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Collectivity, (a non-bureaucratic, non-hierarchical participatory-democratic organizational form) has been developed as an alternative to bureaucracy in some Western industrial societies. Such an organizational form, although existing independently of the feminist movement, is one important tool used by that movement to accomplish its goals. Collectivity has a particularly close relationship with what I have called integrative feminism, which focuses on a synthesis of feminine and masculine polarities both in society and within individuals, on a re-definition and sharing of power, and on an emphasis on the feminine sphere in order to redress the present imbalance between the masculine and the feminine in Western society. Collectivity, with its emphasis on democratization and feminization of the work process, shares many of the goals of integrative feminism.

The purpose of the thesis, then, is to demonstrate the masculine nature of traditional bureaucracy and the feminine nature of collectivity, and thus the relationship between integrative feminism and collectivity.

The point of view taken in this thesis is that the sexual polarization that exists throughout Western industrial society is not a natural outcome of the biological differences between the sexes, but is socially determined and therefore changeable by social means. The thesis argues that this polarization, manifested in one-sided personality development for both sexes and the division of social life into an over-valued masculine (productive) sphere and an under-valued feminine (maintenance) sphere, which emphasize different functions, characteristics and values, is destructive to human and social growth. It also argues that sexual polarization is a significant factor in the crisis
the world is now facing, which involves the domination of the powerless by
the powerful, domestic and international conflict, and, in the West, too-
rapid growth and over-consumption.

While certain limitations restrict the general application of collectivity
as a universal organizational form (for example, social demands for productivity
and disparity between the ideology of collectivity and the dominant ideology),
it may be that elements of collectivity can be effectively combined with elements
of bureaucracy in a variety of contexts.

The data on which the argument is based includes the literature of feminism,
organizations, and social movements; previous research done on the Vancouver
Women's Health Collective; and personal experience in social movement
activity.
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CHAPTER 1

FEMINISM AND COLLECTIVITY

A. From the New Left of the 60's to the feminism of the 70's

1. The roots of feminism and collectivity

It is no accident that the new feminist movement and collectivity as an alternate organizational form grew at the same time and often in the same places, in the company of already committed social movement activists. Not only do collectivity and what I will call integrative feminism share ideals, goals and means, but they share their roots, both evolving in response to the radical Left of the 60's. Feminism, of course, formed the substance of the new social movement; collectivity was one of its organizing tools. Feminism was the umbrella under which women came together; collectivity was one of the major structures by which they organized. Both substance and form were posited as possible solutions to the problems of the social movement that preceded them.

Most students of the feminist movement link the beginnings of the recent wave of feminism in the Western world to a time in the late 60's when the women within the New Left began to recognize their powerlessness within 'the movement' and to mobilize against it. (See, for example, Armstrong, 1979; Dinnerstein, 1976; Firestone, 1970; Freeman, 1972, 1973; Hartsock, 1975; Korda, 1973; Morgan, 1977; Ware, 1970.) The New Left had reached a dead end and was in search of fresh ways to tackle old problems of oppression, injustice and powerlessness, both inside the movement and out. Form and content were integrally bound up with one another: egalitarian ends could not be sought within inegalitarian structures. Disillusionment was in terms of both the
failure to meet goals and the failure to find new ways of working. Firestone describes the dissatisfaction rampant in the New Left at this time:

...the Movement [was] foundering, either marginal, splintered, and ineffective due to its rigid and outdated analysis, or, where it [did] have mass movement appeal, lacking a solid base in history and economics, "drop out" rather than revolutionary. The feminist movement [was] the urgently needed solder. (1970:39)

Korda (1973) reports that many men, too, saw the women's movement as a crucial factor in the breakdown and transformation of the movement in the late 60's and early 70's. Those men, however, did not necessarily see this shift as a positive one. Korda says that some men saw the women as "destroying" the U.S. radical movement (p.74) by focusing on its failures, undermining its solidarity, and ultimately, withdrawing into their own movement. Such misgivings miss the point of the continuity between the two radical movements.

Dinnerstein's discussion of the flowering of feminist consciousness through the late 40's, the 50's and the 60's offers an interesting explanation for the sudden explosive anger of women activists at the end of the 60's. She sees the values of the youth counter-culture - the here-and-now orientation, the personalistic politics, the distrust of rational bureaucracy and traditional ideas of progress - as gaining momentum after World War II but remaining largely out of the political spotlight. The private realm, in which these counter-values primarily resided, remained the realm of women. When, in the 60's, these counter-values bloomed publicly in the form of the personal, be-here-now politics of the counter-culture, and human values were asserted as political weapons, they became an "historic tool too significant for women to wield except as men's assistants." (Dinnerstein, 1976:267)

New Left men rejected many of their stereotyped roles and publicly espoused much of what had been traditionally female, but remained unwilling to give up the privileges traditionally accorded to their sex. Women, seeing the knowledge that they "have always informally and deeply known, and been heavily
relied upon...to affirm on an everyday, folk-knowledge level" (p.267) usurped ostentatiously by men in the counter-culture and given nothing back in the way of new power to act, were enraged. Dinnerstein feels that this rage was born out of the incompleteness of the sexual re-definition of this period. Men started to re-define the meaning of being male, but could not accept from women the "impulse toward initiative, the straight-forward, self-reliant pleasure in making dramatic things happen" (p.270) which is an essential part of healthy human maturity.

It was galling enough for women to have been kept out of the public, political, policy-making realm for so long. But to be excluded from this realm when its focus had become those issues that have constituted their own area of experience and expertise was intolerable to many women activists, and led to the creation of the present feminist movement.

The roots of both feminism and collectivity go back, of course, beyond the student activism of the 60's. The roots of the new feminism in the feminist movement of the mid-nineteenth century are well known. The roots of the collectives of the 70's and 80's go back to attempts to establish co-operative and utopian communities in the last century and in the first half of this century, to the movements for workers' control in the thirties, and to classical anarchist and Marxist theory (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Links with collective endeavors across national boundaries can be found with the kibbutzim in Israel, worker-controlled work-places in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe, and collectives in China. For present purposes, however, the roots of feminism and of collectivity will be traced only to their most recent connections to the student activism of the 60's and to the dissatisfaction of many of the participants in that movement. For these are the links that are most personally relevant to present movement participants, many of whom were themselves participants in that earlier movement or who have been directly
influenced by others who were involved.

Feminism was not the only social movement to emerge from the New Left of the 60's. The consumer, environmental, radical therapy and health movements are all examples of social movements that developed from the radical activism of that decade, and utilized the communications network already established by that activism (Freeman, 1973). These movements can be grouped together under the general term 'self-help movement'; they occupy the radical wing of that movement, which is also made up of more traditional groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon. There is a growing body of literature on self-help that provides an interesting perspective on social movement growth in the transition between the 60's and the 70's. (See particularly special self-help issues of The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 12(3), 1976 and Social Policy, 7(2), 1976.) Like the New Left and the feminist movement, the self-help movement that grew out of the radicalism of the 60's has clearly arisen out of dissatisfaction with the existing mainstream social structure and institutions. It advocates people taking back their power; it is anti-professional, anti-bureaucratic and is usually organized in small, autonomous collective groups.

Rothschild-Whitt (1977) traces the present proliferation of community-based alternative institutions to the student-based New Left of the 60's, but goes on to discuss how socio-cultural factors may also have come together in a particular way to facilitate the development of the pattern of counter-cultural institutions that have emerged at this particular time. She shows how the weakening of the Protestant Ethic and the evolution of capitalism toward its own destruction have contributed to the development of the counter-culture.

If it is the rationalization, the technology and the affluence generated by a capitalist mode of production which permit freedom from the necessity of human toil, and which render the values of the Protestant Ethic obsolete, then we should expect the work
ethic to first lose its coherence to people who have grown up under conditions of affluence (i.e. to people whose life experience leads them to take freedom from scarcity as a given)...we would expect people who find conventional cultural values so incoherent that they create alternative values, motivational patterns and life meanings...to be disproportionately from affluent, well-educated, intellectual families. (1977:11-12)

Rothschild-Whitt found that the participants in the five alternative institutions she studied fit this description and that not only were these people very similar to those who peopled the New Left of the 60's but they were often the same people.

Clearly, not only did the women's movement and alternative institutions grow out of the New Left, but all three phenomena were and are responses to some of the same social stresses and part of the same process of change. Simpson (1972) sees anti-bureaucratic activism and alternative institutions as part of a larger process of post-industrial, post-bureaucratic development, wherein the value of rationality is being challenged in a myriad of ways both from outside and from within the bureaucracies.

The radical activist movement of the 60's, like many of the groups that followed in the 70's, was organized in reaction to the hugeness, the impersonality, the bureaucracy and the psychological and physical violence (real and potential) of the technocratic society (Roszak, 1969). Young people felt fragmented and powerless. The slogans that formed the heyday of political graffiti—make love, not war; power to the people; black is beautiful; is there life before death?—captured the spirit and ideology of the movement.

2. Power, community, integration: unmet goals of the movement

I have identified three major goals of the New Left of the 60's: 1) power to affect those processes that govern one's life; 2) a sense of community; and 3) integration of the various aspects of one's life into a
meaningful whole. (Light, 1977:2) The movement failed to satisfy those goals. In spite of the excitement, dedication, and personal satisfaction participants found in that movement, there were many failures and disappointments. Although there were certainly some successes (and the present countercultural alternative institutions are a monument to the participatory ideals espoused by the activists of the 60's), it is probably true to say that most members of the New Left became disillusioned, dissatisfied or at least bored with the emphases and tactics employed in those years of marches, sit-ins and bizarre floutings of the bureaucracy. "Turn on, tune in, drop out" replaced many of the more activist political slogans that decorated walls from Amsterdam to London to Vancouver.

Many of the problems of the movement were internal ones. Although organized in reaction to the impersonal bureaucracy of the larger society, much of the movement was organized along its own bureaucratic lines, with national headquarters and networks of branch groups throughout the country and small groups making decisions for large memberships. Although the ideology of the movement included egalitarianism and participatory democracy, there were few organizational techniques built in to ensure that responsibility and power were equally distributed. The 'star syndrome' replaced formal leadership structures. Those who were most articulate, most politically knowledgeable and most aggressive (usually the men) were the leaders. In the absence in many cases of formal mechanisms for choosing and changing leaders these 'stars' often remained stars and therefore in leadership positions for long periods. Those who did not occupy positions of leadership often had little or no influence within the group. An appropriate example is provided by the Company of Young Canadians, which employed a core of well-paid organizers who made the decisions and an army of poorly paid volunteers who did the work.

The failures of the movement were felt most dramatically by the most
powerless within its ranks. While their brothers and lovers were planning strategies and writing press releases, the women were typing and making peanut butter sandwiches. Like their mothers before them, these 'radical' women acquired their power and their status largely from the men with whom they were connected. They found themselves facing the same frustrations in the movement as they did in their personal lives. Their continuing powerlessness and oppression within a movement dedicated to gaining power for the people finally led many women to question the morality and effectiveness of such a movement. Both within the movement, then, and from the point of view of its impact on society, the struggle of the movement for a more equitable distribution of power met with many failures.

The goal of community was also incompletely attained. A movement divided into 'leaders' and 'followers' or 'oppressors' and 'oppressed' is not conducive to the creation of community. Certainly many participants felt a sense of belonging in the peace or civil rights movements that they did not find within the larger society. But eventually schisms with the movement and the frustration and isolation of many who were excluded from policy-making processes began to undermine that sense of community. The exclusion that many women felt in the New Left led them to search for community among other women. Robin Morgan writes of her and other women's passage through the 'male-dominated Left', what she later came to call "the boys' movement" (Morgan, 1977:4):

And it wasn't merely the mass epidemic of bursitis (from the continual cranking of mimeograph machines) which drove us all out, but the serious, ceaseless, degrading, and pervasive sexism we encountered there, in each man's attitude and in every group's structure and in the narrow political emphases and manhood-proving tactical style themselves. We were used to such an approach from the Establishment, but here, too? In a context which was supposed to be different, to be fighting for all human freedom? (1977:4)

In this passage can be found evidence of the failures of the New Left to meet
all three of the goals set out above. In an article tracing the development of Marxist feminist theory but which applies also to the development of a separate women's movement, Armstrong writes:

The story probably begins in 1967 with "Sisters, Brothers, Lovers... Listen..." Women in the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) were frustrated by the contradiction between the rhetoric of the movement and the reality of its practice, by their treatment as wives and workers, by their feeling that they were 'like a civil rights organization with a leadership of southern racists." (Bernstein et al., 1967:38) (1979:125)

The third goal, personal integration, was also largely unmet. Although the 60's counter-culture was reacting against the fragmentation and compartmentalizing of lives in industrial society, it did not succeed in facilitating the integration of the various aspects of participants' lives or in taking these into account in its organizational structure. Hartsock, criticizing New Left socialism from a feminist perspective, writes:

The history of the male Left demonstrates that it has no concept of process. As a result, it has been unable to understand the fundamental unity of theory and practice...that the separation of theory and practice and the unconscious classism which accompanies it, result in the notion that we work for revolution, not for ourselves and out of necessity, but for others, out of an idealistic commitment. The refusal to recognize that revolution begins in our own lives first, and that it concerns our own identities as human beings, took many forms...(1975:68-9)

The male New Left emphasized the political and neglected the personal; it emphasized the intellectual and neglected the emotional. Participants were often expected to give their 'all' to political activity in much the same way that executives are expected to in the corporation (Whyte; 1957).

