

Communal Groups: Social Laboratories or Places of Exile?

PETER MICHAEL FORSTER
AND
WILLIAM JAMES METCALF

Why do we study communal groups?

Like all social groups, they are interesting in their own right, but most communal scholars seek other reasons or justifications for their research endeavors. They occasionally ask whether communal groups are good or bad for their members, and whether communal groups serve the rest of society in some positive manner, or as a terrible example to avoid, albeit perhaps still worthy of study.

Indeed, as communal scholars, do we not have a professional duty to ask if utopian communal groups are good for their members and/or for their host society? Who benefits and who suffers; what is the ultimate point of communal experimentation; and who pays the price? Or do we retreat to a social and ethical relativist position, unwilling to express our professional judgment about the social groups we study? This paper looks at the relationship between communal groups and the rest of society, with particular emphasis on communal groups as the outcome of society's attempts to marginalise its change agents.

Costs and Benefits of Communal Living

Don Pitzer's theoretical model of Developmental Communalism looks at the movement in and out of mainstream society of groups of people experimenting with a communal lifestyle, and focuses on how communalism serves its members. Developmental Communalism offers a perspective on the benefits of the communal lifestyle to its members and places rather less emphasis on whether communal groups are of benefit to the rest of society.¹ A somewhat similar analysis was provided earlier by

Michael Barkun.² Other scholars have looked at the psychological,³ cultural,⁴ material (economic and environmental)⁵ and even town and regional planning⁶ advantages to people who live communally, and at their collective contribution to mainstream society. These scholars usually argue that communal living is a healthy way for individuals to be protected from the worst excesses of modern living, and to be supported in their individual endeavors. These rather joyful word pictures, while often inspiring, however, may only be a partial story.

Looking beyond the presumed benefits of a communal group to its members, many of these same scholars have also argued that communal experimentation is important to the rest of society -- that the benefits of communal living extend far beyond the immediate members and their particular time, and are to the advantage of those who remain in mainstream society.⁷

In 1890, Oscar Wilde, penned his colourfully romantic and oft-quoted justification for utopian thinking and communal living:

A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which Humanity is always landing. And when Humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realisation of Utopias.⁸

A number of contemporary communal scholars have specifically focused on the crucial role played by utopian communal groups as laboratories for testing and demonstrating new ideologies and social structures. In other words, looking at what communal groups can contribute to the rest of society.⁹

Metcalf's major study of 27 long-lasting communal groups from around the world found that these "mature" groups, which have existed for an average of over 30 years, offer a viable alternative model for our common human future. This study clearly showed that while many communal experiments may be ephemeral, many others endure across several generations. These 27 communal groups, however, are not representative but were selected to demonstrate communal "success stories".¹⁰

Other authors go even further, arguing that experimentation with utopian communal living is crucial to our global survival, that without it we are all doomed. For example,

Visionary activity is not an extra in society any longer, if ever it was. It is the only thing that has any chance of carrying us from the world in which we presently live. ... This transformation ... will be brought about by a revolution in our imagination's exercise; by the dreaming up of new utopias.¹¹

Clearly not all communal experiments offer other members of society hope for a better future, except in so far as they perhaps indicate cultural norms and social behaviour that is best avoided. The contribution of some communal groups to the rest of society is arguably only in serving as a negative example of what happens when group-think and mind-control take over. Neither is it easy to identify any benefits coming from some communal groups even to its individual members.

In recent years, the mass murder and suicide of the Jonestown community in Guyana in 1978, the mass suicide of the Heaven's Gate community in the United States in 1997, and the deaths in a fire fight between government officials and members of the Branch Davidian community in Texas in 1993, are among the more extreme examples of communal utopian experiments that have gone horribly wrong. Other examples of communal death through mass murder or suicide included the Order of the Solar Temple in Switzerland and Canada, the Jombola Cult in Sierra Leone, The Adolfo de Jesus & Sara Aldrete commune in Mexico, The Church of the Lamb of God, the Manson Family and Yahweh Ben Yahweh (The Temple of Love) in the United States, and Aum Supreme Truth in Japan.

