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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the history of our complex society, there have been two phenomena that have stood out: the importance of freedom to the individual and the markedly increased violence in our society. In a society that claims to be part of the "Free World", we have people marching and carrying slogans calling for "Freedom Now" or "Freedom from Repression". And how many times has a peace demonstration ended in violence? How many times has one seen freedom to mean freedom at the expense of another person's rights? To our society and to democracies in general, freedom is an important concept.

The importance of freedom has not escaped recognition from the discipline of sociology. In the November, 1968 issue of the American Sociologist, the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics has incorporated the meaning of freedom in research into a Code of Ethics for sociologists. The following is an excerpt from that issue:

"Among the central characteristics of (democratic) societies has been the trends toward maximizing the opportunity for people to participate in the making of decisions by which their lives are vitally affected and toward maximizing the range of significant choice. The opening of the social structure into institutional patterns of shared decision making and into patterns of choice within the institutional framework has been based on the assumption of the essential freedom of the human person. From this assumption of essential freedom and from the pressure for maximizing its institutional forms stem the
other values which cluster around the person of modern man: dignity, privacy, and the positive assessment of reason. Therefore, as sociology attempts to relate itself to its ethical responsibilities toward the society of which it is a part and as it defines its own internal ethic, these standards of essential and institutional freedom are central. Ultimately, sociological research and knowledge must always be related to the task of creating and maintaining human freedom. Such research and knowledge are, of course, part of the universal human quest for knowledge and freedom and are not the monopoly, either in their making or in their application of any special nation or people.

In pursuing its task of creating and maintaining human freedom, sociological research, to command proper support from a society, must in the long run, justify such support by contributing its fair share of the social scientific knowledge needed and realistically attainable for the rational solution or amelioration of that society's major social problems. Furthermore, as these problems develop increasingly vital and international dimensions, sociological research must enlarge the scope of the subject matter it considers relevant until ultimately it undertakes to study and understand sociological phenomena throughout mankind.1

Dr. G. A. Hillery has recognized the importance of freedom to a community. He has set out to find some answers concerning what freedom is and how perceived deprivation of freedom affects the people. He has found that certain organizations tend to allow more perceived freedom to its members than do other types of organizations. He has also found that perceived deprivation of freedom was directly related

to increased violence of individuals in certain groups.

Granted the sociological significance of this type of research, the value of attempts to replicate also follow.

**Purpose**

Hillery (1971a, 1971b) has found a reduction in perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict in communal organization as compared to formal organization. He has stated, moreover, that only within a communal organization can freedom be maximized (1971a, 1971b). In so doing, Hillery demonstrated the utility of categorizing the qualitative differences between communal organization and formal organization into a taxonomy (1968, 1971a, 1971b).

The purpose of this study is to replicate Hillery's study, using the same procedures, framework and methodology, and to see if the new results are compatible with his findings. In essence, this study will be checking the reliability of measures used in his research.

**Problem**

The problem at hand is whether perceived deprivation of freedom (independent variable) is positively related to conflict (dependent variable) within formal organizations and communal organizations. If so, can freedom be maximized within a communal organization rather than a formal organization? Is the potential for freedom inherent within the structure of a particular social system? If so, how is it accomplished? These are the major problems with which this research will be concerned.
A discrete or qualitative distinction is the key to Hillery's argument for a taxonomy of formal organizations and communal organizations. In other words, there appears to be a sharp qualitative distinction separating both types of organizations (Hillery, 1968, 1969a: 143). Hillery describes formal organizations as having "primacy of orientation to the attainment of specific goals" (Hillery, 1971a: 53), and communal organizations as "heavily institutionalized systems which lack defining goals, but have the central characteristics of familial behavior" (1971a: 52).

In simple terms, formal organizations have specific goals and exclude familial behavior while communal organizations include the family and exclude specific goals. Since the concept "goal" is used quite broadly in the literature, it is important that "specific goal" be defined clearly. The definition follows Parsons' usage (1960: 17-18). A specific goal has at least three characteristics: (1) the product of the goal is identifiable, such as automobiles, M.D. degrees, etc.; (2) the product can be used by another system; i.e. the output of one is the input for another system, and (3) the output is amenable to a contract; e.g. it can be bought and sold. Because of the many connotations of "goals", Hillery (1971a: 54) mentions that it may be helpful to use the term "output goal" as synonymous with "specific goal" (see Gross, 1968, 1969). Hillery suggests that another helpful term to use is "contract-object". "In order to produce a contract object, a group must behave in such a way that a measurable output results and this output, in turn, must be able to be contracted for by another system" (Hillery, 1969b: 3).
A general theoretical taxonomy represented by the broad categories of formal and communal organization, expressive and informal group developed by Hillery (1971a: 53) is given in Table I. Hillery (1971a: 53) also developed a taxonomy emphasizing borderline cases of communal and formal organization. It is transformed into Table II.

According to Hillery, (1969b) the general taxonomies are directly in line with the efforts of Parsons (1960: 16) and Etzioni (1964). In fact, the concepts employed were largely developed from the work of these men and from Hillery's work on communal organization (Hillery, 1968: 145-151).

The distinction between formal and communal organization is closely related to the concepts of MacIver (1917: 23-4), Rose (1954) and Lenski (1963). The chief difference is in the distinguishing criteria. MacIver speaks of "common life" and "common interest" in distinguishing communal and associational types. Rose uses facets and purposes, Lenski speaks of church attendance, whereas Hillery would use the criteria of goal attainment and the family (Hillery, 1969b: 12).

The basic differentiation is more similar to Parsons' pattern variable (Parsons and Shils, 1951). "The most important difference is that Parsons was studying social behavior by examining processes associated with such behavior instead of examining social entities. Insofar as groups maintain some type of group boundary (conceptual or otherwise), they are entities, and thus, they are whole" (Hillery, 1969b: 13).
TABLE I
A General Taxonomy of Human Groups

The system has primacy of orientation to specific goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Institutionalization</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>Vill (village or city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business</td>
<td>Local Business</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Captive Communities&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Captive Communities&quot;</td>
<td>Intentional Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutions</td>
<td>Total Institutions</td>
<td>Limited Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE GROUPS</td>
<td>INFORMAL GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Movements</td>
<td>Social Movements</td>
<td>Ethnic Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowds</td>
<td>Crowds</td>
<td>Cliques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

qualitative difference

.. . quantitative difference

Source: Hillery, 1971a: p. 53
TABLE II

A Research Taxonomy Emphasizing
Borderline Cases of Communal & Formal Organizations
The system has primacy of orientation to specific goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes Contains the Family</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CAPTIVE COMMUNITIES</td>
<td>INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation Center</td>
<td>Hutterite Kibbutz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slave Plantation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>TOTAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>LIMITED COMMUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Public Schools</td>
<td>Shaker Trappist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning with the assumption that groups are entities, it is possible to examine the degree to which human collectives can be compared holistically. It should be noted that the concepts of formal and communal organizations are on the general macro-sociological level of abstraction. The groups used as the level of analysis in this research will be of a lower type which are specific in nature and which allow for the gathering of empirical evidence. See Table III for a detailed breakdown.

**Level of Analysis**

For the purpose of analysis, the communal organization will be an intentional community, its counterpart under formal organization is a total institution, the underlying constant being the assumption that the members spend most of their time on the premises (examples: eating, sleeping, working). So far, it has been shown in the past, by Hillery, that groups in which the members do not spend most of their time on the premises tend to behave quite differently than is true of groups in which the members do spend most of their time on the premises. Both groups will be treated and compared as whole social systems. Essentially, the unit of analysis is each system, i.e. members of the total institution and members of the intentional community. Within the total institution, the students and staff are subunits (see Table III).

In this study, the intentional community is considered as the level of "social reality". Boskoff (1962: 5) defines "level of social reality" as "the level of context of social experience -- i.e., the level of meaningful stimuli, of the conscious or implicit 'projection'
TABLE III

Levels of Units of Analysis and Concepts in Terms of Inclusiveness and Abstraction

I Collectives

II Formal Communal

III Total Institution Intentional Community

Epistemic Correlations

IV Farmingdale Walden Farm

V Staff/Students Members
of social behavior, and the level of consequences generated by such behavior."

In addition, Hawley (1948: 154) explained the double importance of the use of the community in research:

1. "The community is important because it is the least reducible universe of cause and effect relations; any smaller unit would not contain a sufficient number of variables."

2. "The community, as an object of study, is the most nearly comparable unit for different societies."

Intentional communities differ from most communal organizations in that they are setup for a particular purpose, most often ideological, in order to achieve some particular condition, or to realize some value.

Total institutions may be described as "systems in which a bureaucratic staff compels a localized collectively to act for a certain end" (Hillery, 1963; 785). A communal boarding school was used to represent a total institution in this research project.

**Definition of Concepts**

It appears to this author that freedom, conflict, and violence are household words and are universally found. Freedom, especially, is very abstract and is not always discussed in sociological literature. This concept has plagued scholars, rulers and political philosophers for centuries. Lefebvre (1964: 182) interprets Marx's position that human freedom is not to be defined on the political, but rather, the social plane. Herbert Marcuse (1964: 7) concludes that "the range of
choice open to the individual is not the decisive factor in determining
the degree of human freedom, but what can be chosen and what is chosen
by the individual. The criterion for free choice can never be an
absolute one, but neither is it entirely relative." Hillery views
freedom in its most simple form as "the ability of someone to do what
he wants to do. The consequences of freedom from this point of view
are innumerable, and only four are considered here" (Hillery, 1971b:
1):

"first, freedom depends on the ability
to make choices. Second, (and this aspect
is inseparable from the first), freedom requires
making a choice. If one never chooses an alter-
native, he may be judged to have never exercised
his freedom. Third, freedom depends on one's
definition of the situation concerning choices
that are or should be available. Fourth, there
are structural features in human groups that are
more often associated with freedom than not"
(Hillery, 1971a: 55).

B. F. Skinner, (1971) in his latest book, Beyond Freedom and
Dignity, emphasizes the fourth point when he states that "instead of
promoting freedom and dignity as personal attributes, we should direct
our attention to the physical and social environments in which people
live. It is the environment that must be changed rather than man
himself if the traditional goals of the struggle for freedom and
dignity are to be reached."

Hillery (1971b: 3) uses the term "perceived" freedom to represent
the feeling of freedom among the various members of the collective.
"Perceived freedom is measured by the response to a given number of
questions in a Likert type scale format" (see Table IV). The crucial
**TABLE IV**

Deprivation of Freedom Scale

The following questions are intended to find out how people feel about freedom in the communities in which they now find themselves (whether visiting or living).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I used to have more freedom before I came here than I do now.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The people in charge should be more considerate.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I do not have the kind of freedom that I should have.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel as if some of my freedom has been taken away.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I wish that I could leave here and find a place that would let me do more of the things I want.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variable is whether the persons are free to enter and leave the system.