The style of organization, debate and decision-making was a male style, abstract, intellectual, combative, insensitive to considerations of process. (Armstrong, 1979; Firestone, 1970; Hartsock, 1975; Morgan, 1977; among others) Feelings were ignored, if possible, except for the anger participants felt toward the 'Establishment'. The drug culture, the flower children, on the other hand, rejected political activity in favour of individualistic,
hedonistic, and sometimes spiritual solutions. Firestone described the state of the movement that contributed to the development of an integrative feminism.

The dichotomy between emotions and intellect has kept the established movement from developing a mass base: on the one hand, there are the orthodox leftists, either abstract university intellectuals out of touch with concrete reality, or, in their activist guise, militantly machismo, self-indulgent in their action with little concern for political effectiveness. On the other, there is Woodstock Nation, the Youth Revolt, the Flower and Drug Generation of Hippies, Yippies, Crazies, Motherfuckers, Mad Dogs, Hog Farmers, and the like, who, though they understand that the old leafletting and pamphletting and Marxist analysis is no longer where its at...yet have no solid historical analysis of their own...indeed who are apolitical.(1970:38-9)

The transition between the New Left of the 60's and the movements of the 70's was marked by a focus on the connections between the political and the personal. This emphasis on the personal was recognized by men as well as women, but was not always welcomed. Korda quotes from a young male activist in Glamour magazine in 1972 who understood that the personal had become political, but did not understand the positive significance of that shift for radical social action.

I mean, all of a sudden the revolution had become personal. It stopped being some external phenomenon which we could confront. (1973:75; emphasis in original)

He goes on to call this shift a "deterioration" and women "selfish" for phrasing political demands in personal terms.

Probably the best of the communes, rural or urban, came closest to achieving an integration of all parts of a person's life into a cohesive lifestyle. However, sexism abounded in many such communes (this issue is discussed in Chapter 4, under the heading Men in communes) and they, too, eventually served to produce dissatisfied women who looked elsewhere for community and political efficacy.

Women in the movement probably felt the effects of lack of integration more than the men, for women have traditionally been the generalists, coping with a myriad of tasks and roles within their primary identity as caretakers, while
men have been the specialists, in modern times separating their work lives clearly from their home lives. It is harder on women than on men to maintain rigid distinctions between their different roles and aspects of their character. Men have been trained from early childhood to treat their work lives as the most important part of their lives, hence more easily relegate home and family to evenings and weekends. Women, on the other hand, have been trained to see their roles of wife, mother and homemaker as primary, and to fit in paid work or career as best they can. Therefore, a work situation or political activity that does not incorporate the values or the practical aspects of the home and family is a great source of frustration and tension for a woman and somehow invalidates her as a woman and as a person. Coser and Rokoff (1971) point out that it is the social expectation that working women continue to give primacy to their home lives while (impossibly) maintaining an uninterrupted work life that causes conflict for these women.

I will now turn to how these deficiencies in the New Left of the 60's led some people, most notably women, to put their energies and their hopes into the women's movement. Before doing this I want to emphasize two points. First, I am stressing the failures of the 60's because these failures give us some clues about the ways in which the social movement activity of those years led into the social movement activity of the 70's and now 80's. In so doing I do not wish to belittle the efforts or successes of the 60's. Significant gains were made in those years toward both personal and social changes; in many important ways it was the activity of the 60's that paved the way for the activity of the 70's, both in terms of the ideas, commitments, and experience of the participants, and in terms of the receptiveness of the larger society.

Second, I want to re-emphasize that I am focusing on the pathways that led from the New Left of the 60's to the feminism and collectivity of the 70's
because I think that these pathways reveal some important insights about the women's movement. However, I do not mean to imply by this focus that these paths are the only ones that led to modern feminism. As I have already mentioned, earlier movements also led in that direction. Furthermore, as Firestone says:

...it would be false to attribute the resurgence of feminism only to the impetus generated by other movements and ideas. For though they may have acted as a catalyst, feminism, in truth, has a cyclical momentum all its own. (1970:31)

She attributes this momentum in large part to a technology which has freed women from the tyranny of reproduction in all its ramifications. Technological and economic factors have played a central role in the development of the women's movement and it is important that these considerations not be forgotten in the present emphasis on prior social movements, socio-psychological factors and social values.

B. Feminism and collectivity in the 70's

Reacting to these deficiencies in the New Left, women began to see their personal frustration as more than just private pain, but as a general condition of women in the movement and in society. As they saw the connections between their pain and anger and that of their friends, they began to see the continuity between the personal and the political. They already knew that the political was personal - their own lives had been so intertwined with and affected by their political ideology and by the movement that this connection was a hard one to miss. But to realize that their personal situations and feelings were a political issue was one of the most fundamental catalysts for the growth of the radical feminist movement. Firestone confirms the significance of this development:

The feminist movement is the first to combine effectively the "personal" with the "political". It is developing a new way of relating, a new political style, one that will eventually reconcile the personal - always the feminine perogative - with the public,
with the "world outside", to restore that world to its emotions, and literally to its senses. (1970:38)

In terms of all three goals outlined above, some branches of the women's movement have been more successful and therefore more satisfying to their participants than was the male-dominated New Left. The feminist struggle for a more equitable distribution of power has been directed both externally to the larger society and internally to the organization of the groups themselves. Fee writes about this dual aspect of innovative politics of the women's movement:

If the theoretical work of the radical feminist movement has been uneven, it has been productive in actual struggles against an oppressive reality, and inventive in developing new forms of resistance. In addition to their demystification of paternalist ideology, women have created special organizational structures to combat specific symptoms of their oppression. Among these are the consciousness-raising group, the women's center, the rape crisis center, the women's commune, and the self-help group. (1975:82)

An organizational format common to most of these political structures is collectivity, which has been one of the most significant organizational tools used by the feminist movement. This tool has been effective in meeting not just the goal of power-sharing, but all three of the goals mentioned above.

The success of the women's movement in winning more power for women and a higher valuation of feminine strengths in society as a whole may be debatable. However, its success in achieving a more even distribution of power within its own organizations is clear. Reacting against the unequal distribution of power in the New Left, women, and some men, developed new organizational forms designed to ensure more equitable sharing of power and responsibility. The collective model of organization is among the most notable of these.

Firestone discusses this shift. In contrast to most revolutionary movements, where "strong leadership cults, factionalism, 'ego-tripping', backbiting are the rule rather than the exception," Firestone maintains that:
The women's movement, in its short history, has a somewhat better record than most in this area. One of its major stated goals is internal democracy - and it goes to (often absurd) lengths to pursue this goal. (1970:39)

Individuals and groups within the women's movement have experienced many difficulties in maintaining this ideal of internal democracy. Although this thesis will reflect a basically positive view of the success of some branches of the women's movement in this direction, it will not neglect to pay attention to the difficulties and failures in this struggle. These difficulties and the ways in which power, responsibility and thus information are distributed, equality is safeguarded, and participation is maximized in collectives, will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

A change in the way women's strengths and traditional activities are valued is at least as important in helping women to achieve power as is helping women develop assertiveness and new areas of competence. In the integrative feminist movement, those qualities and activities for which women are accustomed to being denigrated and restricted are highly valued and used as techniques of liberation. For centuries, women have met in small groups and talked about themselves and the structures of their lives: in churches, in farm kitchens, in factories, and, in the 19th and 20th centuries, in a "multitude of women's clubs and organizations [developed] around every conceivable social and political purpose" (Freeman, 1972:205). With few exceptions, these gatherings were objects of men's apathy, ignorance and sometimes, derision. In the 1960's and 70's, in the New Left, these meetings of women took the form of 'rap' or consciousness-raising groups, and became an explicit political tool. (For discussion of the techniques and functions of C.R. groups, see Freeman, 1973; Morgan, 1977; Ware, 1970, among others.) Women have understood that political activity has to start with the individual; hence consciousness-raising has become one of the main strategies for recruiting, educating,
motivating and sustaining members. Powerful, knowledgeable, politically conscious women can then take a variety of political directions, using a variety of approaches, including the small, informal group.

A sense of community has been one of the strongest links among women in the women's movement. Consciousness of sisterhood became a force that has, to a significant extent, linked women across class and ethnic lines. This goal has been met through small groups, consciousness-raising, and intense personal relationships within the movement. Collectively-run groups, which make decisions by consensus and which stress process as much as product are more conducive to the creation of community than are hierarchically structured groups. As women have come to allow themselves to value the feminine strengths inherent in their nurturing capacity, these strengths have become the cement that has bound them together in small groups and in a movement.

This sense of community is closely bound up with the integration of women's lives in the movement. Many of the women in the movement are actively seeking an integration of the various aspects of themselves into a satisfying whole. Rossman, in writing about the particular power of self-help, which is integral to the women's movement, says:

...when I come back to the question of what the magic is that at times enables us to believe in each other and rediscover our power to recognize and move on our needs together, in existential peership, it seems to me that it has something to do with wholeness, with a vision of self and purpose which grasps our private and social lives together as one continuous fabric, rather than as things divided from each other. The women's C.R. groups and the communes operated in this spirit... Where it fails completely, ...is at the extremes; in the domain of rigidly ideologized political organizing...and in the slushy domain of 'human potential', 'growth' and 'devotion'. (1976:89, emphasis in original)

The goal of integration is more important, or more explicit, in the integrative women's movement than it was in the New Left of the 60's, and certainly has been more successfully met. (Firestone, 1970; Hartsock, 1970, among others.) Galper and Washburne write of their experience integrating their
roles while working as social workers in a feminist agency.

...it felt terrific. One major effect our style of working had was to enable us to mesh our personal/political/professional lives. We were not separate selves. The more we brought our personal experiences into our work, the more effective our service was. (1976:50)

This personal integration has been achieved on a variety of levels, from the ideological to the practical. Many participants in the women's movement want to respect themselves and to be respected as whole people, including the so-called feminine and so-called masculine sides of themselves and including all their various life roles. Some of the specific ways in which this integration has been achieved through collective organization will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Not the least of these forms of integration has been the integration of the personal and the political.

Although collectivity and integrative feminism can and have existed independently of each other, both in theory and in practice, the area of their overlap is what is particularly significant for the arguments presented in this thesis.

Of the 40-odd present and past collective groups I identified in the Vancouver-Lower Mainland area, more than half were all-women collectives, most of the rest included both women and men, and only two were all-men collectives. Although there have been occasional men's collectives which would fit my criteria, as well as consciousness-raising groups composed of men, they are few and far between. They usually consist of men who are coupled with feminist women or who are gay, and/or who are making an attempt to 'work on' some of the same issues, both personal and political, as those that concern the feminist movement. Even these male groups, then, may be seen as a product of feminism. Those men who do establish and fit well into collective organizational structures may be those who society would class as not 'typical' men, but rather those high on attributes such as sensitivity, gentleness and emotional openness.
Consideration will be given in Chapter 4 to the different ways in which men and women relate to collectivity.

One further note is relevant here. It would seem that collectivity is an organizational form that has concerned women theoretically as well as practically to a greater extent than it has men. A high proportion of the written work on collectivity that I have come across has been done by women. Crow (1978); Freeman (1975); Freeman and McMillan (1976-77); Galper and Washburne (1976); Kanter (1972); Mansbridge (1973); O'Sullivan (1976); Riddle (1978); Rothschild-Whitt (1976, 1977, 1979); Sparks (1978), among others, are all women who have explored in detail some aspect(s) of collectivity as an alternate organizational form. In contrast, male writers, although often writing about the same social movements or other social movements which have grown in reaction to the New Left of the 60's, have dealt with these movements very differently, and not usually from the point of view of an analysis of the organizational form itself. (See, for example, Curtis and Zurcher, 1973; Katz and Bender, 1976; Levy, 1976; McCarthy and Zald, 1973, 1977; McNeil and Thompson, 1971; Traugott, 1978.) This concern shown by women for the internal processes of social movement groups reflects women's greater concern in general with process, a point which is important in the arguments put forth by this thesis.