Every communal historian knows that such extreme and anti-social behaviour is not a recent phenomenon. There is a depressingly long history of communal groups that have moved from high ideals to the oppression, and even destruction of their members.¹²

Most western countries have, over the past decade or so, developed what are loosely called "cult-busting" networks. These frenetically active socio-political groups have a philosophy that appears to be premised on the assumption that almost all communal groups are dangerous cults that, through subtle mind-control, doom their members to psychological, financial and even physical enslavement.¹³

But neither the perhaps overly optimistic, utopian view of communal groups as healthy social laboratories, filled with happy and stable people, experimenting with radical social alternatives, then forging ahead, showing the way of the future (as many communal scholars suggest) nor the dystopian view of brain-washed zombies being led to self destruction (as posited by the cult-busters) is the whole truth. Both, however, represent aspects of this diverse social movement.

Communal Settlements as Places of Banishment

Another aspect of the relationship between communalism and wider society is the role which communal groups often fulfill in removing or isolating "disruptive" people from the rest of that mainstream society.

It is understandably common in mainstream, civil society to seek to

improve security and the quality of life for the majority by removing or controlling minorities who are perceived to be disruptive or damaging to the "greater good". These near-universal tactics include incarceration in prisons, mental hospitals or young offenders institutes; restrictions such as curfews and probation; and less obvious forms of marginalisation and banishment such as military conscription and perhaps even voluntary overseas service.

Both historically and contemporaneously, another mechanism of marginalisation and banishment is the occasional use of communes or intentional communities as repositories for "social misfits". Potentially disruptive individuals are thereby isolated and insulated, where they can have the least social impact.

It is a legitimate question for us to ask whether intentional communities are simply the inevitable result of individuals actively seeking alternatives to their mainstream society, or whether western, liberal societies are still actively pushing some people out of the mainstream and in the direction of communal living. Many accounts of why members joined their communities give the impression that pressure to join came only from within the individual rather than from without. However, there is some evidence for pressure toward communal living coming from without.

Pitzer describes an example of this, whereby communes have been used by governments as a tool of imperialist expansion.

Governments, especially new regimes and their agents, use communal methods to pacify conquered peoples, settle new territories, solidify domestic control and solve economic problems. The Spanish and Portuguese governments authorised the village mission system as a means of Indian pacification in the Western Hemisphere. Their agents were the regular clergy of the Roman Catholic Religious Orders. Of particular interest are the villages created in sixteenth century New Spain by Franciscan, Vasco de Quiroga. His Indian villages are modeled after Thomas More's *Utopia*, complete with community of property and labour, and representative government.¹⁴

Other examples, according to Pitzer, include the Zionist development of communal Kibbutzim in Palestine, and the more recent use of communal groups in Israel's disputed, occupied territories. Similarly, the early stages of the Soviet Union and Communist China made use of communal groups as instruments of expansion and social control.¹⁵

Zablocki, in his major study of contemporary communal groups in the USA, observed,

Communes have been around for a long time. However, they have always been peripheral rather than central to any known civilization. ... Communitarian social movements share with revolutionary social movements the psychological symptoms of alienation. ... The communitarian strategy is to escape from

alienation by achieving consensus within a circumscribed social microcosm. This strategy has continued to win adherents for over two thousand years. ... In both their behavior and their attitudes, communitarians seem to be significantly alienated from the capitalist work ethic and from participation in the labor force.¹⁶

In Australia there is considerable historical evidence of governmental pressure toward communal living. For example, official support and direct financial subsidisation of communes in Australia in the 1890s was partially undertaken because nervous colonial governments saw this as a way to get disgruntled radicals out of the cities -- where they could make revolution -- and onto the land, albeit as communards, where they were safely out of the way.¹⁷ Some of these 19th century communal groups, such as the Leongatha Labour Colony in Victoria, resembled concentration camps more than happy communes.¹⁸

More recently, a similar strategy was explored in New Zealand, with their Ohu scheme and by the Australian (Labor) Government with its "Kibbutz Scheme" in the 1980s.

In New Zealand, a number of rural communes, known by the Maori word, "Ohu"¹⁹ were established in the middle 1970s with government encouragement and financial support. The motivation behind this scheme was obviously three-fold: First to provide a cheap and easy means of decentralisation by encouraging this highly urbanised society to move to rural areas; secondly, to satisfy the political demands of some young people to be allowed access to land for their communal social experiments; and thirdly as a way of removing troublemakers from cities and getting them off the social security roles, by setting them to work, trying to be self-sufficient, in remote rural areas.