Following Dahrendorf's (1959: 135) distinction, "social conflict is defined as consisting of all relations between sets of individuals that involve an incompatible difference of objectives." The purpose of this study is to show how perceived deprivation of freedom affects the degree of conflict, not its absence; this would probably be impossible since, in most cases, as long as there is interaction, there will be some conflict. As Dahrendorf (1959: 225) has remarked, "without community there is no conflict and without conflict, there is no community."

Unlike the concept of freedom, social conflict is less abstract and is more readily observable. Conflict was measured by asking the respondents to rate the extent to which they were personally involved in a series of intra-group behaviors (Hillery, 1971b: 3) (see Table V). Hillery's (1971b: 3) first three types of behavior involving conflict were taken from the negative part of Bales Interactional Categories (Bales, 1950). To these were added categories of behavior referring to increasingly more violent involvement of a physical nature.

A Statement of Hypothesis to be Tested

The following is a general statement of the expected relationships in their general form:

Hypothesis 1 -- "The greater the perceived deprivation of freedom, the greater the intra-conflict level" (Hillery, 1971a, 1971b).
TABLE V

Intra-Group Conflict Scale

Table 3. Questions asked in the conflict scale.

The next questions describe only the contacts you may have had within this group during the past WEEK. We are interested only in situations in which you were actually involved, as for example, speaking with at least one of the persons involved when the action occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has this occurred to you this week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A discussion in which some disagreement occurred (include rejection, withholding information or withholding help):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A discussion in which some tension occurred (include withdrawal of help):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A discussion in which some antagonism occurred (include deflating someone's status, or aggressively asserting oneself):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A disagreement in which shouting occurred:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A situation in which some physical force was used on someone (include pushing, shoving, etc.; do not include inflicting physical harm or use of weapons):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A situation in which some physical harm was done to someone (cutting, punching, bruising -- do not include use of weapons or killing):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A situation in which weapons were used or where someone was killed (include threatening with weapons, such as rocks, guns, knives):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walden Farm members, Farmingdale staff and Farmingdale students' composite scores on both the perceived deprivation of freedom scale and conflict scale were compared to Hillery's findings.

Hypothesis 2 -- "If a group is primarily oriented to attainment of a specific goal, then it would not maximize freedom" (1971a, 1971b).

In this case Farmingdale was treated as a whole system (subunits of staff and students) and Walden Farm was treated as a whole system; the results were compared to Hillery's findings.

Hypothesis 3 -- "Only if a group is not primarily oriented to the attainment of a specific goal will it maximize the freedom of its members" (1971a, 1971b).

In other words freedom tends to be maximized in communal organizations. Again both Farmingdale and Walden Farm were treated as whole systems and the results were compared to Hillery's findings.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Methodological Approach

In this paper the author used a combination of the two major research approaches that are formally known under the headings of quantitative and qualitative methodology (Bruyn, 1966). To represent the former methodological tool, a structured questionnaire was used; the qualitative approach was represented by the techniques of participant observation.

The data reduction technique of the questionnaire was used to ascertain whether or not the author's quantitative results compared to Hillery's results. The aim of participant observation was to understand the people from their own frame of reference, that is, to obtain the sense of "verstehen". The method of participant observation is, in part, another step in the direction of completing the picture of the social organization that has an impact on the variables being observed in this research effort.

After participating in each organization for approximately a week, the author personally distributed by hand, to each member a questionnaire which contained (among other measures) Hillery's indices of relative deprivation of freedom and indices of intra-group conflict. The respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaire at their convenience, and to return it to the author. Since the unit of
analysis was the community, as well as the total institution as a whole system, and since the N was the score for each collective, it was imperative to obtain a very high rate of return of the questionnaire. The mean scores of both scales (relative deprivation of freedom scale and conflict scale) were to be compared to Hillery's (1971b) findings. (See Table VI for the type of organization that they will be compared against.)

A total of 41 days was spent participating in Walden Farm and Farmingdale, combined. Initially, Walden Farm was studied from June 17 through July 15, 1971 with a follow-up study done from September 24 through 26 of that year. Farmingdale was observed between October 10 and 24, 1971 with a follow up done from March 16 through 20, 1972. The follow up studies were mainly used to go over the findings with the members to assure that a correct and accurate picture was drawn of their respective systems. The author also corresponded with researchers who have undertaken previous studies on Walden Farm and Farmingdale and discussed the results and checked the findings.

Background Information on Walden Farm

The significance of the proper social setting for this research cannot be understated. An effort was made to study both the intentional community and the boarding school as whole systems. An agrarian milieu was chosen for both collectives. Both were relatively small and could facilitate observation more readily than larger units.

The community in question was derived from the literary utopian work of B. F. Skinner (1948), Walden II. We shall call this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Adult population</th>
<th>Sample size (adults)</th>
<th>Families present</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Structural Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Samuel Community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>community involvement, prayer</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caphas members</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>community and racial involvement, christian witness</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caphas volunteers</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>community and racial involvement</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin House, 1970</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>learning to live in community</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma Fraternity</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fraternity involvement</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Men's Dorm</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>college residence</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker boarding school staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>teaching, counseling, general supervision</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Adult population</th>
<th>Sample size (adults)</th>
<th>Families present</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Structural Freedom to enter</th>
<th>Structural Freedom to leave</th>
<th>Structural Freedom to move in and out</th>
<th>Structural Freedom to move within</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quaker boarding students</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>subject to parents</td>
<td>subject to parents</td>
<td>subject to staff</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's prison staff</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>custody and treatment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women inmates (minimum security)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>custody and treatment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>subject to staff</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men inmates (medium security)</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>custody and treatment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>subject to staff</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden Farm Community</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>alternative life-style</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmingdale staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>alternative life-style</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmingdale students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>custody and treatment</td>
<td>subject to parents &amp; court</td>
<td>subject to staff &amp; court</td>
<td>subject to staff</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intentional community the Walden Farm. The community was founded in June, 1967, by a group of people who met at a conference in Michigan in 1966. They corresponded with each other, found that they agreed on basic ideas about community living, and as a group, sought practical ways implementing their objectives. One of the members had enough money to buy an old tobacco farm in central Virginia and the community was established. The group occupies the land now on a rent-free lease (as of March, 1972) with an option to purchase in the near future.

From reading the literature about Walden Farm and with informal discussions with visitors there, the author found that to many "alternative to living" people, this community is the representation of Walden II. In fact, it was reported at Walden Farm that B. F. Skinner knows of the existence of Walden Farm and has corresponded with them with his approval. He has even referred prospective members to Walden Farm.

Walden Farm code of conduct, was taken from Walden II. It is based on behavioral engineering, orientation toward positive reinforcement, communal owning of property, and the pooling of resources, to name only the most prominent ideas.

Unlike Walden II, there are no children at the present time, since the community feels that children are not yet economically feasible. They have plans (as of March, 1972) for building a children's house in the very near future. When it is completed they will think seriously about having children.

---

1 See Appendix A for a copy of the code of conduct by which they live.
As a result of reading Walden Farm's literature and from informal discussions with the members, it was found that Walden Farm was set up for the purpose of living in a nonviolent environment which emphasizes cooperation over competition; trust and faith of each individual; eliminates envy, possessiveness of property, jealousy, conspicuous consumption; and reduces conflict. Members place great stress on independence, autonomy, humanism, personal affection, a rejection of hostility, and an adherence to positive reinforcement as opposed to punishment. In general, the communitarians are also disenchanted with the nuclear family and depersonalized institutions which the outside society represents to them. An example of this negative connotation towards the outside society can be seen in their reasoning of why the community does not own a television. One member put it this way, "We have decided against it because we believe its cultural impact is damaging. Although some programs are harmless and fun, and others are admittedly fine and worth seeing, the overwhelming impact of television is poisonous to our internal culture. It blasts the viewer with a barrage of consumerism, male chauvinism, artificial standards of beauty, rigid sex roles, and glorification of deceit and violence. It does everything bad literature does, but more often, more easily and more powerfully. Without leisure television, we are forced to think of better ways to use our time."

Walden Farm is a part of a larger movement for an "Alternative Society". The editor from one of the alternative magazines, "Vocation for Social Change" (1972: 4), explains that by "alternative society" we mean constructing a society in which oppressive relationships such as
racism, sexism, elitism, and imperialism are not institutionalized, in which co-operative relationships and collective actions are encouraged."

Charles Reich, in the Greening of America (1971) presents an excellent summary of the basic values to which Walden Farm attempts to adhere: "Respect for each individual, for his uniqueness, and for his privacy. Abstention from coercion or violence against any individual, abstention from killing or war. Respect for the natural environment. Respect for beauty in all form. Honesty in all personal relations. Equality of status between all individuals, so that no one is 'superior' or 'inferior' . . . . This is a community bound together by moral-aesthetic standards such as prevailed before the Industrial Revolution" (Reich, 1971: 418-419).

Roberts (1971), in his work, The New Communes, contends that the modern commune\(^2\) differs from other utopian ventures of previous Centuries in three basic ways:

"First, communal societies specifically reject the concert of hierarchy or gradations of social status as necessary to the social order . . . . Secondly, modern communal societies all maintain that the scale of society as currently organized is too large . . . . Finally, communal societies are consciously antibureaucratic in structure" Roberts (1971: 10-13).

What sets Walden Farm aside from other communes is that they do not reject technology. In fact, the community utilizes all forms of

\(^2\) For all practical purposes, Walden Farm is a commune, but because of the negative connotations the word has to the public, they rather use the term intentional community.
technology that are not dehumanizing or disagreeable. One of the members recently described in their newsletter, the communities' position on technology as follows:

"Unlike much of the communal movement, Walden Farm has never thought of itself as being anti-technology. It is true that some of our methods are primitive (a Massachusetts farmer once said of our farming that the only reason anybody would farm the way we do would be out of historical interest) but it is always lack of money or know-how that sets us back, not dedication to principle. This is hard to explain to a lot of people who yearn to get back to the land. They know that they hate the life they are living and that there is a whole lot of technology mixed up in what they hate. They conclude that machines are responsible for their problems. At Walden Farm, we try to make clearer distinctions between what is bad about the outside world and what is worth saving. Technology, properly used, is generally in the latter category.

