion ignore the Young Cooperative Union. It reflected resignation to the disappearance of the educational cooperative idea in the form that had been imported from Europe. The General Council of the Cooperative Unions expressed this overtly in 1952: "Our youth activities can be seen to be totally paralysed. Negligence is widespread. The Department has difficulty carrying on the important projects it started." Only a few farming clubs joined forces with the Young Cooperative Unions, and they were now operating outside the cooperative framework, only to disappear in the following decade.²³

Why Did Histadrut and National Cooperative Education Fail?

Our historical description shows some of the simple, direct causes. Teacher training was insufficient and materials unsuitable. There were no instructors and an inadequate budget in the early 1950's. Foreign, notably European, cooperative ideas were imported without adaptation and hence did not meet Israeli needs. Abroad, education stressed adult leadership in consumer and producer cooperatives; in Israel, the emphasis was on the schools, educating for

22. Reports on "Agricultural Training in the City", from the file of correspondence between the Cooperative Union and the Education Centre in 1949. This includes various versions, as well as Drabkin's report to the meeting of the Pedagogical Committee of the Education Centre, 11 July, 1949, LA 1526/IV 215. We have formulated a consensus version.

23. Protocol #21 of the session of the General Council of the Cooperative Union on 6 December, 1951; protocol of the meeting of representatives of supervisory boards dealing with cooperative education, 6 November, 1952; Protocol #26 of the General Council session on 4 December 1952;—LA 700/IV 319.

the kibbutz and the moshav. The Labour movement headed by Ben Gurion perceived cooperation as a Histadrut norm, to be adopted by all citizens in the transition from the Jewish settlement period to the Jewish state. From India, Sri Lanka and Sweden rather than from Europe came the model for the combined efforts of the cooperative movement and the government, not from western or eastern Europe: in western Europe, education for cooperation was entirely the task of the cooperative movement while in eastern Europe it was entirely the business of government.

However, there were obstacles to a combined effort. Both the government and Histadrut lacked resources to absorb the new mass immigration, though it was easier for the Histadrut to enlist people in cooperatives. The wrong government bodies took charge. Labour Ministry staff who knew the cooperative movement did not understand teaching, schools were run by the Ministry of Education, and authority overlapped.²⁴ Histadrut institutions, suspicious of possible influence on their educational approach, did not contribute enough to government curriculum planning. This emerged at the pedagogical committee of the Education Centre on July 11, 1949, where the Young Cooperative Union plan was approved. Ya'akov Banai, a leading educator at Kibbutz Degania and in Tel Aviv, declared: "We will be cutting the children off from the school's direct concerns. They have youth movement activities two or three times a week, and here is another burden. Secondly, educational interest is set aside for material interests, which we have been protecting them from. We will not have education for shopkeeping! This is the danger now, when the teacher is not in charge." There is further confirmation of Banai's view at the General Council of the Cooperative Union on December 6, 1951. "Obstacles" were mentioned, among them the decisive—and unfortunate—influence of the teacher entrusted with the Union.²⁵

Additional reasons for failure lie in areas highly developed in Israel, particularly in the Labour movement and in the kibbutz. In keeping with Labour movement ideology, the aspiration was to build a cooperative youth movement that was entirely voluntary and supplementary, whereas in fact the organizations united in the Young Cooperative Movement had become organizations *for* youth, run by adults. These were no free, all-embracing groups of rebellious youth,

24. See¹⁰; Y. Ben-Dror,⁴; Protocol #21, pp. 2,3.

25. See Pedagogical Committee's discussion of Drabkin's proposal and Protocol #21, p. 3.

but were establishment organized and active only in a limited field, this despite their declared intention to educate for full cooperative living.