The Minister for Lands, Matia Rata commenting on his concerns said,

The over-emphasis on ... greed, speculation, profiteering, unethical practices and the cult of individualism can only result in the further alienation of those who seek a return to community and group feelings. I ... hope that the Ohu will, in some way, lead to a more concerned society and recapture anew the deep links of people and land. ... Since many individuals and groups have expressed the desire to adopt different lifestyles, and as some are already living this way, we cannot neglect the opportunity of letting New Zealanders and their friends recapture the satisfaction based on cooperation, mutual assistance and communalism.²⁰

The New Zealand Prime Minister, Norman Kirk, offered a significantly different explanation for the Ohu scheme.

A lot of young people had been saying that the Establishment had gone soft, that it had lost its ideas and its drive. The people who said this, those who

were disillusioned with the way things were going, were to be given an opportunity to see if they could do what they said should be done.²¹

While the first part (by the Minister for Lands, Rata) certainly sounds like positive, supportive rhetoric, the second part (by the Prime Minister, Kirk) contains the clear hint that urban troublemakers should be removed to the safe isolation of the remote countryside. In a remarkably similar pattern to what occurred with Queensland's government-supported communal ventures of the 1890s, one researcher of the Ohu has concluded, "The Ohu Scheme appears to be a classic case of an idea coming from the top levels of government and being almost immediately undermined by the bureaucracy".²²

The Ohu Scheme did temporarily remove many social activists from mainstream New Zealand society, although few groups endured long enough to have a lasting impact.²³ Nevertheless, the more Machiavellian goal of blunting the radical youth social protest movement may have been achieved.²⁴

Soon after the demise of this high profile New Zealand plan to place young people in isolated rural communes, the Australian government considered a "Kibbutz Scheme"²⁵ whereby long-term, unemployed young people would be removed from cities and put into supposedly self-sufficient rural communes. There, they would be expected to toil on their land, feed, house and clothe themselves, and no longer be a financial burden to the taxpayer. These young communards, being in remote areas, would not be able to agitate for peace and disarmament, nor against environmental degradation or nuclear power, or for greater equity of wealth or opportunity. In other words, while this Kibbutz Scheme might well improve the economic lot of unruly, young, unemployed people, it would also contribute to social stability by their banishment to remote rural areas. This Kibbutz Scheme, however, did not go ahead, following considerable political opposition, most noticeably from within the left wing of the ruling Labor Party, and negative advice from those professional consultants employed to advise on it.²⁶

Communes have undoubted attractions for governments seeking to remove sources of political opposition or revolution. As well as making commune members somewhat peripheral to mainstream society, they also tend to be pre-occupied with their own survival and with handling their inevitable internal conflicts, thus providing a "safe" focus for their otherwise disruptive impulses for social change. There is evidence that governments and their agents have long used them as such.²⁷

It can also be argued that there is awareness within mainstream society that pressuring or directing potentially disruptive members into intentional communities will, through this policy and practice of marginalisation, produce greater stability for the remainder of society. If so, then it may

provide at least a partial explanation for why periods of social upheaval, such as the 1840s in the United States, the 1890s in Australia, and the 1960s and 70s in the North America, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand, have been closely followed by dramatic increases in communal living.

Pitzer has observed,

In reality, general, unified communal movements are a fiction. The expansive use of communal living in recent years, like past communal movement mirages, resolves itself on closer inspection into numerous smaller ideological causes having adopted communalism for their own reasons as suggested by developmental communalism.²⁸

But if there are overt or covert pressures for social trouble-makers to be marginalised by being encouraged (banished?) into communes, there are also self-preservation reactions from within those very same communal groups which may try to block their entry. For example, Australian research into how communards viewed the Government's proposed Kibbutz Scheme, showed overwhelming opposition to having unemployed young people foisted onto them.²⁹ After all, social "misfits" and "trouble-makers" may well not be the ideal building block of sustainable social groups, be they communal or mainstream.