Technology means freedom. We have never demonstrated it quite so well as we did this Fall when we bought a used steam table .... Its function is to keep food hot ... At Walden Farm it does more than keep the food hot. It keeps the food line down and the dining rooms uncrowded, demonstrating once again the benefits of the staggered schedule. Before we bought it, we used to ring a dinner gong and the membership would race for the dining room, hoping to be near the head of the line before all the meat had been fished out of the stew. There weren't enough chairs or table space in the dinings room, so when there were a lot of visitors some of us sat on the floor .... After we bought the steam table we stopped ringing a dinner bell at all. Meals are served over a two-or-three hour period, and members can eat when they are hungry. The dining rooms are not crowded, and it is obvious that we can accept several more members with our current facilities."
Visitors ask if we do not miss the ritual of eating together. We do not. In fact, even before we bought the steam table, we were scattering voluntarily in all directions from the kitchen to eat our meals -- some carrying their food out of doors; others to their rooms in search of quiet. These days, a degree of quiet is available even inside the dining rooms. A leisurely meal with a few other members is the norm now, and it is much pleasanter than all being together. Whereas before we tended to eat with our close friends at meal time, now we tend to eat with whoever happens to be there, and we get to know more people more closely. The staggered schedule has enhanced, not disrupted community spirit.  

The Place

Walden Farm is situated on a 123 acre farm in central Virginia. The property has been used in the past as a tobacco farm and the whole surrounding area is given to medium and small sized farms. About one-third of the property is pasture, one-third is woods, and one-third is tillable. Walden Farm inconspicuously blends into the neighboring country side and looks like any other typical farm. The community would go unnoticed without a map and their community sign on their mailbox.

What is significant for this research is the spatial patterning of their buildings and how remarkably similar it is arranged as compared to the boarding school.

Hillery, in his discussion on spatial patterning in folk-villages observed that "All villages displayed the ecological process of

\(^3\)Source withheld.
concentration . . . . In other words, whether residences were on the farmland or separated from it, there was a clustering of buildings: -- and increased density somewhere in the area utilized by the villagers" (Hillery, 1968: 213).

At Walden Farm the buildings are clustered in approximately 5 acres of land. There are three main buildings standing (as of March, 1972) with a fourth one presently under construction, which when finished will be an irregular polygon. All buildings are within shouting distance of each other.4

Work Arrangements

The main economic base of the community is the selling of hammocks, which last year brought in a quarter of their income. Outside work from neighboring cities carried nearly a third. The remainder was made up by smaller industries and lectures. Most of the money that does come into the community is invested in improvements, such as a tractor or tools or enlargement of living space.

The work is performed through an intricate system of work-credits, so arranged that none of the members have unequal burdens. There are several steps involved in carrying out this system. First, each week the members are asked to fill out a "preference sheet" which lists all the work requested for that week by various managers. Usually, there

4It is of some importance to note, however, that the members do not shout. See the later discussion of conflict.
are approximately 50 jobs and the member might rank his favorite to his least favorite job 1 through 50.

Next, the labor credit people assign equal "quotas" of the week's work to every member, assigning people their preferred jobs whenever possible. The credits per hour awarded to each job varies according to the ranking that individual gives it. The higher ranking jobs receive about .9 credits per hour, while lower-ranking jobs receive about 1.7 credits per hour. Each member then receives a labor credit sheet with the week's work schedule on it. By earning more than the quota each week, a member may accumulate "vacation credits" which equal the difference between the cumulative credits earned by the member and the cumulative weekly quotas. Vacation credit allows the member more flexibility in the amount of work he or she signs up for each week. Many of the members accumulate several weeks worth of vacation credit, which means that they could choose not to work at all for that many weeks or to work fewer hours over a greater length of time.

The weekly quota averages around 40 credits. A credit represents on the average one hour of work. The quota is determined solely by the amount of work requested from the various managers who are in charge of various community areas of responsibility. Members are occasionally granted leaves of absences. A leave of absence means leaving the community without having to meet the labor credit quota for the time spent away. Upon return, the number of vacation credits would be the same as when the member left.

The member chooses jobs which are most satisfying and meaningful to him and also selects hours and days he wishes to work, within the
limits of the quota for that week. There is a striking absence of hierarchy in the jobs. That is, there is no staff-worker split. No one is higher than another, no one watches over the work or criticizes what a worker is doing. Work is done on the honor system and a member is expected to do the job at his own pace. There is no evidence of coercive power, that is, no worker can be compelled to do work against his will. If pressure is applied, a worker can simply walk off the job. Members, however, can and do make suggestions in the form of "could you", "would you", or "shouldn't you". To make jobs more pleasant, the community has instituted what Skinner called "behavior engineering" -- that is, it attempts to eliminate discomfort in a certain job and to make it more enjoyable. For example, a stereo speaker unit was installed close to the kitchen sink to make the task of cooking, or washing the family dishes more enjoyable.

The members see work as a necessary function for the running of the community. That is, work is a means to a certain life style. They take pride in learning and doing all the work on the premises by themselves rather than calling on professionals, i.e. plumbers, electricians. Everyone, including visitors, is expected to work and they have had very little problems in getting the members to cooperate. They do have a policy whereby if anyone refuses to work they will ask the person to leave the community.

The only monetary remuneration is a weekly allowance of $.75 which the members can use for snacks. The type of work is varied and is generally considered basic farm labor, i.e., cooking, construction, electrician work, milking, gardening. There is equality of work, in
the sense people are not discriminated against because of sex. There are female electricians and there are male typists.

**Government Structure**

Walden Farm has a formal structure of government which consists of planners, managers, and workers. In reality, all planners are workers, and almost all workers are managers (in fact, there are more managership jobs than there are workers). There are 3 planners. Plannership is a non-prestigious or non-status job. Planners receive no special privileges -- they are workers like everyone else. They are not considered above other members, they just work more than the others. Their main purpose is to allocate the money that is made available to the manager for each job. They also make policy decisions, but they generally listen to the major consensus. The job of planner is rotated on the average of every 8 months.

A community meeting is held once a week where members iron out differences. The meeting is used as a mechanism for conflict resolution. Here the lack of authority figure is evident. Authority and hierarchy are rejected because, according to the Farm members, they represent the subjection of human value to the requirements of the organization.

The code of conduct (see Appendix A) is very simple and they have had little difficulty in getting people to follow it. The code is set up to safe-guard the rights of the individual and to maintain the cohesion of the group. They try to use positive reinforcement as a source of social control and they expect control to come from within
a person. If a person is really obstinate, i.e. continually criticizing the community in public, the community can use peer group pressure by isolating him from conversations or activities. The worst thing that could happen to an individual would be to be banished from the community. From their encounter groups, the community tries to understand each others' position or the particular thing that is bothering a member, and after discovering the problem, the community attempts to help the person work out his problem.

Deviance has a different connotation to the member than to the outside society. They do not label people good or bad nor do they particularly care what criminal act a person might have done on the outside. Their criteria for membership is whether or not a person can get along with others.

It has been said that laws create criminals. The more laws you have the more criminals defined. The author observed at Walden Farm that the laws were simple and they did not try to legislate morality. Within the parameter of their ideology, they accepted different choices in life-style. No repressive force exists to make one conform to a particular life-style. The stress is on individual comfort, convenience and the person's "own thing". There is no status associated with certain clothing, lengths of hair (whether short or long), no guilt feeling or self-hatred. Every current sexual arrangement is acceptable and tolerated, from gay to celibacy. If a person is a "night owl" and

5 This general notion is discussed in Walter C. Reckless' The Crime Problem (1967, pp. 55-72).
likes to sleep all day, that is his business and his alone. If a man wishes to wear a dress or sit in a yoga position, no one objects. A point must be made here: at Walden Farm there exists not the freedom to do as one pleases, but the freedom to be what one pleases.

**Statistical Characteristics of Members**

At the time of the study there were thirty-six members; nineteen males and seventeen females. Thirty-one of the thirty-six members responded to the questionnaire. The ages of the members range from 18 years to 48 years with the mode at approximately 23 years. Only 3 members were over 30 (see Table VII). The turnover rate is approximately four a year with the average stay of over one year. At the present time, there are two of the original eight members still residing at Walden Farm. Since they do not yet have children, they have had to rely on recruitment from the outside. New members are usually people who have read *Walden II* and desired to join such a community. All the prospective members are asked to visit Walden Farm for two weeks or more and see if the members get along with them. After two weeks, members are asked to vote on the person, if the vote is favorable, the person can join immediately, but if there isn't room he is put on a waiting list.

The educational level ranges from non-high-school graduates to Ph.D. candidates (see Table VIII). Twenty-seven members have attended college with thirteen of them graduating. Two of the members have masters' degrees and an additional member was a Ph.D. candidate. It
### TABLE VII

**Age of Respondents from Walden Farm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of December 31, 1971*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school, but did not graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some schooling beyond high school, but did not attend college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college (including junior college, but did not graduate)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or beyond</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seems to the author, that the community must be described as being well-educated.

Nineteen out of thirty-one members (61%) spent the longest period of time before coming to Walden Farm in urban areas of over 50,000, of which twelve of them (39%) lived in cities of over a million (see Table IX).

From reviewing the occupation of the father of each member and the various types of occupations the members had before coming to Walden Farm, it became evident that the typical member was a middle-class, educated, urbanite who was serious about participating in an experimental community based on Walden II.

When asked how many hours a day (on the average) did they spend away from the territory, only three said they averaged about two hours away from the Farm. The remaining twenty-eight members responded that they spent the entire day on the premises. Walden Farm meets the criterion of spending most of the day on the premises.

**Background Information on Farmingdale**

The boarding school used in this research was initially based on the combined approach of A. S. Neill's *Summerhill* (1960) and Homer Lane's famous school called the Little Commonwealth. The boarding school, which shall be called Farmingdale, was organized principally by George von Hilsheimer. He presents his school as an alternative

---

6 See E. T. Bazeley's *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth* (1969) and Homer Lane's *Talks to Parents and Teachers* (1969) for more information about the Little Commonwealth.
### TABLE IX

Size of Community Members Lived in Before Coming to Walden Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm or open country</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or village of less than 2,500 persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-49,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-999,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million and over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to public education, one that is especially set up for problem children. The school sees itself as the first "Summerhillian" or "free school" in the country. These types of schools are based on the "commonwealth idea", which makes the following postulates: "(1) the adults' legitimate rule-making authority is limited to health, safety, and the requirement of public law; (2) adults and children have an equal voice and vote in the establishment of all other rules; (3) a sort of basic "Bill of Rights" limits the kind of rules the school community can make -- no bills of attainder or ex post facto law, etc.; (4) children are not compelled to attend classes; (5) the staffs' primary goal is a healthy psychological and social climate, and only incidentally intellectual education" (von Hilsheimer, 1970b: 177-178).

In Hart's work, Summerhill: For and Against (1970), Dr. Louise Bates Ames, who helped to found the world-famous Gesell Institute of Child Development at Yale University, makes reference to Farmingdale in her critique of Summerhill. She stated that:

"certainly most of us admit that when one is dealing with unusual children, very unusual methods must be used. The Farmingdale school in Florida, is a good example of a school run most successfully, more or less, along Summerhill lines. If I were a British clinician and Summerhill were available, it is quite likely that I would recommend this school or one like it to parents of a child who just does not fit in anywhere else" (Hart, 1970: 79).