C. The purpose of the thesis

The main argument contained in this thesis can be stated most simply as follows: given that women in general and for whatever reasons are more nurturing, co-operative, emotional, intuitive and process-oriented, and that men in general and for whatever reasons are more competitive, aggressive, ego-centred, rational and product-oriented, and given the nature of hierarchical organization and collective organization, one would expect that women would more readily establish and participate in collectives than would men. The strength of the
argument for the close relationship between integrative feminism and collectivity will rest, to a large extent, on establishing a case for bureaucracy as primarily a male organizational form, constructed according to values and strengths that are traditionally male, and collectivity as a female form, constructed according to values and strengths that are traditionally female.

Although the argument developed in this thesis applies most forcefully to feminists, who are consciously dealing with the issues of gender presented here, it is also intended to apply, in a less dramatic way perhaps, to women in general. However, integrative feminism as an ideology appears to lead logically into collectivity as an organizational form; for those not committed to an ideology of feminism and not aware of or accepting of the strengths of so-called feminine approaches to the world, espousal of collectivity may be more problematic.

In Chapter 4 some attention will be paid to those ways in which men and women have been socialized similarly and those characteristics which men and women thus share. Some of those qualities, such as competitiveness and achievement orientation have resulted in problems for women as well as for men in collectives. Others, such as co-operativeness and desire for affiliation have contributed to the success of some men in helping to establish and maintain collective organizations.

The purpose of the thesis is to examine in greater detail the relationship between integrative feminism and collectivity and to point to some of the major reasons why the two are so closely connected. Their shared goals and methods will be explored as well as the significance of these for a society in need of fundamental change. The thesis will assert that a primary goal of integrative feminism is to synthesize or integrate traditionally female and male roles, values and strengths and to change the ways in which power is defined, used and
It will also assert that the collective organizational form is one significant tool used by the feminist movement to accomplish these goals. The themes of integration and of power will be the underlying themes of this work. The relationship between these two concepts, how they are defined and used in the feminist collectivist world as opposed to the male-dominated, bureaucratic world, will be explored. The thesis will look at how power in male-dominated society has been based on polarization of society into so-called male and female realms and how, in one feminist view, power depends on integration. Other goals of feminism and collectivity which will be discussed will be closely related to these two major themes of integration and power.

The feminist literature of the 70's and 80's, both scholarly and popular, has produced an impressive analysis of the integrative functions of feminism and of its far-reaching relevance for a radical transformation of society. The implications of integrative feminism for power relations, for both the maintenance and productive spheres, and throughout our polarized society, have been dealt with by the same writers cited in the preceding paragraph. An article which appeared recently in Homemakers Magazine (Finlayson, 1980), analyzing the issue from a perspective similar to that expressed in these scholarly works, gives some indication of the extent to which this analysis has entered the consciousness of so-called ordinary women and men.

What has not, to my knowledge, been begun with anything like the thoroughness of the former analysis, and what this thesis will attempt in small part to do, is to make a detailed application of this feminist analysis to organizational theory, including both bureaucratic organization and its collective alternative. Kanter, a sociologist who has studied alternate and bureaucratic organizational
forms and sex-roles, remarks on the paucity of the research on women's roles in organizations and the ways in which these differ from men's. She closes her article on "Women and the Structure of Organizations" with the following:

The ideological underpinnings of modern organizations, such as the connection between a "masculine ethic" and a "spirit of managerialism", need further examination. To understand the structural conditions for men and women in organizations and the organizational behaviour of men and women is critical for both social inquiry and social change. (1975:64)

With the increasing production and sophistication of feminist analysis and a growing body of theoretical literature on organizational alternatives, this paucity may change (see for example, Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; and the Quest issue on leadership, 11:4, 1976).

The thesis will also look at some of the ways in which collectivity and feminism, in reacting against the rational, bureaucratic, male-oriented society, have acquiesced with that society's tendency toward polaraization. Collectives in some instances may put too much emphasis on counter-values and reject mainstream values without first considering the ways in which they could be useful to them. To this extent, the integrative function of feminism and collectivity is not served.

It is hoped that this thesis will make some contribution to the body of theory that constitutes sociology, particularly in terms of theories of human nature and of organization. The application of the arguments made in the thesis to macro-levels of social structure and the world system are more problematic. While the arguments have important implications for the ways in which Western society and the world are developing, the direct application of integrative and collectivist principles to macro-structures is probably premature. Educated speculation, while an important component of social change, is nevertheless, still speculation. With these limitations in mind, some of the practical and ideological issues of the application of collective principles to large-scale organization will be dealt with briefly in Chapter 5.
At a different level of application, issues raised by integrative feminism are closely related to questions about what constitutes human nature. Is human nature more elastic than the compartmentalization presently integral to social life implies? Is it possible that instrumental and socio-emotional functions can be integrated within each individual and that such integration is not only possible but necessary for the development of whole and happy human beings? Is it desirable to integrate a wide range of traditionally separated social roles and to meet each with approximately the same range of behavioural patterns?

The issues raised in the thesis can be taken beyond the level of the individual to include questions about what is possible in the ways that we accomplish work in this society. Is it possible to do work effectively and to do it happily? Is it feasible to have a non-bureaucratic work organization that humanizes social relations among workers at all levels and between workers and the productive process, while still producing a product in a way that is economically viable? In what ways and at what costs can this model be developed? To what extent is it possible to alter our definition of what is economically viable?

These are the kinds of questions that this thesis attempts primarily to address.

The arguments contained in this thesis also have implications for the functionalist approach to individual development, social theory and the social structure. Counter arguments may be posed which refer to the functions served by sex-role socialization, the sexual division of labour and the prevailing forms of inequality in our society, and to the chaos which may result should our inequality-based stability be disturbed. In the last chapter, some response will be made to these functionalist concerns.
D. Defining the terms

Before going any further, it is necessary to define the terms and outline the concepts which are central to this thesis.

1. Integrative feminism

Although the terms integrative feminism and radical feminism overlap in important ways, the term integrative feminism will be used in this thesis. This term has been used both in order to avoid the imprecision embedded in the more widely used term radical feminism and in order to refer to a set of quite specific principles implied by the emphasis on the integrative function.

I will define integrative feminism in much the same way as Miles (1980) does. Like radical feminism (as defined in the notes to Chapter 1), integrative feminism sees feminist issues as central to any larger social analysis and any fundamental social change. It sees the cause of women's oppression in the very existence of power structures in society and therefore seeks social change that will not simply re-order power positions but do away with the power relations themselves. Firestone calls this "an end to power psychology" (1970: 39).

Integrative feminism, however, goes beyond Firestone's definition of radical feminism to include an emphasis both in theory and in practice on the integration of the so-called feminine and masculine in society and within individuals. The integrative feminists whose work provides a basis for much of the material in this thesis see the roots of women's oppression not primarily in their reproductive functions, but in the polarization that creates a 'proper' female and 'proper' male sphere and then rewards one while denigrating the other.

It is of crucial importance here to emphasize that this is a feminism which has as its major focus not the fight for women's rights (the propriety of these is taken for granted), but the struggle to understand the implications of
sexual polarization and inequality for the way in which civilization has
developed and to change the course of that development.

Integrative feminists want to re-structure society in ways that give equal
importance not only to women and men but to 'feminine' and 'masculine'
characteristics and values. They want to replace domination, oppression and
competition with equality and co-operation, and polarization with integration.
They do not simply want more women in the productive sphere; and free to forego
the reproductive or maintenance one (although that is part of what they want).
They want to raise the maintenance sphere to a level of importance equal to
that of the productive sphere, and to 'feminize' the productive sphere in terms
of its values, its goals and its practices.

Integrative feminism, then, means an integration of the productive and
maintenance spheres or what Miles (undated and 1980) calls the productive and
reproductive spheres. It also means the integration of the personal and the
political; the emotional, the spiritual and the intellectual; the intuitive
and the rational; co-operation and self-assertion; process and product or
means and end; and the separate roles we must all play in society. All of
these polarities can be seen in terms of the division between the sexes and
the assignment of one sphere of influence and one way of being and doing in the
world to women and one to men. The integrative function central to this
thesis is one which seeks to oppose this sexual polarization. One of the
vehicles used in the feminist workplace to effect these integrative functions
is collectivity.

The term integrative function has been used in its broad sense in socio-
logy in a way that is somewhat consistent with the way that I have used it here
to mean a process which opposes fragmentation and polarization both within the
individual and in society. Parsons and Bales (1955) use the term in
relation to the function of the family. They see it as a healthy counter-
force to differentiation, bringing together the 'expressive' and 'instrumental' functions which roughly coincide with female and male roles in society. This integrative potential of feminism has been explored by Dinnerstein (1976); Hughes (1979); Janeway (1980); Miles (undated and 1980); and Miller (1976), who have focused on the political implications of a sexually polarized society and the possibilities for change through integration.

By integration I do not mean the annihilation of either the female or the male; nor do I mean the perfect bringing together on all dimensions. The union of opposites inherently involves struggle, which can be a creative process of growth or a destructive conflict. It can be a process which results only in struggle and conflict or it can be a process which results also in the maximization of the strengths of each side. The fragmentation and polarization of individuals and of society have so far in history resulted largely in destructive conflict and male dominance - to which feminism has arisen in response.

The integrative feminists occupy a position which contrasts with that of liberal feminists, who primarily want women to get a larger slice of the social-economic pie, with socialist feminists who see feminist issues as subordinate to other issues of the Left, and with radical lesbian feminists who advocate female separatism.

2. Productive versus maintenance spheres

The productive sphere may be roughly equated to the male sphere while the maintenance sphere may be roughly equated to the female sphere. The equations are rough ones because, while they are accurate in a general sense, they do not describe the world (or even Western society) exactly as it is. However, while there are many exceptions to this general picture, they do not belie the truth of the general statement. The productive sphere is the realm of paid work in the outside world, dominated by men and embodying values such as rationality,
efficiency, competition and aggressiveness. It has been socially valued more highly than the maintenance sphere which is the world of the home and family and human relations, including all the nurturing, educative, service processes which help to 'reproduce' and maintain the species. It embodies values such as emotionality, tenderness, caring for others, intuitiveness and co-operativeness. To the extent that some occupations and some jobs within occupations are oriented to nurturing, educating and keeping the species healthy and happy, the maintenance function extends beyond the home to the workplace. Within the occupational context, it is these jobs that are peopled primarily by women, and which claim the lowest status.

The distinction between productive and maintenance functions helps us to better understand the ways in which the world has been divided up into 'male' and 'female', and the ways in which occupations have been allocated and valued according to sexual criteria. The polarization of masculine and feminine values, strengths, characteristics and roles has been a central factor in the domination of women by men. The relationship is a circular one. The stereotyping of women has acted as a self-fulfilling prophecy: to a disturbing degree, women have become the people that society expected them to be and so have aided in the perpetuation of the social structures and the stereotypes on which they are based. This polarization is therefore one of the central targets of integrative feminism.

Such an analytical distinction between these two spheres, of course, is not the product of feminist theory (although it is a crucial distinction in the integrative feminist theory of, for example, Hughes and Miles, who use the term reproductive sphere where I have used maintenance sphere). This distinction between these two spheres is related to the distinction made by Parsons and Bales (1955) between the instrumental and expressive functions which
characterize the roles and personalities of men and women respectively. Instrumental activity focuses on goal attainment and adaptation to the external environment, while expressive activity focuses on integration and tension-management. Morgan describes Parsons' distinction:

Put simply, instrumental activity corresponds to our externally orientated 'ideas' man, while expressive activity is the activity associated with the 'internally' orientated 'custodian'. (1975:29)

Parsons applies this distinction to the family, to the small group, and to the larger society and sees it as a fundamental basis of socialization and sex-role differentiation (Morgan, 1975:29). While the distinctions used by Parsons roughly coincide with those used in this thesis, there is an inevitability, rigidity and static quality implied by Parsons' analysis which is not intended here.

This distinction is also central to the work of such writers as Bakan (1966), who distinguishes the forces of 'agency' and 'communion' and May (1980), who contrasts the 'pattern of pride' with the 'pattern of caring'. The distinction has also been used in analyses of the roles played by women and men in alternative institutions (Mansbridge, 1973).