One of us (Forster), who has lived for several years in an intentional community (the Findhorn Bay Community), has observed similar processes of marginalisation and banishment of disruptive community members, taking place within the communal group itself, where the effects of radical, disruptive, or revolutionary individuals is very clear. Their marginalisation to the edges of the community, or banishment from it entirely, appears to have a stabilising effect on the community as a whole. It may also be that this process leads to a community that loses its capacity for needed changes, which thus stagnates or declines.

Zablocki observed that American communes adopt various self-protective mechanisms to improve their stability and chances of long term survival. He found a direct relationship between the stringency of a community's selection procedures and its social stability.³⁰ The same result was found in Metcalf's international communes research a few years later.³¹ Most communal groups, not unexpectedly, try to bar the entry of people who would be socially disruptive, yet these may be the very same people who are being pushed in that direction by larger social and political forces.

Is it not worth asking, both for intentional communities and for society as a whole, if a point comes when the benefits of communal stability, achieved through stringent selection and exclusion, becomes offset by lost innovation, creativity and capacity for change?

Conclusion

We have raised the question: "Are there pressures within society to marginalise certain "deviant" people by pushing them into communal living, for the sake of social stability?" We have found evidence that governments have applied such pressure to potentially disruptive members, both historically and in more recent times.

We have also raised, but not answered, the possibility that there is a wider awareness through society, of the communal option as a means to overall social stability. This is consistent with a model of society in which there is a level of change that is experienced as "ideal," a society that uses homeostatic mechanisms, including marginalisation and banishment of radical, change-oriented individuals and groups into intentional communities, as the means to restore to that society an optimum level of change.

Finally, we have raised the possibility that societies that overuse the communal option risk losing an important source of creativity, and that communal groups who are over-protective in accepting new members may also suffer from cultural inertia. Hopefully, future research will help to explore these issues.

NOTES

¹ D. Pitzer, "Developmental Communalism: An Alternative Approach to Communal Studies," in C. Coates, et al, eds., *Diggers & Dreamers 94/95* (Winslow: Communes Network, 1993): 85-92.

² M. Barkun, "Communal Societies as Cyclical Phenomena," *Communal Societies* 4 (1984): 35-48.

³ For example, K. Jeffrey, "The Family as Utopian Retreat from the City" in S. Tesalle, ed., *The Family: Communes and Utopian Societies*, (New York: Harper, 1972): 21-41; B. Shenker, *Intentional Communities: Ideology and Alienation in Communal Societies* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986); and S. Matrarese & P. Salmon, "Assessing Psychopathology in Communal Societies," *Communal Societies* 15 (1995): 25-54.

⁴ For example, C. & O. Popenoe, *Seeds of Tomorrow: New Age Communities that Work* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984); J. Blasi, *The Communal Experience of the Kibbutz* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986); C. McLaughlin & G. Davidson, *Builders of the Dawn* (Shutesbury, MA: Sirius, 1986); and S. Dunne, *Celebration of a Generation: The Historical Significance of the Nimbin Aquarius Festival, May, 1973* (Newcastle: University of Newcastle, Honours Thesis, 1992).

⁵ For example, M. Corr & D. MacLeod, "Getting it Together," *Environment*, 14:9 (1972): 2-9, 45; F.E Trainer, "How Cheaply Can We Live," *Ekistics* 304 (1984): 61-66; G. de Gryse, *Visions of Alternative Communities: Environmental*

Sustainability and Self Reliance (Masters Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1985); W. & D. Schwarz, *Living Lightly: Travels in Post-Consumer Society* (Charlbury, UK: Jon Carpenter Publishing, 1998); and M. de Geus, *Ecological Utopias* (Utrecht: International Books, 1999).