---

7 Ibid.

8 The school actually observed was a branch school in New York State.
The goals of the Farmingdale school are to enable students to become individuals who are able to take action, and to be responsible for their actions; to make intelligent choices; to be critical learners; to have a reasonable fund of knowledge; to be able to adapt flexibly and intelligently to new situations; to be able to use all of their experience and knowledge freely and creatively; to cooperate toward ends they have chosen and to seek their own goals and not the approval of others. Essentially, one of the objectives of the school is to force the responsibility of freedom on the children.

Von Hilsheimer contends that:

when they are required to face their own need, they begin to discipline themselves ... I want to emphasize that Farmingdale philosophy is not a 'permissive' philosophy. Nor do I think that it legitimately belongs to the progressive tradition. Progressive education is preoccupied with curriculum and pedagogy. We at Farmingdale are preoccupied with community and values" (von Hilsheimer, 1970b: 178-179).

Von Hilsheimer equates his school as a community and as a place that emphasizes maximum allowance of freedom. However, following the discussion from the first chapter, this position seems like a contradiction. The theory used in this paper posits that a school and a community are qualitatively different. An explanation is in order and perhaps the best way to understand it is to take a careful look into the history of Farmingdale (New York branch).

Farmingdale is located on an old dairy farm of 310 acres in the Catskill Mountains of New York State. The staff at Farmingdale were first organized as a group of adults who had some children, and who
wanted to start a community where they could raise their own children in a Summerhillian school manner. It started first as a summer camp, that is, it began in the form of a camp in the summer of 1965 and decided to take on extra children. Advertisements were made for people to send their children to a camp which was based on the Summerhillian principle. They continued on into a full school from the summer camp, still taking on other peoples' children to help with the finances. Therefore, it was basically started by adults for their own children. One of the staff members comments:

"At that time they were running basically a strictly Summerhillian program for kids who were fairly intelligent but who would prosper really well out of the public school atmosphere and in a free school atmosphere. But it didn't work out quite so well because we didn't get sent this type of kid, even though we advertised for them. What we got sent were kids that people didn't want; kids that no other schools would take so we got to be a dumping ground -- so it changed our minds and we said, listen, this is what we're getting, we might as well just specialize in this type of kid, bone up for it, and you know, become professional at working with disturbed kids because that's what we're getting anyway and it was working; so we did. We changed our advertising campaign for disturbed kids, and as we like to say, disturbing kids because that's what they do -- they disturb adults. Anyway, so that's when we started that and ever since that we've been in that shape. Of course, the school has more taken over the community. That is, it has become a prosperous school. It has become a very large-working project and has overshadowed the community. According to me, there is still a community and I feel community oriented with several people."
Unlike Walden Farm, Farmingdale does not have a model (such as Walden II) to follow for a community. It is not as experimentally oriented nor does it adhere to any specific ideology, as does Walden Farm. However, it is their school that it based on an ideology. As a result, they formulated their own community concept by what is known as "the brotherhood concept" (see Covenant, Appendix B). The school is the business and the membership of the brotherhood is drawn from the staff, although the whole school, staff, and children are the community.

Once a staff member has been there three months and is willing to commit himself to another year of service to the school, he is allowed to join the brotherhood. Essentially, this allows him to vote on policies, issues, and to actually become a part of the school. A new staff member also agrees to follow simple rules. These rules are outlined in Appendix B under Discipline and Standing Contracts.

To the members who are in the "Brotherhood", the community exists first before the school and the school can actually be voted out at their annual retreat. As one of the female members of the brotherhood put it: "I came here because of the community. I didn't come because of the kids."

Every now and then the members jokingly say that "we should give up kids and grow ferns" or "Farmingdale would be such a great place if there weren't any kids here". When the student first comes to Farmingdale the staff tells him that he (the student) has a moral obligation

9See Appendix B.
to the staff because they (staff) have, in fact, taken the student into
their home and wish the student to act accordingly.

It is possible for the members to give up the school business,
but this is highly improbable due to the strong sense of purpose they
have in helping people in trouble which the outside society created.
But this has also led to many controversies within the community,
especially priority issues. The school has developed such as to over-
whelm the community. One of the members explains their dilemma as
follows:

"We're a community of adults who have as
their industry a school. Unfortunately, it
destroys part of the community because when
you take on an industry that is animate rather
than inanimate, that is, human beings rather
than making hammocks or raising cows. When
you do something like a school, community be-
comes a second in your mind because, after all,
you are held responsible for kids. You are
charged with the responsibility of the lives
and the safety and education and the straighten-
ing out of these kids. When you have a decision
on whether to make a decision for the community
or the kids, many times, its the kids that have
to come first, and the loss of adult community
is felt. This happens and its just because
this is the type of thing we've chosen. So I
would say our community, as an adult community,
is probably neglected more than in other com-
munes of different styles. But then again, maybe
just the fact that we have this outside influence
of the kids and this outside responsibility
maybe good because we have been in existence
for seven years and a lot of communes who started
the other way and other styles have folded and
maybe its because they didn't have anything to
keep them on their toes."

To Walden Farm the hammock business is the main economic base for
the communal livlihood. To Farmingdale, the school is the economic
base. What has happened is that the school has overshadowed the community and, in a sense, has become an end in itself. It can also be said that the goals of the school have superseded the purpose of the community. Therefore, Farmingdale is now primarily oriented to the attainment of specific goals. The primary goal is to rehabilitate and to correct the behavior of the students so as to instill responsibility. However, it seems that the states, the courts, and even the parents equate Farmingdale as a custodial institution. This position is understandable when one considers the type of students Farmingdale attracts. Farmingdale, as it is now manifested, is designed to care for a population of adolescents who are not now provided for by public or private facilities throughout the country. The children they seek and have specialized in helping are children in trouble -- delinquents, unruly, unmanageable, incorrigible, wayward, character disordered, socially maladjusted, school failures, drug users, and those whose problems are characterized by:

1. Consistent failure wherever they are sent.
2. Negativism and lack of cooperation with teaching professionals.
3. Poor motivation to improve, and poor insight into their problems.

In other words, all of Farmingdale students have behavioral, psychiatric, or emotional problems. Psychiatric reports of the children established that they cannot benefit from the typical classroom method of group instruction. Their trouble had developed from the style and method used in traditionally rigid classroom structure.
The school population has included the following types:

- Children with drug histories (including heroin users).
- Children involved in criminal activities (with or without court records).
- Children involved in suicide attempts.
- Children with varying degrees of brain damage.
- Children exhibiting psychotic behavior.

From informal discussions with the students, the author found that the students, for the most part, have very little say as to whether or not they want to be there. They see it as a place to be reformed or as punishment for their behavior on the outside. The students are sent there by the parents, or the courts, or both. The parents sign a release that essentially gives the school complete power of in loco parentis, that is, total control over all the students' daily activities. The parents are not allowed to interfere with the rehabilitation of the child and the school decides if and when the student can see his parents. In other words, there is an absence of the students' parents at Farmingdale.

This approach is similar to the characteristics of a "total institution", that is, "being a social system that not only tends to regulate the total lives of its inmates, but which also sets barriers to social interaction with the outside" (Hillery, 1968: 14). Like

---

10 There are, however, staff children living at Farmingdale but they are not considered in the argument.

11 See Erving Goffman, *Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry*, 1957, for further characteristics of total institutions.
other total institutions, Farmingdale is characterized as having "institutions of maintenance", the four being recruitment, custody, treatment and discharge.\textsuperscript{12}

For the services Farmingdale provides, they charge a tuition of as much as $12,000 a year per student. However, the median amount is approximately $3,000 a year. The difference is due to the fact that many scholarships are available, and accordingly several students are there virtually free of charge.

Farmingdale has advertised that it is the only school in the nation that gives a money-back guarantee -- stating that if they cannot correct the disorder of the student within three years, they will refund the full amount of tuition to the parent. So far, they have not had to reimburse anyone. Farmingdale also guarantees that a student will not be suspended or rejected, regardless of the reason.

From personal observation it became apparent that unlike the students at Farmingdale, the staff members are there under their own volition. They came there for an assortment of reasons. There are many sentiments that are similar to those of Walden Farm members. The staff associates the school as part of the "alternative society". The staff has negative attitudes towards the "outside" society, a more or less "we're right and they're wrong" feeling. They do not wish to be a part of the depersonalized, formal institutions or bureaucracies which are associated with the "rat race". Both Walden Farm and Farmingdale are "turned off" by the outside society that represents to them a

\textsuperscript{12}For further explanation of institutions of maintenance, see Hillery, \textit{Communal Organizations}: 1968, pp. 330-337.
Gesellschaft type relationship. They are therefore seeking Gemeinschaft type relationship.

Many of the female staff members came there because they were dissatisfied with their status and role in the outside. The staff has a strong distaste for public education. They have a realistic approach to learning, in the sense that if it works, use it, whether it be positive or negative reinforcement.

Staff members come to Farmingdale because they enjoy working in an informal and relaxed atmosphere; in a noncongested rural setting. The personal affection which is displayed among staff members also is inviting.

They stress cooperation over competition, hard work, sharing, humanism, frugality, privacy, and trust and faith in each individual. They are concerned with the whole person since they have to live with them 24 hours a day.

The members feel strongly that the proper nutrition and a healthy body preceeds a healthy mind. They do not own a television because the damage they feel it does far outweighs any utility it can provide. As the headmaster put it: "If we had a T.V. set here, the kids would spend 24 hours a day in front of it and turn into 'lethargic lumps' -- just staring at it and wasting away".

They also see that technology is not inherently good or bad and use it whenever it is practical and feasible. On the author's last visit, it was observed that the school had purchased a maple syrup evaporating machine. It should be noted that the school uses the maple syrup for its own use rather than selling it for a profit.
The Place

Farmingdale is located on an ex-dairy farm in the Catskill Mountains of New York State. About half the land is wooded, one-fourth is pastureland and the remaining one-fourth is tillable soil.

There are many characteristics of Farmingdale that are remarkably similar to that of Walden Farm. Farmingdale is surrounded by small farms, many of which are occupied by novice, back-to-nature urbanites. The school is situated on an old back road which would go unnoticed without a road map and personal directions.

Unlike other custodial institutions, there are no walls, no bars and no visible differences from any typical farm in the area. This does not mean, however, that the student can come and go as he pleases. The student must secure permission to leave before he can go to town. It is assumed that if he leaves without permission, he has run away.

The buildings are clustered together on approximately seven acres of land. Again, the spatial patterning of its buildings are very similar to Walden Farm. But unlike Walden Farm, there are locks everywhere -- on the kitchen door, refrigerator door, tool shed, staff rooms, student rooms, linen closet -- just about every conceivable place.