Implicit and explicit in the work of Parsons, Bales, Bakan and May is the assumption that the pervasive distinction and sexual division of labour between production and maintenance is a 'natural' and 'proper' one, and one that serves a necessary and positive function for individuals and for society. The argument developed in this thesis directly opposes this view. The major focus of the argument put forward here is that a more elastic and integrated approach to human behaviour not only is possible but may be crucial for human progress.

While the need for productive and maintenance functions to be filled has always existed, no claim can be made for the universality (either historically or cross-culturally) of these two distinct spheres and their assignment according to sexual criteria. While significant elements of such an arrange-
ment have existed in other cultures and at other times, the present form of
the separation of these realms into a productive and a maintenance sphere,
wherein the productive sphere is assigned to men and valued more highly than
the maintenance sphere which is assigned to women, is specific to industrial
society.

3. Collectives

In the thesis, reference will be made to the organizational and ideological
characteristics of alternative collectives. For purposes of this work I have
defined alternative collective organizations (hereafter referred to simply as
collectives) in a particular way. The kind of collectives in which I am
interested here are those of the radical Left, which have a political ideology
and are oriented to the achievement of a task external to the group. They
are those groups which are self-consciously organized as collectives and self-
consciously attempting to create alternatives to and a critical analysis of
the 'established' system for the delivery of educational, cultural, health,
legal, food and social services. I do not include in this definition
residential communes, consciousness-raising groups, encounter groups, psycho-
therapy groups, economic co-operatives which are nevertheless organized
hierarchically, collective sub-groups within otherwise hierarchical bureau-
cracies, or groups of people organized primarily for social purposes.

While collectives have much in common with the communes of the last two
decades and earlier, they also differ in important ways in terms of both ends
and means. Although communes are not, in general, included in this analysis,
reference will be made to them when appropriate. Some discussion of the
differences between these two varieties of social experiment is included in
Chapter 4. There is an extensive literature on communes which may be
referred to for further exploration. See, for example, Abrams and McCulloch
(1976); French and French (1975); Gairdner and Moment (1980); Gardner (1978);
Kanter (1972); Kephart (1976).

Within the loosely bonded counter-cultural community, a collective is usually defined as a non-hierarchical, anti-bureaucratic group which has no formal leaders, makes decisions by consensus or some modified form of voting, and usually employs some form of job rotation. In a collective, ideally, everyone shares equally the power and responsibility and has the right to speak for the organization and to take part in decision-making.

Although collectivity is an organizational form developed and used by the feminist movement, neither its development nor its use have been exclusive to that movement; some men have also become dissatisfied with traditional ways of organizing and have sought a new organizational model in collectivity. Furthermore, there are, of course, feminist organizations which are not based on this model.

This model has been described and discussed in detail by Freeman (1975); Joreen (1973); Kanter (1973); Kleiber and Light (1978); Mansbridge (1973); and Rothschild-Whitt (1976, 1977, 1979) among others.

4. Power

The way I use the term power here is different in crucial ways from the way the term is generally used in sociology. Power can be divided theoretically and practically, into two different types. In distinguishing them I am not trying to isolate one from the other, but to identify my emphasis in this thesis. On the one hand, power can be domination or power over someone else. Power as domination is associated with hierarchies or power structures. It relies on the dependence or submission of others. Power as autonomy, on the other hand, is associated with such words as independence, self-actualization, ego-strength, competence and confidence. It depends not on the domination of others but on the ability to control one's own life: to know what one needs and to have the personal resources to fulfill those needs.
Although in many cases the relationship between these two types of power is close they are not necessarily related. One of the assertions of this thesis will be that the integrative feminist movement, at its best, has succeeded in distinguishing between the two. I will try to show that women are attempting, relatively successfully, to develop self-knowledge, inner strengths and the power to control their own lives, while minimizing the use of power as domination over others.

Janeway (1975) notes these two definitions of power. She identifies two distinct dictionary definitions of power, one referring to ability to do something and one referring to dominance or the ability to compel obedience. She relates these two meanings to liberating power, on the one hand, and limiting power on the other. She suggests that these two types of power are not distinct, but parts of the same process. What is experienced in oneself as liberating strength or capability may be experienced by others as limiting domination. However, she does not stop at this pessimistic observation; she goes on to suggest that alternative ways of looking at the power relationship may include a consideration of the powers of the weak, for example, in granting or withholding their consent to be governed, or a consideration of the potentialities in what she calls liberating power and the possibilities of avoiding the governing or dominating relationship.

Miller also makes this distinction, pointing out that "the capacity to implement" has not in the past been the meaning imputed to the word power.

Power has generally meant the ability to advance oneself and, simultaneously to control, limit, and if possible, destroy the power of others. (1976:116)

Watson also writes of these two meanings:

I believe that we will find that the experience of women helps to clarify the definitions of power and the distinctions between them. The definition of power as dominance covers one range of uses. The definition of power as ability, competence, and the closely related definition of power as energy, cover another, much wider
and more interesting cluster of meanings... The complex relations between the kind of power that involves competence and energy, have never had enough explicit consideration. Literature suggests that for women the two are likely to be in conflict, but also suggests that the two kinds of power are more separable in practice than they have been so far in argument. (1975:113-114)

This distinction is also recognized by many other feminist theorists and activists, such as Hartsock (1974, 1976-7) and Lips (1979).

By concentrating on power as autonomy, I do not mean to imply a devaluation of the importance of women's power in society. In order for women to be free from oppression, they must attain equality with men in social, cultural, political and economic spheres. To attain this equality they must confront not only themselves but society in direct and political ways. My purpose in emphasizing power as autonomy is twofold. First, I want to point out the importance of women's compliance in their own oppression, and to stress that it is necessary for a woman to feel strong and effective in order for her to refuse to be exploited and in order for her to work to change the system. Second, I want to demonstrate the emphasis of integrative feminists themselves on power as autonomy as opposed to power over others. This redefinition of power relations implies a personal and social change so profound that it would alter the ways in which we relate to one another as individuals, as members of our sex, as workers and as nations.

It has been suggested because of the very significant differences between this definition and the traditional definition of power that a new term be used, and that the usage of the term power be retained for its traditional definition. Self-esteem or some related term has been suggested to me as one that would bring my analysis of women and power into the realm of the study of other minority or disadvantaged groups and therefore make available to it comparisons that may not otherwise appear appropriate. Lips argues against this position.
...expanding rather than limiting our definition of power seems important because the traditional definition, representing a somewhat distorted view of what is popularly understood as power, constrains us to label as powerless the person who cooperates with others or who concentrates on the strong effective expression of her self and her abilities rather than on the manipulation of others. (1979:6)

This thesis will argue that collectives, ideologically and in practice, emphasize power as autonomy and try to avoid, as far as possible, the use of power as domination. Bureaucracy, on the other hand, is based on the use of power as domination and of necessity discourages power as autonomy except in certain cases in the upper levels of the hierarchy. It does not, however, mean to imply either that collectives have succeeded in completely eliminating dominating power from their operations or that hierarchies can completely obliterate power as autonomy from theirs. Rather, I will try to locate both collectivity and bureaucracy along a continuum between these two 'ideal' positions, and to take account of variation that exists among organizations.

E. The framework of this thesis

The approach taken in this thesis will be an explorative, speculative one, using evidence from a variety of sources. An argument will be developed and supported, using qualitative and sometimes impressionistic 'data' from my own research, personal experience, and the literature. The literature used will be primarily in the fields of feminist theory and practice, collectivity and organizational theory, and social movements. My three and half years of research with the Vancouver Women's Health Collective (Kleiber and Light, 1978) and my personal experience as a participant in the Radical Therapy Collective provided me with first-hand knowledge of collectives and this will be used as illustrative material in Chapter 3.

During my years with the Vancouver Women's Health Collective, I learned a great deal about how a collective functions and develops, what it values and disvalues, how it differs from a hierarchy, and what its strengths and weaknesses
are. My own detailed observations of Health Collective activities, transcripts of many hours of meetings and of extensive interviews with Collective members, and informal conversations with members will all be used as part of the data for this present work. In the years since our original research was completed, the Collective has altered its political stance and is unwilling to be the subject of any further academic research. The data used in this thesis, therefore, is that gathered from 1974-1977 and reflect the Collective as it was then.

My association with the Radical Therapy Collective, a group which was in the beginning stages of forming itself as an alternative to the psychiatric and professional psychology 'establishment' also yielded insights relevant to this thesis. This group included both male and female participants, and some apparent differences could be noted both in the ways in which men and women operated in the group and in the ways this mixed-sex group operated as opposed to the ways an all-women collective operated. These comparisons sparked my first interest in looking at the differing relationships of men and women to collectivity.

My exploration of collectivity as an alternative organizational form has been closely related to my exploration of integrative feminism as a direction for social change. Throughout my research with the Health Collective and in the intervening time period, I have continued to examine the relationship between these two ideologies and have been continually struck by the similarities between them (Kleiber and Light, 1978; Light, 1978, 1979, 1980).

The focus of this work is on Western society in the last two decades. While both collective groups and women's liberation struggles have occurred in non-Western societies, the forms these developments have taken are quite different from those in the West. And while, within this context, significant development of both collectivity and feminism has taken place over hundreds of years, it is within the past twenty years that these two forces have come
together in the particular ways described here, in the context of two distinct but related social movements. Therefore, although some very brief historical references are made and although some of the ideas presented may have relevance beyond our own culture, the arguments are intended to apply primarily within this bounded time and space.

The terms defined in this chapter also place this work within a specific social context. My focus is on integrative feminism and collectivity as I have defined them. This is not to say that the arguments presented here do not have relevance to other feminist ideologies, other organizational forms, or other forms of communal or co-operative activity. I suspect, in fact, that they do, and will discuss some of the wider implications of the thesis in the concluding chapter.

One further point must be noted briefly and will be taken up in greater detail in Chapter 2. The thesis will make some attempt to address the question of the bases of the differences between women and men. The fact that in our society men are more aggressive, competitive, product-oriented and given to rationality rather than to emotion or intuition, and that women are more nurturing, affiliative, emotional, intuitive, co-operative and process-oriented is an important basis for the major arguments presented in this thesis. While the arguments have some force whether these differences are seen to be biologically or socially determined, the implications of origin are enormous for any attempts to change the way in which society is developing.

While some biological predispositions to certain behaviour patterns may in fact exist, the position taken in this thesis is not one of biological determinism. The position taken here is that sex-role development, and the development of distinct sets of personality characteristics and values for women and for men is a social phenomenon and one that can therefore be changed by social means. Any innate predispositions that may exist have been so
exaggerated and entrenched by our peculiar socialization patterns that any discussion of what is 'natural' has relevance primarily as a political debate.

And finally, making connections between two different streams of thought or modes of analysis can be illuminating insofar as it opens new windows through which to view social processes. There is no need for the two viewpoints to fit together perfectly, to cover or explain every instance, or to be exclusive of all other points of view. To discover and explore connections between feminism and the growth of collectivity does not in any way imply that integrative feminism is solely responsible for collectivity or that collectivity is exclusively a feminine organizational form. Nor does it imply that all women or even all feminists will wholeheartedly embrace collectivity as a way of working together while all men or even all sexist men will oppose it or find it difficult. What it probably means is that more women than men will find collectivity fits their needs and strengths and that more men than women will find difficulties in blending their socialized patterns of feeling and acting with the requirements of collectivity. What it may also mean is that those men who adapt easily to working collectively have in their personalities a relatively high level of what society would define as feminine characteristics and a correspondingly low level of traditionally male characteristics.

Perhaps most importantly, what this analysis contends is that women have found an organizational form that maximizes their contribution to social growth and which could profoundly alter the directions of that growth.

It is not my intention that the sexual polarization and hierarchical ordering discussed in this thesis be seen solely in terms of the framework presented here. Many important factors have been de-emphasized in this analysis of male-female relations, most notably economic and social class factors. The ways in which the arguments of this thesis fit into an economic or class analysis of women's position could form the subject of further work in this direction. One of the
underlying assumptions of this thesis is that fundamental changes in the "sexual arrangements" (Dinnerstein, 1976:4) in our own and in other societies are a necessary but not sufficient condition for other pressing and far-reaching social, political and economic change.

F. Summary

In this chapter I have set the stage for the rest of the thesis. I have given background information and a recent historical perspective on the integrative feminist movement and on collectivity as one of its organizing tools. I have shown how the present feminist and collectivist movements have developed as responses to inadequacies in the New Left of the 60's. On three dimensions - power, community and integration - I have shown how feminism and collectivity have been more successful than the male-dominated New Left. Against this backdrop, I have defined the purpose of this thesis, which is to explore the relationship between integrative feminism and collectivity, and conversely, between hierarchy and male domination. In the latter half of this chapter, I have defined the terms and concepts that are central to the thesis, outlined the approach that I will take in this work, and described the framework that must be taken into account in understanding the arguments presented here.