⁶ For example, J. Ramey, "Multi-Adult Households: Living group of the future?" *The Futurist*, April (1976): 78-83; G. Streib & M. Hilker, "The Co-operative 'Family': An alternative lifestyle for the elderly," *Alternative Lifestyles* 3 (1980): 167-184; E. Sommerlad, P. Dawson & D. Altman, *Rural Land Sharing Communities: an Alternative Economic Model* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1985); P. Williams, *Working and Living Co-operatively: A Planning Guide* (Canberra: Office of Youth Affairs, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1985); L. Durham, "The Urban Middle-Class Communal Movement" *Communal Societies* 6 (1986): 31-39; D. Hardy, *From New Towns to Green Politics*, (London: SPON, 1991); D. Hardy, "Utopian Communities in Britain in the Early Twentieth Century: The Example of New Town," *Communal Societies* 12 (1992): 90-112; P. Kohn, G. McDonald and W. Metcalf, "Group Titles for Rural Areas," *The Queensland Planner*, 32:3 (1992): 21-26; G. Meltzer & G. Bamford, "Sociable Housing and Ecopossibilities," in B. Jolly & I. Holland, eds., *Ecopolitics VII* (Brisbane: Imagecraft, 1993): 249-254; E. Mossop, *From Eternity to Here* (Sydney: Masters Thesis, University of New South Wales, 1993); and G. Bamford, "Sustainability, Social Organisation and the Australian Suburb," in J. Birkeland, ed., *Catalyst "95: Rethinking the Built Environment* (Canberra: Centre for Environmental Philosophy, Planning and Design, University of Canberra, 1995): 49-57.

⁷ For example, A. Aidala, *Ideological Systems: Norms, Values and Ideology in 60 Urban Communal Groups* (New York: Columbia University, doctoral dissertation, 1980).

⁸ O. Wilde, "The Soul of Man under Socialism," in V. Holland, ed., *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde* (London: Collins, 1966): 1089.

⁹ For example, A. Rigby, *Alternative Realities* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974); A. Abrams & A. McCulloch, *Communes, Sociology and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); C. Popenoe & O. Popenoe (1984); C. McLaughlin & G. Davidson (1986); D. Pitzer (1993); B. Metcalf (1996); M. Hollick & C. Connelly, *Sustainable Communities: Lessons From Aspiring Eco-Villages* (Quinns Rocks, WA: Praxis Education, 1998); and W. & D. Schwarz (1998).

¹⁰ B. Metcalf, *From Utopian Dreaming to Communal Reality: Cooperative Lifestyles in Australia* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1995); and B. Metcalf, *Shared Visions, Shared Lives: Communal Living Around the Globe* (Findhorn: Findhorn Press, 1996).

¹¹ A. Belford, "Yesterday's Dream, Tomorrow's Necessity" in G. Moment & O. Kraushaar, eds., *Utopias: The American Experience* (Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, 1980): 244-245.

¹² For example, W. Armytage, *Heavens Below* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961); M. Holloway, *Utopian Communities in America 1680-1880* (New York: Dover, 1966); N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London: Granada, 1970); P. Baum, *Another Way of Life: The Story of Communal Living* (New York:

Putnam's Sons, 1973); D. Cohen, *Not of the World: A History of the Commune in America* (Chicago: Follett, 1973); A. Apsler, *Communes Through the Ages: The Search for Utopia* (New York: Julian Messner, 1974); C. Johnson, *Utopian Communism in France* (London: Cornell University Press, 1974); K. Rexroth, *Communalism: From its Origins to the Twentieth Century* (London: Peter Owen, 1974); D. Hardy, *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England* (London: Longman, 1979); J. Harrison, *The Second Coming: Popular Millenarianism 1780-1850* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); F. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979); L. Kern, *An Ordered Love: Sex Roles and Sexuality in Victorian Utopias* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981); B. Berry, *America's Utopian Experiments* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1992); Y. Oved, *200 Years of Communes in the United States* (New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1987); N. Pleil, *Free From Bondage* (San Francisco: Carrier Pigeon Press, 1994); and D. Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

¹³ For example, T. Patrick & T. Dulack, *Let Our Children Go!* (New York: Dutton, 1976); J. Lofland, *Doomsday Cult: A Study of Proselytization and Maintenance of Faith* (New York: Irvington, 1977); M. Kilduff & R. Javers, *The Suicide Cult* (San Francisco: Bantam, 1978); W. Olin, *Escape from Utopia* (Santa Cruz: Unity Press, 1980); A. Paulos, *The Cult Experience* (Westport: Greenwood, 1982); C. Wright, *Oranges and Lemmings: The Story Behind Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh* (Richmond, Australia: Greenhouse, 1985); P. Bowler, *The True Believers* (North Ryde, Australia: Methuen, 1986); T. Marrs, *Dark Secrets of the New Age* (Westchester, USA: Crossway, 1988); T. Marrs, *The New Rome: Germany, the Fourth Reich, and the New Age Movement* (Austin: Living Truth, 1990); D. Millikan, *Imperfect Company: Power and Control in an Australian Christian Cult* (Melbourne: Heineman, 1991); M. King & M. Brealt, *Preacher of Death* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1993); L. Samways, *Dangerous Persuaders* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1994); M. Thaler Singer, *Cults in Our Midst: The Hidden Menace in Our Everyday Lives* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1995); and S. Hamilton-Byrne, *Unseen, Unheard, Unknown* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1995).