The staff has instituted and even increased spatial restrictions when students violate school rules. In past years there had been no locks on any doors and the students had the same privileges as staff members. But within the past year, the staff has received from the Florida school, a group of students who were particularly unruly.
They initially had the same freedom on the premises as did the staff members. However, some abused the privileges by displaying such irresponsibilities as destroying property, stealing money or equipment, not cleaning up after themselves, etc. that the privilege of equal access to facilities was removed. In accordance with staff statements, there is a student/staff split in the immediate sense due to the fact that the students have brought it on themselves. As an example, the author was relieved of two dollars by leaving his money in an unlocked room. In the present case, the loss was a hazard of participant observation: it provided an inddepth experience of the situation faced by staff (and students).

Work Arrangements

Work plays an extremely important part of the daily life at Farmingdale. In fact, it is a requirement that everyone, over twelve years of age, works. With the exception of administrative duties, the staff and students perform the same type of work. As with other custodial institutions, the staff strongly feels that work is therapeutic in nature (Hillery, 1968: 338). They feel that the best way to socialize the students is to have them participate in work, which, in turn, builds self-confidence and self-regulation. Another similarity to custodial institutions is the fact that the staff receives their livelihood due to the presence of the students.

13 The students who arrive from the Florida school know they are required to work and it is under these conditions that they are sent.
The work done on the premises is quite similar to that work performed by the members of Walden Farm: construction work, cooking, laundering, electrical work and plumbing. In both systems, there is an inherent pride in the fact that members perform their own maintenance.

There is a definite routine or work schedule set up at Farmingdale. Monday through Friday, staff and students alike, are expected to rise at 7:30 A.M. and proceed to hike over the countryside for their daily exercise. Upon returning to the premises, they eat breakfast and at 9:30 proceed with the daily work assignments. The work assignments are issued by the staff with the students' interests and preferences taken into account. The work assignments are usually performed until 12:30 P.M. The remainder of the afternoon is kept open for the student to work on any special project he is interested in, to read, or to set up classes with the staff on various subjects of interest.

The staff rotates cooking duties among themselves. The work is all unstructured in the sense that it is informal and the staff does not have to "punch a clock". If there is a job to be done, they do it. They do not have to put in a specified amount of hours per week. It is assumed that if there is work to be done, they will do it -- seven days a week.

The staff members come to Farmingdale with the knowledge that they are expected to work and they know full well that they will be asked to leave if they fail to do the work. The staff alone is responsible for what is termed "G.I.", which is a thorough cleaning of the kitchen each Saturday morning.
The staff has set up cooperating units known as "the families". These units exist of two staff members and three to five students each. They eat their meals together and work together in cooperation to perform family jobs. Family jobs consists of mopping floors, cleaning tables, washing dishes, cleaning the yard, etc. It should be noted that jobs are performed equally between staff and students.

For those not on family jobs, one staff member will assign work to students at 9:30 A.M. Beyond, this the students are on their own -- there is no evidence of staff dominance unless the students do not make the effort to attempt a job.

The only monetary renumeration is $7.50 weekly for the staff members and a $4.00 weekly allowance for the students. At any time staff members deem it necessary to leave the school, they are granted a leave of absence.

**Government Structure**

Farmingdale has several categories of participants, consisting of members of the brotherhood, non-brotherhood staff members, and the students. It also has three different levels of meetings: Retreat, Staff and General meetings. The highest level of meeting is called the "Retreat". The members of the brotherhood meet once a year in Florida during Christmas recess; and here each member has an equal vote on deciding policy issues. As was stated earlier, they own the school and could vote the school out of existence, if they so desired. Most of the issues concern minor changes, such as whether to allow students to smoke in buildings or whether to have hikes in the morning.
The next level is the staff meeting which is held once a week. All the staff members are expected to attend and discuss the projects or pragmatic problems that they are going to deal with in the next week or two. Also discussed is the progress of the students and those difficulties that could be worked out by any plan of action on their part. This is also the time for the staff members to bring out any grievances concerning the way in which the school is run. All the staff members have equal say as to what courses of action should be taken.

Twice a week there are General meetings which both staff and students attend.\textsuperscript{14} They all sit in a large room with seating ranging from youngest to oldest (including staff). The chairman, who is usually a student, begins with the youngest child and proceeds to ask individuals if they have any problems they wish to discuss. The meeting is used as a device to work out any arguments or wrong doings. The usual problems have to do with having money stolen or property damaged, or rules violated. The injured party can ask for retribution, as he sees fit. A vote is taken as to what course of action should be taken in dealing with the violator. Both staff and students have one vote each. The headmaster explains it in this way:

"... if you vote that everyone laughs, or if you vote that everyone shakes his hand and congratulates him, or you vote that we throw him in the lake, or you vote that he washes dishes for a week, or whatever you decide to do, the purpose of the decision is to change his behavior in some way or another -- not to

\textsuperscript{14}Anyone can call an emergency general meeting if he thinks it urgent.
beat him necessarily or whatever -- it is to mold behavior."

Some of the punishment or "teaching device" (as the staff prefer to use) ends up as a monetary fine from either the students' or staffs' allowance. A common complaint is one which they call "invasion of privacy", that is, entering one's room without permission. An automatic 25 cent fine is set and given to the plaintiff.

Staff members are not exempt from the rules that are set up by the general meetings, and they can be brought up and fined as well. The general meeting plays a major part in the staff belief that self-government (the Commonwealth idea) is most helpful in "straightening the kids out". The idea that they try to instill in the students is "govern yourself or we will govern you".

The staff recognizes that it has responsibility to correct the child's behavior and they will do what they feel is necessary to achieve that goal.

When a student first comes to Farmingdale, he starts off with a clean slate. It is only when he breaks the rules of the group that action takes place.

The student does have alternatives in such matters as the type of hairstyle or the clothes he wishes to wear or how he wants to arrange his room. What would be called "abusive language" does not exist at Farmingdale. "Telling a staff member off" is not a crime. The more responsibility the student chooses to accept, the more he is given; as long as his actions do not conflict with the rules of the school.
Statistical Characteristics of Farmingdale Members

At the time of the study, there were a total of thirty-three people at Farmingdale\(^\text{15}\) -- twelve staff members and twenty-one students. There were six male and six female staff members. Twelve of the students were male and nine were female. All twelve staff members responded to the questionnaire, whereas eighteen of twenty-one students replied. The age range for the staff was 19-57 with the mode at approximately 26 years. Eight are under 30. The students range from 11 through 18 with a mode of 16 (see Table X).

The gross turnover rate for staff was approximately 2 to 3 a year with an average stay of two years,\(^\text{16}\) but there was one member who has been with the school since its inception. Like Walden Farm, Farmingdale also has to recruit members. Usually, people become aware of Farmingdale by word of mouth. If someone is interested in joining, the staff members ask that person to spend a few weeks with them to see if he will be compatible with the staff and the students. The staff agree among themselves to accept him as a member, provided there is adequate room.

\(^{15}\) There were three staff children under the age of four. They will not be considered within the statistics.

\(^{16}\) The staff members travel back and forth freely from the New York branch to the Florida school and vice versa. Therefore, it was difficult to reach a definite average. I relied solely on their estimates.
### TABLE X

Age of Respondents from Farmingdale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Staff Frequency</th>
<th>Staff Per Cent</th>
<th>Students Frequency</th>
<th>Students Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of December 31, 1971
The average stay for the student is approximately eight months. The turnover rate for students is estimated at about seven or eight per year.

The educational level of the staff ranges from a non-high school graduate to a person with a masters degree. Seven of the staff have attended college with five of them graduating (see Table XI). All of the students have not yet finished schooling and because of the school policy of open classrooms, no education level was obtainable.

Seven of the twelve staff members spent the longest period of time before coming to Farmingdale in urban areas of over 100,000 population. Two of the members lived on farms and another lived in a village of less than 2,500 persons (see Table XII).

Eleven of the eighteen students came from cities of over 100,000 population. It can be seen that both staff and students are basically city dwellers.

Most of the staff and most of the students come from middle-class backgrounds, so there does not seem to be any difference from Walden Farm.

To the question, how many hours a day on the average did they spend away from Farmingdale, one staff member and one student said they averaged two hours a day away. One student spent five hours a day away.

\[17\text{ Each student initially goes through basic testing and analysis in the Florida school. They transfer freely from one place to another so that a student can spend a total of three years in the school system but only six months in the New York Branch. It was difficult to get an accurate picture so the author had to resort to staff estimates on stay and turnover.}\]
# TABLE XI

## Education Level of Farmingdale Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school, but did not graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate from high school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some schooling beyond high school, but did not attend college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college, (including junior college, but did not graduate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or beyond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XII

Size of Community Members Lived in Before Coming to Farmingdale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Staff Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Students Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm or open country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or village of less than 2,500 persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-9,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-49,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-999,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million and over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
away and the rest of the staff and students, on the average, did not leave the premises. Therefore, they also met the criterion for spending the greatest amount of time on the premises.

Summary of Characteristics of Each Social System

Before summarizing the characteristics, the author feels it appropriate at this time to mention that the members of both Farmingdale and Walden Farm are aware of each others' existence and, for the past year, have exchanged visitors. In fact, two of Walden Farm members have worked for Farmingdale for approximately eight or nine months.

Walden Farm was also trying to get the Farmingdale staff to send three or four of their advanced students to live and work at Walden Farm, but the arrangement has not yet materialized.

The following characteristics represent Farmingdale's and Walden Farm's major similarities:

1. Both systems are situated in a rural setting that provides a semi-isolated environment.

2. Both have similar spatial patterns; Walden Farm's buildings are clustered on five acres of land, while Farmingdale's is on seven acres of land.

3. Both have physical boundaries that are vague, not sharp (i.e., no wall, no fences).

4. Both are similar in total number of members: Walden Farm having 36 members and Farmingdale having 33.
5. In both organizations, the members spend the better part of the day on the premises, i.e., eat, sleep and work.

6. Both social systems have been in existence for approximately the same length of time; Walden Farm since 1967 and Farmingdale since 1965.

7. Both are alternatives to some aspect of life within our society; Walden Farm to community; Farmingdale to school.

8. Both organizations engage in basically similar types of farm work.

9. Both are anti-bureaucratic in sentiment.


11. The memberships of both groups have negative attitudes toward the outside society.

12. Both systems have regular meetings where differences among members are worked out.

13. Both systems stress cooperation (over competition), humanism, sharing, personal affection, privacy, trust and faith, and frugality.

14. Monetary rewards are minimal at both places; Walden Farm members receive .75 a week; Farmingdale staff receive $7.50 a week and the students receive an allowance of $4.00 weekly.

15. The membership of both organizations are mostly middle-class urbanites.

16. Both systems recruit members from the outside society.

17. Both places expect all members to work.
18. Both places are unconcerned with members' conduct before entering their organizations but are genuinely concerned with conduct of members in the organization.

In a sense, these eighteen major characteristics could be considered control variables. That is, these physical and social conditions are held approximately constant. Farmingdale and Walden Farm were specifically chosen because of their closeness. Their similar characteristics allow for the isolation of the basic distinction between total institutions and intentional communities.