The next chapter will build on the concepts outlined in this first chapter in order to present an integrative feminist perspective on the present sexual polarization that exists within social organization and the feminist response to this polarization.

Notes

1. Throughout most of this thesis, the term integrative feminism will be used to describe the particular type of feminism on which the thesis is focused. This term is defined later in this chapter. Very briefly, it refers to a
feminism which focuses on an integration of the feminine and masculine polarities both in society and within individuals. In certain cases, where the reference is to a more general feminism or to a feminism with a different emphasis, the terms feminism, women's movement, or radical, liberal or socialist feminism will be used.

2. Because the term integrative feminism has a very specific meaning and is not generally used by activists or even yet by theorists to describe a direction within the feminist movement, in this more general context I use the term radical feminism, utilizing distinctions which have also been used by Firestone (1970) and Ware (1970). Freeman (1972, 1973) specifically rejects the radical/reformist dichotomy as meaningless in the context of the feminist movement. However, her distinction between the older and younger branches of the women's movement, based on organizational structure and style, covers some of the same distinctions made here.

Basically, radical feminism, as opposed to liberal or reformist feminism, sees the cause of women's oppression not just in the unequal distribution of positions of power in society, but in the very existence of power structures themselves. Radical feminists "want to destroy the positions of power... not to get into these positions." (Ware, 1970:25) They believe that the exercise of political or social power inevitably depends on someone else's oppression. They therefore seek alternative ways to organize and to relate to people and believe, ultimately, in a radical transformation of society.

3. I have used the word gender here in the sense of socialized differences between the sexes (see Tresemer, 1975). However, unlike Tresemer, I have used the terms sex-role and gender-role interchangeably, as they are used in the everyday sense, to refer to socialized roles played by each sex.

4. An argument may be put forward that the propensity to form collective groups is class-based rather than sex-based. Examples of class-based communal
groups are the working-men's clubs and friendly societies of the Nineteenth Century. Although formed for purposes of community, mutual support, and, in many cases, education, and largely self-governing, they were nevertheless very different from the kinds of collectives discussed here. Most importantly, they were not usually aimed at the accomplishment of work, they were bound by strict and often repressive rules (Thompson, 1963), and appear to have lacked an ideology of opposing hierarchy, sharing power and integrating personal and social polarities.

5. This suggestion came from a session on 'Resource Mobilization in Social Movements' chaired by Guy le Cavalier at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings in Montreal, May, 1980.
CHAPTER 2:

A RADICAL FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

A. The way things are

1. Sexual stereotyping

A crucial manifestation of sexual polarization within our society is a polarization of personality characteristics and values, wherein women are seen as embodying one set of characteristics and values, and men another. Women are 'supposed to be' primarily nurturing, emotional, intuitive, irrational, loving, co-operative, vulnerable and passive. It is this set of characteristics which I will call the 'feminine' characteristics. Men, on the other hand, are seen as primarily rational, intellectual, efficient, competitive, aggressive, achievement-oriented, strong, emotionally controlled and active. These I will call the 'masculine' characteristics. Those characteristics assigned to women are seen as appropriate to the maintenance sphere of home, family and human service; those characteristics assigned to men are seen as the appropriate ones for the world of production. (Bakan, 1966; Bardwick and Douvan, 1971; Fasteau, 1975; Firestone, 1970; Kimball, 1975; Janeway, 1980; May, 1980; Miller, 1976; Weisstein, 1971, among many others.) The stereotypes are supported by many members of the psychology and psychiatry professions (see, for example, Broverman, 1972; Chesler, 1972; Smith and David, 1975, among others). This support has made traditional psychology and psychiatry a target of the radical feminist movement and has been a large part of the impetus for a related social movement, the radical therapy or anti-psychiatry movement.

Bettleheim's now notorious quote:

...as much as women want to be good scientists or engineers, they want first and foremost to be womanly companions of men and to be mothers. (1965, as quoted in Kimball, 1975:129)
is a good example of this kind of support.

Although not all of us fit into these sexual stereotypes, Kimball (1975:122) points out that all of us have learned them both intellectually and emotionally and must respond to them in one way or another. Most of us are uncomfortable with wide deviations from these images, to the extent that an aggressive woman is called 'castrating' or 'manish' and a soft, gentle or passive man is looked at askance as 'effeminate'.

To identify one set of characteristics as masculine and the other as feminine emphasizes the differences rather than the similarities in the ways in which the two sexes have developed. To emphasize these differences is not to deny that men also embody what I have called feminine qualities or that women also embody so-called masculine characteristics. However, the identification of this general dichotomy between masculine and feminine reflects a reality which governs much of our social life. The polarization between women and men is common knowledge in our society. The perceived differences between the sexes form the basis for a common understanding about how we should conduct ourselves as men or women and how we expect others to conduct themselves. The resulting stereotypes and expectations form the subject matter not only of scholarly work and academic discourse but of popular literature and everyday conversation.

2. Sexual stereotyping and the hierarchical division of labour

Differentiation between male and female is not necessarily a negative state of affairs; opposites can be complementary and struggle can be aimed at establishing a balance. However, where one side is considered superior to the other and where the object of the struggle is not balance but domination, conflict becomes not creative but destructive.

In our society, the masculine clearly predominates over the feminine. Masculine principles have shaped organizational theory and determine most of
our social institutions\(^1\) (Crow, 1978; Kanter, 1977) while feminine principles have been restricted to so-called feminine domains where they are considered appropriate. Organizations are geared toward efficient productivity; bureaucracy counts a lack of passion as one of its strengths (Crow, 1978; Gerth and Mills, 1958; Kanter, 1977; Weber, 1947). The productive sphere, where masculine values have their fullest expression, is granted more worth in our society than the feminine sphere of home, family and maintenance tasks (Hartsock, 1976-77; Hughes, 1979; Miles, undated and 1980).

Not only is a hierarchical relationship built into the relations between the sexes, but there is very little freedom of choice allowed for members of either sex in terms of how to define themselves as women or as men. If the sexes were different but truly equal and each sex was allowed to fully explore its possibilities for being and doing in the world, members of both sexes could determine their own position on the spectrum of 'humanness'. Under such circumstances, feminists argue, there would likely be a far more varied distribution along the sexual continuum than the present polarization would lead us to believe possible.

The role divisions between women and men are the most obvious and tangible evidence of the polarization between the sexes and therefore were among the first targets of the feminist movement. Traditionally, women have been care-providers in one form or another: their job is to produce the people who make up our society, to train them in the ways of our world, to keep them healthy and happy and to facilitate sufficient harmony to keep the social machine functioning.

Even within the productive sphere, women are kept in their 'proper place'. They are assigned to the caretaking roles within the workforce and within specific organizations, their ambitions and their contributions in other areas belittled (Korda, 1973). Kanter documents what we all can see clearly in the
world around us, that "Women generally do not hold positions of power and authority in organizations..." (1975:35). Even where most of the employees may be women, she points out, the boss is likely to be a man.

Women participate in a different labour market than men, even within the same organization. Their "typical jobs" in the office carry with them not only sex role demands but also placement in a class and hierarchy that itself limits mobility into positions of power... Simplistically women are part of a class rewarded for routine service, while men compose a class rewarded for decision-making rationality and visible leadership. (1975:35)

The most important jobs in the production of material goods, ideas, technology and 'progress' - in the so-called world-out-there - are left up to the men. The world-out-there is a competitive, aggressive, physically and intellectually demanding one, best left to the control of that sex which possesses strengths appropriate to these demands. Women's greater emotionality, softness, passivity is better suited to the maintenance sphere. So the stereotype goes - and it is this stereotype which has governed not only the division of labour in our society, but the whole direction of that society. (Dinnerstein, 1976; Fasteau, 1975; Firestone, 1970; Hughes, 1979; Janeway, 1980; Miles, undated and 1980; Miller, 1976.)

The fact that women and the female sphere of action are valued less highly in our society than men and the male sphere of action is a crucial component in the way work in our society is organized and understood. The work of men is considered to be important and prestigious. It is paid for in hard cash, whereas the work done by women, often not even considered to be 'work', (Bardwick and Douvan, 1971; Hartsock, 1976-77) is mostly unpaid or, if it is paid for at all is paid at a considerably lower rate than that done by men (see, for example, Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978). Not only are homemakers considered 'just housewives'. (Hartsock, 1976-77), but even those occupations in the outside world that are dominated by women are considered to be of lower status than those occupied primarily by men (Fasteau, 1975). Compare, for
example, the prestige and financial rewards accorded to doctors as opposed to nurses, to secondary as opposed to elementary school teachers, and to waiters as opposed to waitresses.

3. The denigration of the feminine

Closely related to the hierarchical valuation of male and female spheres of action is the fact that male personality characteristics and values are defined as superior to those of women. The so-called feminine characteristics have been sacrificed for more 'rational' principles of social organization (Hughes, 1979; Miles, 1980; Miller, 1976; Wyckoff, 1977, among others). The social denigration and repression of emotion and intuition reflect the denigration and repression of women in our society, with whom these qualities are identified (Hochschild, 1975). The sword is a double-edged one. While women are expected to be the sensitive, intuitive, emotional sex, and while they use displays of emotion as one of their few handles on power, at the same time they are 'put down' for these emotions. Their intellect is not respected because it is supposedly dominated by emotion; logic presumably has no chance in the face of feeling. Intuition is to be avoided in any 'rational' decision-making process. Society is organized around what is supposedly of real importance - bureaucracy, reason, productivity, efficiency - all of which apparently would be destroyed by any display of emotion or any utilization of intuitive powers.

Hochschild (1975) discusses the absence of emotion in sociology as an expression of society's perception of emotion as inferior to cognition. Emotion is seen as at best irrelevant and at worst detrimental to accomplishment. She notes the significance of the connotation of 'emotional' and 'sentimental': in popular usage they imply an excess or a dégeneration (p.281).

The well-known study by Broverman et al. (1972) supplies us with ample evidence of this negative valuing of women's characteristics. Broverman and her co-researchers found that those qualities judged by one of three groups of
health clinicians to describe a 'mature, healthy, socially-competent adult man' and those judged by a second group to describe a mature, healthy, socially-competent adult person were very similar. The qualities chosen by a third group to describe a mature, healthy, socially-competent adult woman, however, were markedly different from those chosen by the first two groups. The differences were consistent with the traditional stereotypes of women and men. The implications of these findings are enormous for the interpretation of women's dilemma. A woman is caught in a double bind, able to be either a normal, healthy person or a normal, healthy woman, but not both! For women, this dilemma has meant restricted life options, stunted intellectual development, one-sided personality development, greater poverty than their male counterparts (see, for example, Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978) and severe self-image problems (see Miller, 1976; Wyckoff, 1977). Women experience half of themselves as under-developed and the other half as under-valued.

One of the most ironical and tragic aspects of this situation, for women and for society as a whole, is that even those manifestations of women's characteristics that could be seen as strengths and central to the human condition are denigrated by society and by women themselves. This irony forms a focus of recent works by Dinnerstein (1976), Janeway (1980), and Miller (1976). Qualities crucial to our humanness - desire to nurture, desire for affiliation, feelings of vulnerability, emotional openness and need - are seen as peripheral, inferior to characteristics such as toughness, independence, aggressiveness, emotional control. Men, who have shaped and dominated our society, have not integrated these characteristics successfully into their own lives, much less into society.

4. The masculinization of organizations

It is not surprising that in social institutions created primarily by men and dominated by men the characteristics emphasized will be those most emphasized
in men themselves. One of the most pervasive manifestations of the 'masculinization' of society is the bureaucratic, hierarchical model of organization on which virtually all of our social institutions are based. (Kanter, 1975, 1977) Descriptions of the ideal bureaucracy include many of the qualities ascribed to the ideal male in our society. Weber uses words like 'technical efficiency', 'objective rationality' and 'impersonality' to describe the strengths of bureaucracy and words like 'professional man' and 'specialized expert' to describe the ideal bureaucrat (Gerth and Mills, 1958). Kanter (1977) specifically names this 'masculine ethic' created by bureaucratic development and shows how the traits assumed to belong to some men are elevated to become necessities for bureaucratic management (p.22). Rothschild-Whitt points to impersonality as a key feature of bureaucracy. Personal emotions are not supposed to 'distort' rational decisions and personal relationships are "role-based, segmental, and instrumental" (1977:88). Contemporary modernization has been characterized as a shift from person-based to role-based social organization (Coleman, 1970). Accordingly, personal relations within bureaucracy are role-based, a situation which maximizes efficiency but seriously threatens the possibility of human satisfaction within those relations.