Significant hallmarks of the youth movements in the Jewish community in the period 1930-45, as shown by Raphael Gat, were also absent from the cooperative unions. The latter were not national organizations in contact with former members. Education for settlement and contacts with political groups for this purpose were limited. There was but a weak connection between the cooperative organization and settlement, and with the Histadrut's cooperative and educational establishment. Indeed, both the Young Cooperative Association and the Cooperative Union for Youth were movements *for* youth. Barzel, Meyouhas, and Gal define supplementary education as that initiated by the establishment and carried out by professional instructors, making limited demands on the participants' daily life. The emphasis is social and cultural, on use of leisure, with no specific ideological commitment. Such groups, including isolated cooperatives, appeared in the 1930's, but were differentiated by definition from youth movements only some 30 years later. As a result, the stress that Zisling and Dravkin placed on the possibility of cooperation becoming a national youth movement limited its real potential as a supplementary education instrument.²⁶

As regards *values education in general, and kibbutz-oriented education in particular*, there are four reasons for failure, particularly as regards the Young Cooperative Unions.

a. *Congruence between the educational framework and the society around it* was found by Reshef and Dror. The former noted a close fit between progressive teaching methods and education for work (including doing one's own work rather than hiring to have it done) on one hand, and the Labour movement on the other. The latter found a similar situation related to kibbutz education. His model demonstrated that only a close correspondence between educational systems and their social surroundings produce the desired results. A

26. Informal frameworks were analyzed here in the light of the principal theories published in Hebrew, dealing with social and values education. (The first item was translated into English); Chaim Schatzker, "Martin Buber's influence on the Jewish Youth Movement in Germany", *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXIII*, pp. 151-163 (Jerusalem, LBI 1978); Raphael Gat, "Youth Movements in Working Israel 1930-1945," doctoral thesis, (Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, 1974); Hillel Barzel, *The Movement for Youth* (Jerusalem, Sha'alim, Zionist Organization, 1966); Joseph Michael Gal, Meyouhas ed. (Jerusalem, Ministry of Education and Culture, 1975) "Informal Education in Israel", in Walter Ackerman, Arik Carmon and David Zucker, *Education in an Evolving Society* (Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, Hakibbutz Hameuchad and the Van Leer Institute, 1985), pp. 601-666.

different situation obtained as regards the Young Cooperative Union: advanced cooperative theory was hardly suitable for all Workers' Stream pupils during the period when mass immigration was doubling the population, bringing in pupils and teachers of "very limited social consciousness".²⁷

b. The Workers' Stream and the Histadrut as a whole always regarded *the kibbutz as the cooperative ideal*. It was to be the educational goal even if few would achieve it. Education for cooperation was in fact outside this consensus, a compromise, teaching limited consumer or producer cooperation, and thus losing its value-oriented basis. This is easy to explain through the inherent difficulties of educating in the city for rural communal life. Even in 1946, Dov Zisleh, inspector in Workers' Stream schools and leader in cooperative groups, knew this: "Self-realization (through collective living) has always been a foundation stone of the education the workers' community has given its children. We wanted not only to inculcate certain views and values, but also to give the child roots in this reality of building a society and an economy . . . so that he will become part of the realization, even advancing it . . . Cooperation and physical work have become basic values of our children's groups and educational institutions. However, though rural schools have found ready support for these values both in the adult society around them and in the children's needs, in cities and towns, even in workers' neighbourhoods, such support is lacking."²⁸

c. Reshef pointed out that the distinctive feature of Workers' Stream generally and kibbutz education particularly was the meshing of "society, education and work." The Young Cooperative Associations and the Young Cooperative Unions did not present such an integrated picture. Their cooperative work was not complemented by teaching, but was linked only to the school's social life. Dror and Bar-Lev showed the validity of this principle in two current case studies from the kibbutz in which they confirmed theories put forth by Carelli and Pain, for example. They reached the conclusion that education for work and for other values can be made to succeed only by using complementary means, both formal and informal, that em-

27. Shimon Reshef, *The Labour Movement School System*; Yuval Dror, *The Formation of Kibbutz Studies Curricula in the Kibbutz Movement*, doctoral thesis (Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 1984); Y. Ben-Dror, "On Cooperative Education," p. 6. See also note 4 above.