Equally or more important than their similarities are their essential differences:

1. Farmingdale has a staff-student split, whereas Walden Farm does not.

2. There is a lack of children at Walden Farm.

3. Both Walden Farm and Farmingdale's staff have contractual agreements that contain a significant degree of mutual aid within their social system. However, the Farmingdale students have no such type of agreement. There are contractual agreements between the students' parents or guardians and the school. In other words, the student does not have the option to come or go as he chooses. More simply, Walden Farm members and Farmingdale staff are there under their own volition, while the students of Farmingdale, in most cases, are not.

4. Walden Farm is set up for a purpose, i.e. to live a certain life style; while Farmingdale is now organized for specific goals, i.e. (1) to correct behavior and (2) to graduate students.
5. The economic base of Walden Farm is hammock-making; the economic base for Farmingdale is their school.

6. Both Walden Farm members and Farmingdale staff can be banished if they break the rules of their respective organizations; whereas the student cannot.

7. Doors are frequently locked at Farmingdale; whereas at Walden Farm none are locked.

8. Farmingdale staff can restrict student movement; whereas there is free movement at Walden Farm.

9. Farmingdale has total control of the students.

10. At Farmingdale, there is an absence of families for a certain segment of the population (students).

11. Farmingdale has institutions of maintenance (specifically: custody, treatment and discharge) whereas Walden Farm does not.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the first chapter, it was stated that the general hypothesis of this study is that perceived deprivation of freedom increases conflict and this is related to different types of social organizations. Walden Farm members' scores, Farmingdale students' scores, and Farmingdale staff scores were calculated separately and the results were compared to Hillery's findings (1971b).

It should be noted that the scores are self-reported measures and depend on what the persons perceives as much as what "really" happened.

Hypothesis I -- The greater the perceived deprivation of freedom, the greater the intra-conflict level.

a. Walden Farm Members

Walden Farm members' scores were as expected. As shown in tables XIII and XIV, the scores were compared to Hillery's findings. It was found that the members had both relatively low scores in deprivation of freedom (mean = 19) and internal conflict (mean = 10).

The author sees no real visible signs of freedom loss or continued conflict. To be sure, there were arguments, disagreements, and shouting, but these were of low, infrequent intensity and were of a short-lived nature. Considering the events which were taking place at the time the questionnaires were distributed, the conflict scores were
# TABLE XIII. Attitudes concerning deprivation of freedom; percentage agreeing to selected questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Samuel</th>
<th>Martin House</th>
<th>Men's Dorm</th>
<th>Sigma Fraternity</th>
<th>Caphas Members</th>
<th>Caphas Volunteers</th>
<th>Walden Farm</th>
<th>Farmingdale Staff</th>
<th>Farmingdale Students</th>
<th>Quaker School Staff</th>
<th>Quaker School Students</th>
<th>Women's Prison Staff</th>
<th>Women's Prison Inmates</th>
<th>Men Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I used to have more freedom before I came here than I do now.</td>
<td>9 21 24 21 14 11 10 25 61 59 53 38 92 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The people in charge here should be more considerate of the members.</td>
<td>0 31 51 3 21 0 13 8 89 59 28 31 65 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I do not have the kind of freedom that I should have.</td>
<td>0 7 57 3 0 0 31 8 56 47 23 10 58 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel as if some of my freedom has been taken away.</td>
<td>36 21 24 21 21 0 23 28 78 65 40 17 92 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I wish that I could leave here and find a place that would let me do more of the things that I want.</td>
<td>0 17 38 9 0 0 16 8 78 29 7 10 78 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9 19 39 11 11 2 19 15 72 52 30 18 77 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>13 7.5 5 11.5 11.5 14 7.5 10 3 4 6 9 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIV. Mean conflict scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Samuel</th>
<th>Martin House</th>
<th>Men's Dorm</th>
<th>Sigma Fraternity</th>
<th>Caphas Members</th>
<th>Caphas Volunteers</th>
<th>Walden Farm</th>
<th>Farmingdale Staff</th>
<th>Farmingdale Students</th>
<th>Quaker School Staff</th>
<th>Quaker School Students</th>
<th>Women's Prison Staff</th>
<th>Women's Prison Inmates</th>
<th>Men Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disputes (disagreement, tension, antagonism)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence (shouting, use of force, inflicting harm, use of weapons, killing)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault (inflicting harm, use of weapons, killing)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disputes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.513</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores represent the means of the percentages in each group who checked "yes" to the responses shown in Table V. Included in the mean scores are responses pertaining to the week and to the year preceding the survey. One may interpret the scores approximately as follows: "On the average, 84 per cent of the people in St. Samuel Community have been involved in some type of dispute during the past week or the past year; 8 per cent have been involved in some types of violence."
remarkably low. At that time, the members were preparing for their first annual conference for people seeking to join or start intentional communities. Tension was running high for some of the members, particularly those who had the pressure and responsibility of making the conference run smoothly. Also, there were members who did not want to participate in the conference. Understandably, at times tempers did flare up between pro-conference and anti-conference people. Once the conference was over, the community calmed down considerably.

It must be remembered that the purpose of study was to show the level or intensity of conflict, not its elimination. Such a condition would probably be impossible since, in most cases, as long as there is interaction, there will be some conflict.

To facilitate an additional professional opinion, the author conferred with a second researcher, Jay W. Worrall, III, who had completed research at Walden Farm the preceding year (1970). Although his thesis was not concerned with the topic in question, he was also able to observe pertinent behavior. He described his observations as follows:

"Freedom at Walden Farm is certainly not absolute, but, in certain terms, it certainly is more nearly so than in the "outside" society . . . . I know of no one who expressed delimited freedom, or acted as if his freedom were limited. Certainly no one resented the way in which Walden Farms' labor credit system functioned . . . . I observed no -- absolutely no -- outbreak of violent conflict. Conflict and friction certainly exist. There are, however, several institutionalized practices which function to allow tension to be vocalized and brought to the surface. The principal of these is the
criticism session where one volunteer member is openly criticized by others, without opportunity of retort\(^1\).

Another, less obvious, is the generally frank and open manner in which communal members generally address each other. Sensitivity sessions may occasionally help also. I would be hardpressed to specify any isolated incidents which led to friction. Disagreements did exist, but nothing that spelled any significant rifts within the community . . . . If you have read Walden Farms' Code of Conduct, then of course, you know that some rules are broken. However, they are relatively unimportant affairs. The basic ideological framework behind those rules, however, seems to be generally accepted and adhered to.\(^2\)

b. Farmingdale students

The results for the students were dramatically different from the scores of Walden Farm members. The students had relatively high perceived deprivation of freedom scores (mean = 72) and relatively high conflict scores (mean = 42) (see Tables XIII and XIV). They had the third highest deprivation of freedom scores; only men prisoners (mean = 87) and women prisoners (mean = 77) had higher scores. In regard to the conflict scores, the students were second only to Farmingdale's staff scores (mean = 43). The student scores for both scales were unexpectedly high considering the actual freedom the students do have on the premises, as compared with any prison or other

\(^1\)Walden Farm, at the time of research, had abandoned this approach and replaced it with encounter group sessions.

\(^2\)Personal correspondence.
custodial system. To the student, freedom has a different connotation than to the staff.

Basically, the students see their freedom deprived in three different ways:

1. Deprived of making the decision of where they want to be; in other words, they are at Farmingdale against their will. From the author's own personal observations, and from talking to most of the students, there was a substantial number who were there against their will. It made no difference to them whether it was the court or their parents who sent them to Farmingdale, they resented being there and retaliated against the staff and other students. The staff represented at least symbolically the authority that sent them there.

When the students were asked whether they felt they were a part of this institution, one of the responses was, "I am, but I don't want to be". Another was, "I am a part of this institution, however, under court order. If it were my choice I would not have anything to do with this community."

Runaways have become a usual routine for the staff to contend with. One particular boy has run away at least thirty times within the last year. However, all attempts have ended unsuccessfully (i.e., in being returned to Farmingdale).

When the author asked where they wanted to be, the dissenting ones overwhelmingly told the author that they wanted to be with their

---

3It is interesting to note that the student equates the institution with the community.
friends back home and "hang around and stuff like that". This is one of the requests the school can not accommodate. The student must adjust by changing his attitudes toward the school -- not vice-versa. It should be remembered that the school legally has total control over the student.

2. Deprived of movement within the organization; that is, freedom from restrictions imposed on them by staff or other students. The restrictions are usually brought on by abuses of rules and depriving others of movement. The staff sets restrictions as a reaction to the breakdown of trust and cooperation between students and themselves. In other words, the staff feels that the students bring it upon themselves. They alone create the situation. The staff would be overwhelmingly happy to unlock doors and lift restrictions. When the students show that they can accept responsibility, they will be granted more privileges.

One of the students who has been at Farmingdale for over three years sums it up this way:

"We got a group now from Florida . . . we got a pretty bad bunch, not really that bad once they get used to the place. They're still spoiled, mother's kids. Lots of them are that way. When you have a bunch of thieves, you have people who go into the kitchen. We used to have rights to go into the kitchen any time; we could go in and make up something, but we'd clean up afterward, things like that, pick up trash. But the people don't do that anymore. They rob things. They leave things around. So, they themselves are depriving themselves of their freedom and everybody else has to feel it. The people don't realize that all these locks and rules are put on there by themselves. I was
here when every kid had as much rights as the staff. You didn't need a key to the kitchen because there wasn't a lock on it. The office was open and if they asked you to get out, you left. You knew there was stuff to do. Now you got to have locks on everything. You got to lock the kitchen. The staff has to be your father, and put down all the rules. I saw all the people, all kinds of different people, and I saw how things worked out with on group of people. How some people were privileged before me. I saw how they got to be that way. You don't have to work to be real privileged. I shouldn't say privileged, I should say am allowed to do more things because I earned the right. Like running the Back Hoe. I got an experience there. I can go out and can get a job with that, cause I was trusted with it. I had to prove to them that I could do it."

3. Freedom from Accountability: though the students do not use the concept, essentially they do not want to be held accountable for their actions. A. S. Neill (1966) called this type of attitude "License, not freedom". They want freedom at the expense of others. The staff equates this feeling with lack of self-discipline. This is basically why the students are sent there. By working with the students and applying the self-government approach, the students can regulate themselves. The staff then achieves its primary goal of correcting behavior. The Headmaster explains his views on this type of freedom:

"Within the freedom, there are certain things that are almost not discussed. There are certain disciplines that are just there. After awhile you just take them for granted. You take it for granted that when you're name is up to mop the floor, you mop the floor. No one is really given the freedom of not doing that. And it is not even brought up at general meetings, you just don't discuss those things. The fact that staff has to work and do certain
things and has certain obligations with kids is there, and there has to be a strong discipline about those kinds of things. If you have a discipline to get your work done ... you will have more freedom outside the work because you don't have to worry about it as much."