The fact that these developments are in the direction of the masculine end of the spectrum of human characteristics as they have been defined in our society, reflects the fact that bureaucracy has historically been a male organizational form, developed and controlled by men. From the beginning of formal bureaucracy, its management levels, those levels where the most successful bureaucrats reside, have been peopled by men, who have been assumed to embody the personality traits necessary for thriving in such a structure. When women tried to enter these levels, they were rejected on the basis of their deficiency in this masculine ethic. In this way, hierarchical bureaucracy was maintained by men in their own image (Kanter, 1977).
5. Nature or nurture?

Arising from any discussion of the sexual polarization in society is the question of origin. Why do these differences exist? Are men and women born so different, or do they become so? Although I will not here attempt to present the full arguments for both sides of this debate, the question must be addressed in at least a cursory fashion. For a presentation of the point of view that the most important differences between the sexes are innate or natural, see May (1980). For a presentation of the case for the main basis of gender differences being in socialization, see Millet (1969) and Weisstein (1971). Willett (1971) offers a more integrative position, open to the possibility of exploring the extent of the biological differences between women and men but emphasizing the social and therefore changeable differences. Tresemer (1975) emphasizes the difference between sex-roles (based on biological differences) and gender-roles (learned roles) and argues for an integration of the nature/nurture polarization. He provides the familiar argument that biological differences result in predispositions for differences in behaviour, which are in turn affected by environmental factors and cautions against exaggerating differences that are modifiable.

Underlying all these arguments is a fundamental gap in our knowledge: because of the differences between male and female socialization patterns and adult social roles, we cannot know how much of the difference between the sexes is biological and how much is learned (Millet, 1969:39; Weisstein, 1971:222).

Dinnerstein acknowledges the biological determinants of gender differences but chooses to emphasize those aspects of the sexual dichotomy which are amenable to change. She recognizes the immense complexity of the psychosocial situation, while maximizing the possibilities for altering the present human condition. She argues that although what underlies the ways in which
men and women differ and the ways in which we relate to each other is not as immutable as anatomy or hormones:

our consent is far less simple to withdraw than many feminists would like to believe... The prevailing symbiosis between men and women is something more than a product of societal coercion. It is part of the neurotic overall posture by means of which humans, male and female, try to cope with massive psychological problems that lie at the heart of our species' situation. At the present stage of technological development, it is primarily because they help us to maintain this doomed posture that the specific societal mechanisms supporting the sexual status quo continue to feel necessary. (1976:7-8)

She goes on to argue that:

It is senseless to describe our prevailing male-female arrangements as "natural". They are of course a part of nature, but if they should contribute to the extinction of our species, that fact would be part of nature too. Our impulse to change these arrangements is as natural as they are, and more compatible with our survival on earth. (p.8-9)

The position taken here is one that, while acknowledging the complexity and unresolved nature of the question, sees socialization as the primary determinant of sex-role behaviour in women and men. It seems clear that whatever biological tendencies there may be for women to act in one way and men another have been so exaggerated and entrenched by socialization that the institutionalization of these differences has long ago become a political rather than a scientific question. Clearly, current sex-role divisions serve to maintain the present hierarchical social system; those in control have an interest in perpetuating such arrangements. In the face of such political necessity, there is little room for exploring the full range of possibilities for either women or men.

The extent to which sex-role polarization impairs overall human organization and how this impairment can be counteracted are questions which are central to this thesis.
B. The feminist vision

1. An overview: the integrative function

Many integrative feminists are refusing to accept the male-constructed vision of the world, and are trying to construct instead an alternate image, centred on integration, co-operative endeavour and the full development of the human potential. Miller (1976) and Janeway (1980) are among the most eloquent of those feminist theorists who are attempting to construct a new reality. The integrative vision of other social critics such as Schumacher (1973) coincides in many ways with that of radical feminists.

The integrative feminist position depicted here argues that a balance between the feminine and the masculine represents an optimal social state. The position asserts that the differences between the sexes must be recognized, respected and in some cases revelled in, but the sexes not hierarchically ordered nor the differences forcibly maintained. The part women play in reproduction and in maintenance and the personality characteristics that are emphasized as a result of these roles, argue these feminists, should be rewarded but not glorified, encouraged but not made exclusive to women, nor women restricted to this realm. In this view, the maintenance role and its contingent values are at least as important as the productive processes and values from which they are so clearly separated and to which they are judged inferior. Integrative feminists argue that this maintenance realm must be placed with masculine values in the centre of human existence and the values of that realm asserted as dominant values in our culture. Both female and male realms must be radically altered to incorporate aspects of the other.

In order to counteract the existing imbalance between the male and female realms, relatively greater emphasis would have to be placed on the female realm, which theorists refer to variously as the 'pattern of caring' (May, 1980:69-70), the 'expressive function' (Parsons and Bales, 1955) and 'communion' (Bakan,
Hughes points to this shift in emphasis which is necessary before any real change can be accomplished in this area:

The transitional period from patriarchy to androgyny will be marked by an inversion of current emphasis; the private realm will take on a greater importance than the public realm and so-called "feminine" characteristics will take on greater importance than "masculine" characteristics. The "sex-gender system" will be turned on its head before it finally merges into a synthesis of public and private, of political and erotic, of objective and subjective, of intimate and shared, most fully symbolised by reproduction. (1979:23)

The central theme running through this vision is integration, a process which an increasing number of feminists consider to be the pivotal function of their feminism (Dinnerstein, 1976; Hughes, 1979; Miles, undated and 1980). Hughes calls synthesis the "hallmark of feminist theory" (1979:21). This theme of integration can itself be seen to integrate those goals that I will identify as most central to feminism. These goals include the integration of 'feminine' and 'masculine' characteristics and strengths, of production and maintenance functions, of process and product, of the personal and the political, and of the emotional and the rational.

2. The feminist vision and the roles of women and men

The changes envisaged by integrative feminists do not create a win-lose situation between women and men. In the long-run, both women and men stand to gain by a broadening and integrating of their ways of being in the world. The price men pay for their dominance is a high one - a loss of easy warmth, emotional vulnerability, access to their intuitive powers, the ability to connect with people with ease and intimacy, the ability to be weak and ask for support.

However, it is not concern for men which motivates the feminist movement: it is concern for the women - for their powerlessness, their oppression, and their pain - and it is concern for the state of the world, which has been created largely by the predominance of male patterns of operating and organizing

Feminists recognize that most men will not willingly give up their positions of power and will not grasp the value of the integrative feminist approach for themselves and their children. They understand that women have less to lose than men and that women, therefore, will have to be the ones to fight for integrative social change.

Another reason women can act so effectively in the struggle towards an integrated society is that they have not been so thoroughly socialized into the dominant and dominating roles of the patriarchal society they are trying to change. Integrative feminists argue further that women's special role as reproducers and caretakers places them in a unique position as engineers of change. Hughes points out that the relationship between the development of effective means of contraception and the emancipation of women has long been understood, but that:

...it is only now possible to transform the fact which restricted women into the fact which places women in a special revolutionary position. (1979:24)

Thus, the ideas generated by the integrative feminist movement, that place reproduction at the centre of human experience, restore to women the power and the ability to use the knowledge that is uniquely theirs and crucial to the development of a balanced world. Hughes writes of the special role women have to play in the creation of this new social order:

While a woman does have a special relation to the process of reproduction, she is not limited [in the new social order] by that relation as she has been in patriarchal theory and society. In her is embodied the synthesis of private and public. Feminist theory claims that only women can return us to our essence as human beings by bringing an end to our alienation from the process of human reproduction; that is why women must be the agents of the human revolution. (1979:23-4)

Miller's (1976) view of the centrality of women's areas of special strength supports this contention.
Although most of the writers calling for social change in a direction of feminization are feminist women, there is a small but growing number of male writers analyzing the same situation from a male perspective and calling for similar changes both in the home and in the workplace (Fasteau, 1975; Korda, 1973; Nichols, 1975; and Lyon, 1977).

Korda, for example, ridicules the male fantasy that men are somehow more capable than women of doing the "real business" of society. There is no reason of course, he says, that women could not do it just as well, or better. But if they could, he asks of men:

Then who are we, and why are we sitting there shuffling papers and answering the telephone, heirs in fantasy to the power and authority of Fredrick the Great, Barbarossa, the Plains Indians, a hundred, a thousand million men who believed... that it was a man's function to deal with the physical world, to conquer it, to tame it, to mold it in his image; who left to women that magic, inward mystery of childbirth, of continuity, the impulses that silently, instinctively connect one generation to another and provide the rationale for expansion and adventure and work. To ask men to allow women into this dream castle... is to ask them to dismantle it, to admit... that the dreams and illusions are over and done with, that nothing is taking place in this office, at this desk, behind this typewriter or computer but work without glory, without special significance... (1973:63)

3. Re-definition and integration of female and male strengths

This goal incorporates both the best known and what is perhaps the most truly radical of the integrative feminist goals. On the one hand, integrative feminism encourages women to be strong, competent, assertive. It is this goal that is most commonly understood by the general public as a plank of the feminist platform, and has motivated many consciousness-raising groups. On the other hand, it is equally necessary for women, and ultimately the whole society, to re-evaluate 'feminine' characteristics and to re-define these as strengths, and to see women as powerful in the larger society as well as in the family. To re-define as strength what has traditionally been defined as weakness involves a profound and radical shift in our consciousness of the world.
Firestone (1970) recognizes both the central importance of 'love' in society and the way it has been used to keep women out of the mainstream of culture creation. She recognizes that the sexual polarity that underlies the whole of our society results in only half the culture being termed its totality; and the other half, the emotional half, being hidden, denied, depended upon only 'on the sly' (Firestone, 1970). Women have always recognized the importance both for themselves and for men of this emotional realm, but because of the way in which society denigrates it, they have faced a conflict. That conflict between what they know in their hearts to be true and what society has tried to make them believe has resulted in a great deal of ambivalence about their own emotionality, sensitivity to others, and desire for dependence. The assertion that emotion and vulnerability constitute strength rather than weakness is also made by such writers as Dinnerstein (1976), Fasteau (1975); Janeway (1980); Lyon (1977); Lyons (1976); and Miller (1976); among others.

Many feminists are now stressing the need to recognize that the behavioural characteristics designated as feminine are central to the essence of what it means to be 'human'. Because of its importance in the development of the integrative feminist vision, it is appropriate to re-emphasize this position.

By asserting that women's special function is the core of human existence, feminist theory argues for the predominance and universality of so-called "female life experiences"... (Hughes, 1979:25) Miller, discussing a list of objectives emphasized by integrative feminists, points out that:

This list of issues suggests a most interesting and exciting proposition: in the course of projecting into women's domain some of its most troublesome and problematic contingencies, male-led society may also have simultaneously, and unwittingly, delegated to women not humanity's "lowest needs" but its "highest necessities" - that is, the intense, emotionally connected cooperation and creativity necessary for human life and growth. (1976:25-6)
Janeway (1980) sees those characteristics that have been socially defined as feminine as having great potential for changing a world that is fraught with polarities.

To recognize the dangers of an over-developed emotionality and nurturing capacity combined with an under-developed rationality and capacity for assertiveness is as important as recognizing the essential nature of either sphere. Adams (1971) warns against what she calls "the compassion trap", which places women in a position where they are the only ones able to provide love, nurturing and protection for their families and where this nurturing function is their primary, or only one. While the feminism espoused by, for example, Hughes, Janeway, Miles, and Miller may support the importance of this nurturing, affiliative capacity in women, it in no way seeks to exclude men from this function or to restrict women to this role. On the contrary, integrative feminism sees the necessity of men taking on these nurturing roles and developing their affiliative capacities and of women developing their assertive, bold and intellectual sides. The crucial point here is balance: to effectively balance the soft, the vulnerable and the emotional with the tough, the assertive and the rational, without denying either.

Miller (1976), in placing a high value on those characteristics well-developed in most women, comes dangerously close to what Kimball calls the pedestal phenomenon (1975:124) which romanticizes women's role. Although Miller herself says that she does not wish to put forth women as the saviours of the world, she does place a tremendous amount of faith in the power of women to use their particular strengths to change the course of the world. While the argument of this thesis supports this view, one must guard against an overly simplistic analysis of a very complex situation.

Another danger in this process of attaching greater importance to the maintenance realm, particularly if the thrust comes from men, is that such a re-
valuation may be used to rationalize and perpetuate a discriminatory division of labour. For this reason, all aspects of change in women's social position must receive equal attention: re-valuation of maintenance functions, equal access for women and men to all types of work situations, and an integration of the productive and maintenance spheres.