¹⁴ D. Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (1997): 88.

¹⁵ D. Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (1997): 88-90.

¹⁶ B. Zablocki, *Alienation and Charisma* (New York: Free Press, 1980): 24-25.

¹⁷ A. St. Ledger, *Australian Socialism* (London: Macmillan, 1909); G. Coghlan, *Labour and Industry in Australia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1918); D. Gobbett, "Communal Village Settlements of South Australia in the 1890s," paper presented at International Communal Studies Association Conference, New Harmony, Indiana, October, 1993; W. Metcalf, "Utopian Queensland," *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland* (1995): 553-570; W. Metcalf, "Australian Utopias," in W. Hudson and G. Bolton, eds., *Creating Australia: Changing Australian History* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1997): 122-130; and W. Metcalf, *The Gayndah Communes* (Rockhampton: Central Queensland University Press, 1998).

¹⁸ R. Kennedy, "The Leongatha Labour Colony: Founding an Anti-utopia," *Labour History* 14 (1968): 54-58; and J. Murphy, *Leongatha Labour Colony* (Leongatha: John Murphy, 1983).

¹⁹ According to L. Tower Sargent in "The Ohu Movement in New Zealand: An Experiment in Government Sponsorship of Communal Living in the 1970s," *Communal Societies* (1999), Ohu is a Maori word which means "to achieve something by means of friendly help and work." According to "AhuAhu Ohu," a Country Calendar documentary on NZTV, New Zealand (6:30 PM, March 28, 1998), however, "Ohu is a Maori word which means working together in a communal group."

²⁰ L. Tower Sargent, "The Ohu Movement in New Zealand..." (1999).

²¹ L. Tower Sargent, "The Ohu Movement in New Zealand..." (1999).

²² L. Tower Sargent, "The Ohu Movement in New Zealand..." (1999).

²³ In 1981, when one of the authors, Metcalf, undertook field research in New Zealand, five Ohu remained. By 1999, Ahu Ahu Ohu was, as far as we can determine, the only Ohu still in existence, although it was no longer very communal. It is in a remote part of the east of the North Island, and is only accessible by boat trip across the Whanganui River, and then a 4km (2.5 mile) hike through dense forest. It has been the subject of a number of TV documentaries in New Zealand, the most recent being shown on Country Calendar (March 28, 1998).

²⁴ W. Metcalf, "Dropping Out and Staying In: Recruitment, Socialisation and Commitment Engenderment in Contemporary Alternative Lifestyles" (Griffith University, Ph.D. thesis, 1987); and L. Tower Sargent, *The Ohu Movement in New Zealand...* (1999).

²⁵ The term "Kibbutz Scheme" had, in its early days, also been applied to what became known as the Ohu Scheme in New Zealand. Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke was a strong admirer of Israel, and he preferred to adhere to the term Kibbutz rather than find a native (Aboriginal) term to use, as had happened in New Zealand.

²⁶ E. Sommerlad & J. Altman, "Alternative Rural Communities: A Solution to Urban Unemployment?" *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 21:1 (1986): 3-15; and B. Metcalf, "Dropping Out and Staying In..." (1987).

²⁷ D. Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (1997): 88-90.

²⁸ D. Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (1997): 90-91.

²⁹ W. Metcalf and F. Vancley, *Government Funding of Alternative Lifestyles: An Opinion Survey* (Brisbane: Institute of Applied Social Research, Griffith University, 1984, as commissioned by the Federal Department of Education and Youth Affairs).

³⁰ B. Zablocki, *Alienation and Charisma* (1980): 46.

³¹ W. Metcalf, "Dropping Out and Staying In..." (1987): 196-244.