Only after a student changes his attitude toward Farmingdale and develops controls within himself, will he adjust to the place and feel like he has more freedom. One staff member has noticed changes in students and stated that:

"I think maybe there is some evidence that they do adjust and they end up liking the place. We get so many of them back to visit all the time, and to spend their holidays with us rather than with their families. A lot of them consider this their real home. A lot of those kids just hated the place when they came because they were sent here on a court order."

In other words, when they are not compelled to go there, the students see that Farmingdale isn't such a bad place after all. They see the "community" aspect of Farmingdale rather than the "institutional" aspect.

The violence scores for the students seem to be abnormal, that is, the scores were higher than for prison inmates. There are some explanations that are worth noting. Unlike a prison, where an inmate is locked up for a certain length of time during the day, and his interactions are limited, Farmingdale has no such policies. The students can and usually do interact at will. There is no attempt to restrict this. (The staff restricts privileges, not interaction between members). So there is more interaction and more chances for conflict.
Another reason for the high rate of conflict behavior can be attributed to a physiological disorder known as Hypoglycemia. At the time of the study, there were seven students at Farmingdale with hypoglycemia. It is the opposite of diabetes -- too little sugar in the blood. Consumer Reports did a study on hypoglycemia and presented the following findings:

"Hypoglycemia ... is a condition caused by the too-rapid movement of glucose out of the blood or too little entry of glucose into the blood, and it can ... result in sudden fatigue, nervousness, trembling, dizziness, headaches, hunger, sweating and various mental aberrations including depression and anxiety. To relieve all such symptoms readily and dramatically until the next episode, the patient has only to eat a prescribed amount of sugar" (Hypoglycemia: 1971: 444-446).

There is a certain amount of violence that can be contributed to hypoglycemia. Unfortunately, when the questionnaire was distributed, the author was not aware of it, and since the questionnaire was anonymous, there is no way to detect which of the respondents' behavior was influenced by the disease.

The staff has the responsibility to control the amount of sugar that enters the students' body. In fact, there is no sugar allowed on the premises. The students must take in sugar through natural fruits and vegetables -- not by processed sugar. However, since the students are permitted to go into town, a hypoglycemic child can get someone to buy candy or other sweets for him. To a few students, a single bottle of a soft drink can set off violent behavior. Several incidents were reported where hypoglycemic students would get drunk on a Friday night.
and "flip out". In one particular incident a student, for no apparent reason, picked a fight with another student and beat him so badly that two staff members had to pull him off. When it was over, the aggressive boy cried and confessed that he didn't know why he attacked the other student, and repeatedly said that he was sorry for all the trouble he had caused.

The author observed many situations of conflict that were not initiated by the hypoglycemic students. Yelling, screaming, fighting and arguing over who stole what from whom, seems to be the norm at Farmingdale.

c. Farmingdale staff

The results from the staff responses provided an unusual situation. They had very low scores of perceived deprivation of freedom (mean = 15), lower than Walden Farm members (mean = 19); but they also had the highest conflict scores (mean = 43) of the groups studied, slightly higher than the scores of Farmingdale students (mean = 42) (see Table XIII and Table XIV).

When the Walden Farm members, Farmingdale staff and Farmingdale student scores of both deprivation of freedom and conflict were placed on a scatter diagram and compared to Hillery's findings, it can be seen that the Farmingdale staff scores are quite inconsistent (see Figure 1).

The scores of the staff appear to contradict the hypothesis. They had low deprivation of freedom scores and high conflict scores rather than low deprivation of freedom scores and low conflict scores. There
LEGEND: Student Group: ○  Staff Member: ★  Inmate or Commune Group ★  Farmingdale Staff

* Farmingdale Staff  ❄ Farmingdale Student  ❄ Walden Farm

FIGURE 1. Scatter diagram of the relation between perceived deprivation of freedom and internal violence, for selected groups.
are certain reasons to explain why the hypothesis did not hold up. Hillery found other variables to influence conflict, he noted in his report that:

"The data confirm the hypothesis in terms of the number of cases examined so far, and they indicate also that the hypothesis is not reversible. In other words, deprivation of freedom increases violence, but groups may be violent for other reasons than deprivation of freedom. The latter is apparently the case for the Quaker School staff. From personal observation of behavior in this school, it can be concluded that the staff reports a high involvement in violence merely because the students (high school) that they supervise are violent, and the staff becomes personally involved in many if not most cases of violence among the students.

Analysis of the data for the Quaker School staff should indicate that the results in this study are not due merely to the fact that only those persons more 'prone' to violence are used for groups with high violence scores. The staff of the Quaker School has violence scores lower only than the prison population, and the Quakers are pacifists. (Most of the staff are Quakers.) The interpretation of these data would be quite misleading if made solely on a psychological and not also on a sociological basis. The Quaker School staff has as high a score as they do because of the sociological situation in which they are found, not because of any peculiar predisposition to violence" (Hillery, 1971b: 7-8).

It seems to the author that the staff at Farmingdale are confronted with a similar sociological situation. What compounds the situation at Farmingdale is that the school seeks out problem children and the staff are responsible and committed to correcting the anti-social behavior of the students. Unlike Walden Farm members, the staff has made an agreement not to dismiss the students for any reason. If a
Walden Farm member refused to cooperate, he could be asked to leave. If a student was behaving in a manner that was dysfunctional to the group, the staff would have to intervene and in some cases, would have to coerce the student to reform. Many times they have had to use force to protect themselves, other students or school property.

The staff has to put up with an unusual amount of abuse from the students who impinge upon the staffs' rights. It is not unusual for a staff member to be awakened at 2 A.M. by a student pounding on his door asking "what's for breakfast in the morning?" One particularly disturbed student was fond of chasing staff members with a hatchet. Those days are over, but there are still deeply imbedded hatchet marks on the doors. One staff member is a conscientious objector who is generally a calm and easy going person. In a particular incident, he became so outraged that he threw a student completely across the kitchen. As another example, one boy felt so destructive that he completely demolished a stand-up piano. The author was personally involved in a particular incident where he had to cease being an observer and help out a female staff member who was being choked by a student. The list of violent incidents can be considered endless.

On the last visit to Farmingdale, one of the female staff members related to the author the latest incident which triggered a response of violence from the staff.

"The other night Alfred [student] had woken George [headmaster] at 12 midnight saying, 'Get up, we are going to have a general meeting'. George was really tired and sick and couldn't stand it. Alfred had also let off all the fire
extinguishers and had stolen the turkey for the next day's meal, hacked it in two and threw it in the garbage can. So of course, we had a general meeting immediately. It was really an intolerable situation -- really nothing we could do. George had really gotten angry and pulled the kid's hair and the kid called a general meeting to get retribution for George pulling his hair. Mary [staff] and Linda [staff] and I were so angry at the kid and the general meeting had been so ineffective, Mary and Linda and I had let into the kid in the kitchen. We just really chewed him out.

Mary was so angry that she attacked him -- Mary weighs 106 pounds. Linda and I were ready to kill the kid, which probably would have been the very best thing for him to understand that female staff aren't totally helpless. He had just harassed the whole staff to such a state of excitement that there was no other way to deal with it. It was much less violence than anything we could possibly have done. The really unfortunate part of it was Mary attacked him and he was just in the process of pushing her down. I saw him pushing Mary and I dashed over but Gregg [staff] also saw him pushing Mary, and before I could get there, Gregg had throttled the kid. I didn't have a chance to get at him.

Mary, Linda and I had all this adrenalin built up and we didn't know what to do with it. We marched around mad all night. It was just awful. Poor Mary was so upset she was in tears .... If I could have some nice regular high school kids, we could really go to town. We could have so much fun and do so many nice things. As it is, these kids have taught me to dislike kids and I really don't like that feeling.

To a puzzled reader the question might arise -- Why do the staff members submit themselves to these daily abuses? They are free to leave at any time, why don't they? Most of them choose not to. As one member put it, "The school is its own screening process; if you can take it, you stay."
When one considers the staffs' low deprivation of freedom scores, there must be an attraction to the staff that overrides the negative side of Farmingdale. To the staff members, it is the strong "sense of community" that attracts them and keeps them there. They are there because of the life-style they want to live, and they can separate the school from the community. In other words, it is the "community" sentiment that has created the low deprivation of freedom scores, and it is the "custodial institutional" aspect that has created the highest violence scores.

The same staff member who told the preceding story also made the following comment a half-hour later:

"Sometimes I get really mad at them (students) and wonder why in the world I submit myself to this. But then again, I can't imagine any other place I'd rather be. No matter where I am, no matter what anybody does, there are other people sort of impinging on their little worlds; so it's kind of unrealistic to wish no one would bother you ever."

Hypothesis II -- If a group is primarily oriented to attainment of a specific goal, then it would not maximize freedom.

When Walden Farm members, Farmingdale staff and Farmingdale students composite scores of "perceived" deprivation of freedom were ranked (Table XV), it was found that both Walden Farm members and Farmingdale staff had relatively low deprivation of freedom scores, which can to some extent be interpreted as high freedom scores, and at the same time, Farmingdale students had high deprivation of freedom scores, which can to some extent be interpreted as low freedom scores.
It was also discovered through investigation of the two systems, that to some extent, Farmingdale as a whole system did not maximize freedom for all its members. That is, one group (staff) did have freedom at the expense of another (students). It was also discovered that Farmingdale was primarily oriented to the attainment of a specific goal, while Walden Farm was not. Table XVI shows the relation between freedom and specific goals. It can be seen that Farmingdale staff can increase freedom within an organization that is primarily oriented to the attainment of specific goals, but only for a select few. The author concludes that the second hypothesis is essentially correct, since for the group as a whole, freedom was not maximized.

A certain segment of the organization has more freedom than the other due, in part, to a split in status groups -- staff/student split. The staff has a superordinate position while the student has a subordinate one. Perhaps the hypothesis should be modified to read:

If a group is primarily oriented to attainment of a specific goal, it would not maximize freedom for the segment of its members who are subordinates.

Hypothesis III -- Only if a group is not primarily oriented to the attainment of a specific goal, will it maximize the freedom of its members.

It was found from the argument in the second hypothesis that Walden Farm, as a whole system, did maximize freedom for all its members, whereas Farmingdale maximized freedom for only its superordinates (staff) and not its subordinates (students) (see Table XVI). Therefore,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Men prisoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Female prisoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Farmingdale students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Quaker school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Men's Dorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quaker school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Walden Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Martin House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Staff Womens prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Farmingdale staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sigma fraternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Caphas members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caphas volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI

Relationship Between Freedom & Specific Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom*</th>
<th>Low (1-6)</th>
<th>High (7.5-14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific goals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Farmingdale Students</td>
<td>Farmingdale Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walden Farm Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rank taken from Table XV
since Walden Farm is not oriented to the attainment of a specific goal and it did maximize the freedom of its members, the third hypothesis was supported.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

In the final analysis it can be concluded that on a general macro-sociological level, freedom can be maximized in a communal organization for all its members, whereas in a formal organization, freedom can be maximized for a certain segment of its members who are superordinates rather than subordinates. It was also found that an essential criterion for maximizing freedom in an organization is whether or not the members are there under their own volition.