In spite of these dangers, the need to integrate male and female patterns in our society and the prerequisite of increased emphasis on the feminine has significant implications for the way in which society is organized. A society based on male-oriented values and a bureaucratic, hierarchical format geared primarily toward production, will, in an integrated world, have to change in the direction of more attention paid to people's emotional satisfaction, more emphasis on the process of activities rather than just on the product, cooperative rather than competitive working arrangements, and a synthesis of those bastions of the male and the female, the spheres of production and maintenance.

4. Integration of the productive and maintenance spheres

One of the major ways in which society reflects the polarization and hierarchical relation between male and female is through the separation of the realms of production and maintenance (Hughes, 1979; Miles, undated and 1980). In the world envisaged by the integrative feminists, the characteristics, values and goals of the productive and maintenance realms would be integrated, as would, in certain instances, their physical spaces and their tasks and responsibilities. The maintenance of the species would be seen to be the responsibility of both women and men and the productive sphere would be equally accessible to both sexes.

In order for such changes to occur, those who make decisions in organizations would have to accept those organizations' share of responsibility for raising the society's children. In such an ideological shift, the maintenance sphere would be placed in a primary position in the minds of women and men, at
the centre of human activity and achievement.

At the same time, it would no longer be mandatory for a woman to bear and raise children in order to be valued in society or for a woman to consider the bearing and raising of children as her primary or only function. As women gain equal access to all levels of the productive world, and as men take responsibility for maintenance functions, the options open to both sexes would be increased.

However legislation which rules that men and women be treated as equals or be offered equal employment opportunities does not deal with the central problem of dissatisfaction at the workplace. Miles asserts that:

It is not through female entry into the male world and the elimination of the 'female' sphere that liberation will be won; and the real liberatory potential of women's entry into the work force is indirect - as it breaks down the power relation (and its rationale) between men and women. (Undated, p.22)

An analysis which sees female entry into the labour force as attacking the basic problem of the inequality between the sexes does nothing to deal with the problems of personal fragmentation and powerlessness in the traditional male world. Nor does it take into account:

...the existence or the significance of the powerful tendency within feminist radicalism whose political perspective goes well beyond seeking women's entry into these male realms, to assert the importance of the female realm and the necessity of integrating all of life and society around the requirements of people's self-actualizing reproduction. (Miles, undated, p.22)

Hughes (1979) points out that this emphasis on reproduction or maintenance is one vital way in which integrative feminist theory goes beyond Marxism to place the maintenance realm in a position of importance equal to that of the world of production in determining the quality and direction of human life.

It is the integration of the two realms rather than a reversal of the present dominant/subordinate relation that is the crux of the issue. The lack for women and men of a sense of meaning or wholeness in their lives stems at
least in part from the gulf that exists between the productive and maintenance spheres. Lack of fulfillment takes different forms for women and men partly because of what has been denied each sex.

The integration of productive and maintenance functions in many ways underlies the forms of integration which are discussed below.

5. Integration of process and product

In the traditional, product-oriented organizations, the process is valued insofar as it is rational, orderly, and geared to efficient productivity (Crow, 1978:16). The goal of the organization is to produce as much as possible as quickly and cheaply as possible. Organizational structures and methods are geared to this end.

In the world imaged by integrative feminists and other political activists on the left, there are alternatives to this product-orientation, of which the collective is one. Such alternatives are based on changes in the value system on which human activity is predicated - work is no longer directed predominantly to the production of more material goods or a greater number of services. Emphasis is placed on the personal, political and moral implications of the process of accomplishing productive work, the way in which an organization operates. 'Process people' not only value the process itself, but they value the attention paid to it within an organization (Crow, 1978). Concern with the way in which things are done occupies a considerable amount of time and energy in this branch of the feminist movement.

Changes in this process are seen as crucial in meeting goals of social change. Although the necessity of a certain level of production is recognized, emphasis is also placed on the health and happiness of the human beings who are doing the producing and of those who are benefitting from the product. The well-being of all humans is recognized as the primary goal of this life and production as only one of the many means to this end. Connections are made
between the way in which things are done in a specific organization and the way activists would like to see things done on a larger scale. The same values are seen to operate in the workplace as in the home and in the political arena: respect for the whole human being, emotional honesty, equality among people, respect for the environment. Thus the humanization of the production process is accomplished not in order to increase productivity (as in the human relations model of bureaucracy described by Kanter, 1977, and Shepard, 1977), but for moral and political reasons.

Within the feminist movement itself there is a split between those oriented toward an emphasis on process and those oriented toward an emphasis on product. A particularly comprehensive discussion of this tension is contained in a series of three articles under the heading "The Process/Product Debate" (Crow, 1978; Riddle, 1978; Sparks, 1978). Clarifying this dichotomy, Crow (1978) identifies a process-orientation with an emphasis on what I have called the feminine qualities and a product-orientation with what I have called the masculine traits. She describes the 'process person' as one who feels that the most important goals of the feminist movement and culture have to do with nurturing qualities: emotional openness and support, sensitivity, intuition, interdependence and cooperation. The 'product person', on the other hand, emphasizes as the major goals of feminism assertiveness, competence, and those qualities that will put women on an equal footing with men in the economic and productive world.

Although both ends of the spectrum are represented in feminist and many other alternative groups, many groups are actively engaged in working out some balance between these two extremes. An integrative position advocates a balance between a concern with human needs for emotional expressiveness and support, and a concern with personal and organizational productivity, development of competence, and efficiency at developing and using a system (Riddle, 1978).
6. Integration of the personal and the political

As was pointed out in Chapter 1, the integration of the personal and the political is a central issue in the development of the modern women's movement. The emphasis on process, on the centrality of the maintenance sphere, on the universal availability of good day care, on emotion, and on power and autonomy in their own lives, all these are expressions of the realization of the essential continuity between the personal and the political. Feminists argue that women cannot be free to determine their own social and work lives if they are not free to determine their own personal and sexual lives. Unless it becomes the norm for the responsibility for the maintenance of the personal sphere to be shared by all members of society, women will not be free to participate equally in the productive sphere (Coser and Rokoff, 1971).

Integrative feminists insist that sex, housework and motherhood are profoundly political (Morgan, 1977) and that the way we work and the political programs we develop are inexorably personal. They comprehend the political causes of women's personal oppression and the political impact of changing those personally oppressive situations. They grasp the necessity of bringing the personal into their work lives: of refusing to allow the greater part of their lives to be relegated to a strictly defined time and place and to be treated as inferior in the workplace because of their personal lives and commitments.

Integrative feminists argue that this insight into the necessary integration of internal and external realities, of feeling and acting, and of private and public is what makes the women's movement less abstract, more practical and more centred on real possibilities for change within both individuals and the social structures than previous movements (Firestone, 1970; Hartsock, 1975; Morgan, 1977).

Integrative feminists insist that it is not psychologically or socially healthy to have one set of rules and values for the personal sphere and another
for the productive or political one. As in the separation of process and product, the separation of the personal and political implies a fragmentation of the person into distinct and often conflicting roles. An emphasis on the union between these spheres, on the other hand, reflects integrative feminism's emphasis on the whole person.

It is believed that in order for the personal to be integrated with the political and the productive, it cannot remain in its present position on the periphery of what is considered 'really' important in the world. As long as the personal is considered trivial, neither men nor women will grant it centrality or integrate it into their public lives.

7. Integration of emotion and intellect

There is a close relationship between the personal politics of the women's movement and an emphasis on emotion (Firestone, 1970:38). The integrative feminist movement has not surprisingly identified bureaucratic society's preoccupation with reason with male dominance, and has striven to combat it as part of the problem of sexual polarization in society. The movement's concern with process reflects its concern with emotion; emotion is seen as an essential part of the whole person and its expression as necessary to human fulfillment. The liberation of emotion in society is seen as contingent with the liberation of women.

In arguing for the inclusion of emotion in sociology, Rothschild (1975) is critical of the confusion in sociology and in society between rationality and emotionlessness and the implication that rational action and organizational functioning do not require emotions and feelings. A recognition of the part played by emotions and feeling in bureaucracy, and an augmenting and utilization of emotion in alternate organizational forms are both part of the integrative vision.

Ware comments on the significance of the fact that in the women's movement,
happiness finally became a political issue (1970:17). She notes that in building alternate structures in the women's movement, "For the first time political systems are being developed that validate the demand for happiness" (1970:14). This recognition of people's right to satisfaction is integral to a recognition of the need to grant emotion a significant place in the structure and functioning of organizations, in partnership with currently pre-dominating forces of reason and intellect.

8. The sharing of information, power and responsibility

One of the primary goals of the women's movement involves power - to re-define power, to effect the re-distribution of power both in the larger society and in the movement, and to attain the power necessary for women to control their own lives. Integrative feminists believe that in order to radically alter society in the long run, power must be conceptualized to emphasize its liberating aspects (Janeway, 1975, 1980; Lips, 1979; Miller, 1976; Ware, 1970; Watson, 1975). In their organizations, power as autonomy is emphasized, and an attempt is made to avoid the use of power as domination over others.

The process of extricating ourselves from the patterns of domination/submission in all its various forms is probably the most pervasive theme running through the integrative feminist movement. In the face of the power structures existing in society, a crucial step in this process is for women to gain the power to free themselves from the domination of men. Often women must overcome feelings of inadequacy, incompetency, and fears both of failure and of success (Miller, 1976; Gornick, 1972) in order to have the confidence to use what they do know to begin the process of acquiring new knowledge. This is one important component of the feminist consciousness-raising process.

One of the necessary preconditions for the sharing of power and responsibility is the sharing of information. Integrative feminists are opposed to the monopolization of information that is the backbone of the hierarchical system.
Co-operation as equals is dependent upon both people in the relationship having equal access to the information necessary for decision-making and action.

Most feminists, liberals and radicals alike, are trying in a variety of ways to gain knowledge. Within the integrative feminist movement itself, there is a high value placed on the sharing of information, power and responsibility; this sharing is one of the organizing principles of collectivity. The movement's relation to the larger society also has as one of its primary goals the sharing of the information, power and responsibility that have been monopolized by men. The radical arm of the self-help movement, which is directed to the acquiring of knowledge in order to help oneself and in order to gain some independence from an unhelpful and in some cases oppressive society, has developed hand-in-hand with the women's movement. That principles of self-help suffuse the feminist movement is demonstrated by the proliferation of such groups as women's transition houses, women's publishing houses, women's information centres, rape crisis centres, birth centres, and women's health collectives.

D. Summary

In this chapter I have described the state of society that has led to the integrative feminist response: the polarization between the sexes and the domination by men. I have discussed how the role divisions of women and men have resulted in women being largely restricted to the maintenance sphere and men to the productive sphere. I have demonstrated not only how male spheres of action are defined as superior to those of women, but how male personality characteristics and values are defined as superior. Emphasis has thus been placed not only on the lack of development in women of the so-called masculine traits of aggressiveness, competitiveness, intellect and achievement orientation
but also on the denigration of those characteristics that are considered appropriately feminine: warmth, emotionality, intuition, and attention to interpersonal processes.

In a brief discussion concerning the origins of these differences between women and men, no attempt is made to deal comprehensively with the nature-nurture issue. The position is taken that although present reality is obviously a result of an interaction between biology and environment, this thesis focuses on socialization processes as the prime determinant of sex-role differences.

The feminist position is detailed in terms of its integrative function: the integration of feminine and masculine characteristics and strengths; of the productive and maintenance spheres, of process and product, of the personal and the political, and of emotion and intellect.

Finally, discussion centres on the integrative feminist goal of an equitable sharing of power and responsibility, and the integral role played by information in this power-sharing. This goal is applied both to the larger society and to organizations within the movement itself.

The next chapter will deal with some of the ways in which collectivity gives form to these feminist goals of integration and power-sharing.

Notes
1. However, it is also important to recognize that a minority of men have had a predominant influence over the development of these structures. These men and the structures they have created and maintained are what Smith (1980) calls the ruling apparatus. Although it is men who have been the creators and the primary beneficiaries of these structures, the majority of men have been relatively powerless within these structures just as have the majority of women. While the precise nature of the relationship between
class and gender as determinants of oppression will not be discussed in this thesis, the complexity of that relationship needs to be acknowledged. (See Smith, 1980, for an examination of this relationship.)