28. Reshef, *ibid*; Yuval Dror, "Social Education as Values Education—from the Workers' Stream to the Present", in Rina Shapira and Arie Kasher (eds.), *Educational Policy—a Memorial to Shimon Reshef* (Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, School of Education, 1991); see Dov Zisleh's introductory remarks in *Cooperation in the Schools*, p. 8.

brace classroom instruction, outside work and social life, like examples taken from cooperative and kibbutz life.²⁹ The cooperative organizations mentioned did not educate successfully for work because work was not part of the educational experience offered in the city school. They were, moreover, scarcely reinforced by any classroom teaching of the subject. The teacher came from outside, and was not always conversant with what was going on in the school. Very few pupils participated in productive cooperative work and consumer cooperatives too were limited. Yehuda Ehrlich, Zisleh's collaborator, summed up the situation at a convention in 1946: "Practical cooperation—cooperative stores run by the pupils—can only exist as part of the school's social life . . . just as cooperation as a subject belongs with social studies. Pupils' activities should be more varied and more comprehensive."³⁰

d. The paradox: *actualizing a value without educating for it* sums up the difficulty of education for cooperation, even before 1948. The kibbutz was the living reality of the cooperative-Zionist-socialist ideal. Because they were living the ideal for the younger generation to see, they saw no need to talk about in their children's classrooms. Logical as this may seem, educational and social reality contradict it. In the kibbutz, where educational authorities neglected the subject for years, asserting "the kibbutz itself is a campus and needs no programmed learning," the problem is acute. It is a mistake to assume that children take the kibbutz and the children's society they live in for granted. The kibbutz movements themselves understood this only too well following the great ideological split of 1951, which drove many participants in the heroic period of settlement that preceded the establishment of the state away from cooperative and collective life. Moreover, the departure of half the adult children from the kibbutz in the last decade shows that to live the cooperative reality is not necessarily to accept it. The same is true of Zionist and religious education in Israel, despite which emigration and lapsed religious observance have become widespread. In both these value systems, which are meant to be lived out in daily life, an ideologically

29. Reshef, *ibid.*; Yuval Dror and Mordecai Bar-Lev, "Integration of Educational Paradigms relating to Education for Work in Ideological Societies", paper presented at the 14th Congress of the Comparative Education Society in Europe (Madrid, The National University of Distance Education, 1990); M.D. Carelli (ed.), *A New Look at the Relationship Between School, Education and Work*, (Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education, 1980); A. Pain (ed.) *The Interaction Between Education and Productive Work*, Bulletin of the International Bureau of Education, UNESCO, (225) (1982), p. 56.

30. Yehuda Ehrlich, conclusions in *Cooperation in the School*, p. 25.

oriented childhood and youth is not enough: comprehensive and multifaceted education is necessary.³¹

Precisely because the Labour Zionist movement exemplifies cooperation by its very existence and vision, and because cooperation and collectivism have been part of our movement from its inception, we have paid insufficient attention to developing instruments that would educate to cooperation as a world view and a way of life." Similar views were expressed at the General Council of the Cooperative Union in 1951: "At the last international cooperation convention, in Copenhagen, we found ourselves in second place as regards the size and extent of our movement—and everybody knows the difference between the sheer size of Israeli cooperation and its socio-educational level."³² The Young Cooperative Union, like Israeli cooperative education in general, got caught in the paradox of realizing the value without educating towards it, and was not part of a comprehensive and multifaceted ideological educational system. This paradox is the main reason that education for cooperation failed in those years, and generalizes, to a large extent, the failure of formal education for values.

Several conclusions relevant for cooperative and communal education today can be drawn from the failures in this area between 1940 and 1960. Formal and informal educational frameworks must be compatible with the society in which they function: they cannot simply be lifted from one society to another. An optimum and real model for cooperative living, such as the kibbutz, is essential, even if some compromises with ideals are accepted in daily life. A series of formal and informal educational means are necessary, however, to reinforce the living example and thus assure the success of value-oriented education. Effective education for cooperative living is not to be taken for granted, even for those growing up in cooperative and communal societies.

31. See Dror, "The Formation of Kibbutz Studies Curricula"; Zvi Sobel, *Migrants from the Promised Land*, (N.J., Transaction Books, 1986); Mordecai Bar-Lev, "Is National Religious Society Suffering an Additional Attack of Secularization?" (*Zra'im*, 1990), pp. 10-12.

32. See Protocol #21, p. 1.