Within a particular social setting, therefore, perceived deprivation of freedom increases conflict. However, the relationship was found to be non-reversible, that is, members were violent for reasons other than freedom deprivation.

From personal observations it became apparent to the author that perceived deprivation of freedom was strongly related to the point of view or attitudes the members had toward the structure. In the case of Farmingdale, it seems ironic that within the confines of the same organization certain segments of the membership viewed the organization in totally different perspectives. The staff associated Farmingdale first, as an alternative community, a place to come to be free from the "outside society's" repressive influence. In a sense, their freedom was maximized when they entered the system. The school at Farmingdale played a secondary role in their minds.

79
The students at Farmingdale saw the organization as an institution, not a community. They viewed Farmingdale as a place of punishment for their behavior in the "outside society". When they entered Farmingdale they saw their freedom minimized. No matter how much freedom the students had within the structure, as long as there was a strong desire to be elsewhere, it overrided the community sentiment aspect of Farmingdale. Essentially, freedom depends on how one defines the situation in which he finds himself.

According to the manner in which Farmingdale presently functions, it probably provides the most freedom within its structure for its members than any custodial institution possibly could provide. Yet, the students equate Farmingdale as a place to run away from. It appears to the author that most of the students are blinded from the freedom that the organization can provide for them by their resentment of their presence there. It is this attitude that has created most of the conflict and violence within the structure. It was also seen that, in the long run, the students do adjust to Farmingdale and their attitudes change such that they realize the freedom they have within the structure of Farmingdale. To obtain freedom, it is the student who must change, not the structure; that is, there must be a resolution from within the student to stop fighting the system and take advantage of what is offered (and in fact this does occur).

It is the attitude or position of those entering an organization that is essential toward a feeling of perceived deprivation of freedom and its consequence of intra-group conflict.
Further questions can be asked: What would happen to Walden Farm if a group of students were brought in without their consent? Would there be a member/student split? Would there be restrictions imposed on them? Would there be increased violence? In other words, would there be created a situation such as was found at Farmingdale, where the staff has been forced to impose restriction to protect themselves, the property, and other students?

The author can only speculate that under such conditions Walden Farm could find itself in the same predicament that Farmingdale now faces.
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APPENDIX A

WALDEN FARM CODE OF CONDUCT

The following is the Walden Farm Behavioral Code, with brief explanations of why each item was included.

1. WE WILL NOT USE TITLES OF ANY KIND AMONG US. All members are "equal" in the sense that all are entitled to the same privileges, advantages, and respect. That is the reason we shun honorifics of any kind, including "Mrs.", "Dr.", "Mother", "Dad", etc.

2. ALL MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED TO EXPLAIN THEIR WORK TO ANY OTHER MEMBER WHO DESIRES TO LEARN IT. The purpose of this is to insure the opportunity to learn any available and appropriate work. Observing this rule makes it impossible for any member to exert pressure on the community by having a monopoly on any certain skill.

3. WE WILL NOT DISCUSS THE PERSONAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER MEMBERS, NOR SPEAK NEGATIVELY OF OTHER MEMBERS WHEN THEY ARE NOT PRESENT OR IN THE PRESENCE OF A THIRD PARTY. This rule is both unusual and difficult. Most of us find a certain pleasure in gossiping or grumbling about other people. We feel that this kind of talk is harmful to a small community. If a member is unpleasant, or lazy, or gross, let each other member discover this for himself. It is not fair to damage another member's reputation, nor to encourage others to dislike another member. The Community is constantly trying other means of dealing with interpersonal problems and complaints. Talking about them with each other does not help the problem; it only spreads the discontent.

4. WE WILL NOT PUBLICLY GRUMBLE OR GRIPE ABOUT THINGS WE THINK WRONG WITHIN THE COMMUNITY. Complaints are best taken up with the appropriate manager. Public bitching is bad for morale: it imposes on those persons who overhear it and may find it unpleasant; and it can drive away prospective or new members.

5. MEMBERS WHO MAY HAVE UNCONVENTIONAL OR UNORTHODOX VIEWS ON POLITICS, RELIGION, OR NATIONAL POLICIES ARE REQUESTED TO STAY CLEAR OF SUCH TOPICS WHEN TALKING TO NON-MEMBERS. Most of us probably disagree on many issues with our neighbors and residents of this county. We need the good will and friendship of these people, and it is our firm policy to stay clear of controversial topics when we converse with them.
6. SENIORITY IS NEVER DISCUSSED AMONG US. This is because we wish to avoid the emergence of prestige groups of any kind.

7. WE SHALL TRY TO EXERCISE BOTH CONSIDERATION AND TOLERANCE OF EACH OTHERS' INDIVIDUAL HABITS. This means that you don't play the record player at full blast in a public room when there are people trying to have a quiet conversation. It also means that if someone is playing the record player full blast when you want quiet, you try to put up with it for a little while or go elsewhere. There is nothing absolute about this rule. It's just a guideline.

8. WE WILL NOT BOAST OF INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS. We are trying to create a society without heros. We are all expected to do our best, so making a fuss over some accomplishment is out of place.

9. WE WILL CLEAN UP AFTER OURSELVES AFTER ANY PRIVATE OR INDIVIDUAL PROJECT; WE WILL NOT KEEP ARTICLES LONGER THAN WE NEED THEM BUT WILL RETURN THEM TO THEIR PROPER PLACES, SO THAT THEY CAN BE ENJOYED BY OTHER MEMBERS. Cleaning up after yourself includes washing out the tub after a bath, putting your book back in the library, and cleaning up your own pans if you make candy or popcorn.

10. INDIVIDUAL ROOMS ARE INVIOLATE. NO MEMBER WILL ENTER ANOTHER'S ROOM WITHOUT THAT OTHER MEMBER'S PERMISSION. We all need a place to be alone. It is the aim of the Community for all members to have private rooms as soon as possible. Neither adult nor child should enter a private room without knocking and being admitted.
APPENDIX B

FARMINGDALE COVENANT

We believe that freedom is not a luxury -- that love is not naive, -- that freedom in love and in fellowship is the necessary condition for creativity, -- for sanity -- for human existence.

We believe our shared quest for insights -- for direction and for meaning can be accomplished through the deepest respect for the autonomy and the integrity of each individual.

We believe that every man has the right, the strength, and the obligation to seek out the fabric and the meaning of his life and faith for himself.

To this end we join in fellowship.
Appendix B (continued)

FARMINGDALE DISCIPLINE

Any person may join us.

Agreements among the brothers are written.

The discipline and agreements of the brothers will be written in less than five thousand words.

We will write no history, although records for business will be kept. The discipline and agreements will be freshly written each ten years.

Oral tradition will not be used to justify decisions and references to general history will not justify policy.

We will use the language of the day and the place as simply and directly as we can.

Everyone owns everything together, respecting privacy, habitual use, and good sense.

Brothers will leave if they do not work, if they will not abide by our agreements, or if three-fourths of the brothers ask them to leave at the annual retreat.

Each December we will suspend normal business for two weeks. The first week will be for joy and community and instruction. The second week we will meet to establish goals and policies, and to review the old year and carry out any other business.

The retreat will be chaired by the general superintendent. He will cause the brothers to meet in a square or circle. Each item of business will be discussed separately. Each brother will speak one after another in sequence around the circle. Decisions will be made by substantial agreement, but a decision will be made by the end of the retreat on each item of business.

A general superintendent will be chosen to administer common business. He will be guided by the brothers as they express themselves in retreat.

He will have full authority to carry out their will, appointing officers and establishing procedures as he chooses during the year.

As many brothers as can should be officers, and offices should be changed frequently. No one should be punished with authority for more than six years in a row.
Brothers will be secure in their offices and will have authority to decide. If a brother believes the general will is not being followed he must first talk to the officer who offends. If the officer does not satisfy them both should talk with the supervisors. If satisfaction is still not found, then they must meet with the general superintendent. If satisfaction still eludes then the brother offended must assemble all of us to decide on that solitary issue or accept the ruling until retreat.

If the superintendent affirms that a brother will not work or that he breaks the agreements he may cause the brother to leave. The brother may ask to disagree and if we do the superintendent will stand silent until the retreat.

Every declared meeting of the brothers for business will follow the procedure of the retreat for meetings.
FARMINGDALE STANDING CONTRACTS

Applicants will work with us for three months. If the members agree they will be asked to make a commitment for a specific period of time, a year or more, and will be confirmed in membership by the superintendent and the business manager.

If members leave after the end of their committed period they will be given the costs of their travel to their point of origin or to their new residence (whichever is closer) and $200.

We agree to provide each other with room and board, and essential goods and services, medical care, care through their minority and education for children, and $7.50 a week.

We agree to set funds aside in the amount of five percent of income from any enterprise to support sabbaticals, vacations, retirement and future needs of the brothers.

We agree to do any work that is asked.

We agree that during business hours, and when on the business of the community we will wear the established habits.

We agree that our dress and behavior in the general community will be within the customs of the leading portions of the community.

We agree that none of us will, in any way, encourage or support any student in smoking or the use of drugs, to the extent that we will not borrow a cigarette nor loan one, nor buy one for the student, nor ask or give a light, nor any behavior equivalent for any other drug, intoxicant or proscribed foods.
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FREEDOM AND CONFLICT: A REPLICATION OF
G. A. HILbRY'S COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

Dean Ardash Haledjian

(ABSTRACT)

The study was undertaken as a replication of an earlier work of G. A. Hillery. It was his contention that within an organization, perceived deprivation of freedom increased conflict. He also found that a communal organization tends to maximize freedom, whereas a formal organization does not.

The object of this study was to use the same procedures and methodology in an attempt to see if the author's results were compatible with Hillery's findings. Under the heading of formal organization, a total institution was chosen whereas under the heading of communal organization, an intentional community was chosen. The unit of analysis was each whole system. Two different methodological tools were used: participant-observation and a structured questionnaire.

In the final analysis, it was concluded that freedom can be maximized in a communal organization for all its members, whereas in a formal organization, freedom can be maximized for a certain segment of its members who are superordinates rather than subordinates. It was also found that an essential criterion for maximizing freedom in an organization is whether or not the members are there under their own volition.
Within a particular social setting, therefore, perceived deprivation of freedom increases conflict. However, the relationship was found to be non-reversible, that is, members were violent for reasons other than freedom deprivation. The author concludes that it is the attitude or position of those entering an organization that is essential toward a feeling of perceived deprivation of freedom.