2. The 'human relations' model of bureaucratic organization, although it has made some inroads on the theory and practice of bureaucracy as an emotionless entity, has not fundamentally altered either its theory or its practice. (Kanter, 1975; 1977; Whyte, 1957). Its recognition of emotion as a force in the workplace is anything but egalitarian: it is the workers, not the managers, who are even in theory recognized as bringing their emotional needs to work and whose emotional needs must be taken into account in any plan for effective management (Kanter, 1975, 1977). However, according to workers interviewed by Terkel (1972), little or no genuine consideration is given in the workplace to their feelings.

3. As stated in Chapter 1, Note 3, I have not followed Tresemer's (1975) distinction between sex-roles and gender-roles.
CHAPTER 3

BUREAUCRACY AND COLLECTIVITY

A. Principles and practices of bureaucracy and collectivity

1. Introduction

What follows is a comparison of bureaucracy and collectivity in terms of the issues or problems that both organizational forms face but which each of them deals with somewhat differently. Rothschild-Whitt (1977:79) cautions us in our analysis of these two very different organizational forms, that neither exists in its 'pure' form, but that all organizations are some combination of the two extremes. However, she also points out that examining the principles and practices of anti-bureaucratic organizations with an aim of developing an ideal type of collective organization will:

allow us to understand collectivist-democracies not only in terms of bureaucratic ideals they do not share, but in terms of counter-values they do hold. Further, the use of an ideal type permits us to locate actual organizations along a continuum. (1977:79)

In spite of the overlap between these two organizational types, they are, in both theory and practice, very different. The fact that their ideologies, their assumptions about human nature and the way the world should operate, the values they institutionalize and the specific goals they hold are so different is the major consideration here. Similarities between the two, I will argue, while they must be noted, are less significant than the differences.

The following sections describe the differences between collectivity and bureaucracy as organizational forms. The problems and compromises generated by the day-to-day operations of collectivity will be dealt with in the final section.
2. The organization of power

Probably the most central task faced by bureaucratic and collective organizations is the distribution of power and authority. The way in which this distribution is accomplished, and the theoretical and practical ways in which power is dealt with, form the major bases of contrast between these two organizational forms.

Bureaucracy is organized around the principle of hierarchy, based on asymmetrical relationships between subordinates and superordinates. The power is ultimately invested in one person at the top and flows downward, negligible amounts of it ever reaching the lowest levels of the hierarchy (Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978). This inequality in relationships is inherent in our society's prevalent ideas about the necessity of leaders and of the personal exercise of authority in order for a group to function efficiently as a team. A prevailing assumption in our society appears to be that in order for a task to get done, one person must tell another (subordinate) person to do it. Remuneration in a bureaucracy reflects its hierarchical format: those at the top of the hierarchy earn many times more than those at the bottom.

Control is one of the central functions of bureaucracy (Kanter, 1975; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Shepard, 1977). This function is assumed by the leader at the top and by the managers - a whole class of workers whose primary role is to control the actions of others - according to guidelines set by persons above them in the hierarchy.

The organizational structure of bureaucracy looks like a pyramid and the preoccupation is control. Sometimes there is rebellion and we realize that all along the actual power is in the people and their compliance. However, as long as people are following the rules of the status quo, control flows down from the leader at the top. (Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978:5)
Bureaucratic authority may be based on control by expertise, on the basis of superior knowledge, or on obedience for its own sake, whether or not the person commanding obedience has greater knowledge or whether the control is in the interest of those whom it governs (Gouldner, 1954; Gerth and Mills, 1958; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).

In the terms defined in Chapter 1, bureaucracy maximizes power as dominance and minimizes the use of power as autonomy. Power as autonomy must be strictly regulated in a bureaucracy; workers who are encouraged to develop autonomy could not be easily controlled. However, some creativity among employees is necessary for the productivity of the group. Autonomy and self-motivation are allowed, even encouraged in certain upwardly mobile workers and managers only to the extent that they are necessary for advancement and the assumption of greater responsibility within the organization. Although the human relations model of bureaucracy has encouraged at least a semblance of autonomy among its workers, the overall goal is still one of efficiency and productivity and the overall organizational plan one of control from the top down (Gouldner, 1954; Kanter, 1975; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Shepard, 1977).

Control and accountability are formal and explicit; they are maintained in bureaucracy partly by direct supervision and partly by its use of defined rules, procedures and sanctions. (Gouldner, 1954; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Incentives are primarily material (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Control is maintained to accomplish goals which may be rational and expedient for those who make the rules while being neither rational nor expedient for the workers (Gouldner, 1954:20-21).

In contrast, collectivity is based on ideals of equality and participation of all members in all aspects of the organization; authority is vested in the whole group rather than in any one individual (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).
Collectivity opposes both expertise and obedience for its own sake as bases for authority. It recognizes the relationship between knowledge and power and therefore works against the monopolization of expertise. The distribution of moniês reflects this ideology of equality. Remuneration is usually the same for all members or else is allocated according to need. Where differentials exist, they are relatively small (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).

Rules in a collective are minimized and flexibility and personal responsibility maximized. What rules there are, and of course there are some, are made by the whole group, in the interests of goals shared by all group members. Individuals are accountable to the group and to each other in a personal way. While less formal and rational than those in a bureaucracy, rules and procedures in a collective are far from arbitrary. The pressures to perform and to fulfill commitments are personalistic and moral rather than material ones (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:86). People who have taken an active part in making decisions and defining policies and who feel closely identified with the organization itself, are able to take responsibility for those decisions and policies. They are more likely willingly to fulfill their commitments in terms of specific job responsibilities within the group, thereby obviating the need for a hierarchical system of command. The group's high expectations of its members are supported by the value placed on individual responsibility and personal integrity. Some collectives use structured techniques to help ensure that jobs get done—such as posted schedules and duty rosters, log books and check-off lists, and weekly reviews during meetings. If individuals do not fulfill obligations, moral pressures may be brought to bear both by individuals' disapproval and by structured criticism sessions.

Gouldner (1954:241) notes that bureaucratic rules serve to regulate the tensions generated by supervisory relations without resolving the tensions which are inherent in relationships of inequality. Collectivity tries to attack the
problem at a more basic level, trying to facilitate ways of working together that do not require relations of dominance and submission. While collectivity may thus be a more problematic and tension-producing work environment on one level, lacking rules which act as short-term solutions to worker tensions, collectivity which successfully challenges asymmetrical relationships as a basis for accomplishing work, deals more effectively with the conditions that produce the tensions in the first place.

Collectivity attempts to maximize the use of power as autonomy and to minimize its use as domination. At its best, it has succeeded in separating these two types of power: to encourage group members to develop their inner resources, their skills and their confidence to take control of their own participation in the group, and to contribute to the limits of their capabilities without controlling others. It is through maximizing individual strength rather than minimizing it that collectives try to maximize their strength as organizations (see Bunch and Fisher, 1976). In the same way that bureaucracies embody and encourage in their members the values of the bureaucratic status quo, collectives serve a consciousness-raising function, in encouraging their members to develop their own strengths and to take power not only in the organization but in society.

Both bureaucracy and egalitarian groups or communities require a complex balancing of individualism against the needs of the group (Whyte, 1957). The differences between the two organizational forms are ones of power, inequality, and consciousness. In a bureaucracy, the interests of the least powerful are consistently sacrificed to the interests of the most powerful, which are most often posited as the interests of the group as a whole (Gouldner, 1954). Willingness to give up autonomy is not a matter of conscious choice for most workers, nor is it based on commitment to the goals of the organization. Individual autonomy and power are limited by coercion, with wages and
promotion used as the weapons of that coercion. Workers' sacrifices may be made with resentment, with resignation, or with an acceptance born of a lifetime of socialization that has convinced them that the subordination of the individual on the basis of position in the occupation system is 'normal' (see Heinz, forthcoming).

Participants in collectives also recognize that "an organization...cannot be comprised of a collection of autonomous wills, each pursuing its own personal ends" (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:81). In a collective, the interests of the individual are sacrificed to the interests of the group as a result of conscious commitment to group principles and goals. The goals of the individual are generally the same as those of the group itself, a situation which, in contrast to bureaucracy, makes the sacrifice a personally consistent one. Unlike in a bureaucracy, in a collective, a conscious attempt is made to fulfill the needs and rights of each individual member and to balance these against the requirements of the group. Because there is no hierarchy of groups of individuals whose interests are in conflict, there does not exist the problem of certain rules working in the interests of the management but against the interests of the managed. Where certain requirements of the group do not coincide with particular interests of an individual, that individual's commitment to the group usually makes him/her willing to sacrifice his/her specific interests without feeling oppressed or exploited.

...one thing I've really learned to believe in through the Collective, which I didn't have such a strong belief in before, is process. I'm less concerned when group goals don't coincide with mine, because I think that people can learn, and consciousness changes, and my consciousness changes, and my goals don't necessarily stay the same. That's an ongoing process... (HC member, 1974)

The collective alternative of sharing power and responsibility requires involvement in and commitment to the organization as a whole and to its decision-making process, and therefore more effort on the part of each individual
participant. It is considerably easier for an individual to take refuge in the complexity and anonymity of a bureaucracy than to fully participate in decision-making and to share in the responsibility for those decisions, whether they are in regard to a schedule for clean-up, who is to chair a meeting, or how the group is to relate to a group or policy of the larger society.

...there's this world out there that is just very hard on women, hard on people, and competitive, and non-supportive...and knowledge is a secret, and there is so much that is trying to be different here...we really work at it...really work at being a health COLLECTIVE, and both of those words are important... (HC member, 1974)

In order to have equal access to power, participants must have equal access to relevant information. The relationship between power and information is underscored by Pateman (1970). The distribution of information within the group is a major time consumer within collectives and is one of the main tasks addressed in meetings and in other organizational structures. This commitment to the distribution of information is, again, in marked contrast to the system employed within bureaucracy. In bureaucracies, while the importance of information is also recognized as a crucial factor in the distribution of power, information is deliberately distributed differentially. It is withheld from those at the lower levels of the hierarchy precisely in order to prevent them from assuming too much power.

Although both power and information are imperfectly shared and sometimes deliberately withheld in collectives as well as in bureaucracies, there are significant differences between the two modes. In a bureaucracy this inequality is officially sanctioned and institutionalized, and therefore consistently perpetuated; whereas in a collective such practices run counter to the ideology of equality and participation and are negatively sanctioned. In collectives, the organizational structure, rather than institutionalizing the unequal distribution of information, specifically tries to ensure its
broad dissemination.

What's important in collectivity and in consensus decision-making is that everyone is encouraged to share in the knowledge, power and responsibility. We all have the potential to be powerful and to take responsibility. The Collective can encourage this involvement, and make new members realize that they have as much worth and potential as everyone else. (HC member, 1976)

Rothschild-Whitt points out that the organization of power in collectives and in bureaucracies reflects strikingly different assumptions about human beings and their capabilities. Collectivity "presupposes the capacity of individuals for self-disciplined, co-operative behaviour", aspects of human beings which collectives "universally and routinely emphasize." (1977:80). Bureaucracy, on the other hand, assumes that most people need to be tightly controlled by external forces and that they are primarily motivated by greed and self-interest.

Officially, the organizations run [by bureaucrats] deify co-operation; in actuality, they remain places where success still comes to those motivated essentially by the old individualistic, competitive drives. (Whyte, 1957:156)

While the formal rules that govern the distribution of information, power and responsibility in a bureaucracy may be grumbled about by participants, they are rarely challenged. A local union president commented on the limitations of plant workers' dissatisfaction with their jobs:

Their idea is not to run the plant; I don't think they'd know what to do with it. They don't want to tell the company what to do... (Terkel, 1972:264)

Pateman (1970) takes a closer look at workers' attitudes to participation and makes an important distinction between high and low level participation. Workers studied in participatory work settings showed considerably more interest in participating in decision-making at lower levels, involving everyday work issues than they did in participating in higher level decisions. Lack of desire to participate at higher levels may be accounted for in large part by socialization into existing hierarchical industrial structures where rule by
virtue of formal expertise and position on the hierarchy is accepted as necessary (Pateman, 1970:83; see also Heinz, forthcoming). However, Pateman argues that workers learn to participate by participating, that the self-confidence and sense of political efficacy gained by almost any degree of participation has a generalizing effect on an individual's sense of the possibilities of participation in other ways and in other contexts. Lower level participation, which is likely to be more highly motivated, is likely to increase workers' desires for higher level participation, which contains the greatest potential for real power. Such a circular development reverses the vicious circle of powerlessness in which most workers are caught in traditional work settings.

The formal rules and hierarchical distribution of power are expressions of values common to the larger society: order, obedience, formal rationality and impersonality. These values are firmly held by many of society's members who would not under present circumstances choose the freedom and the responsibility of a collective way of working and who Rothschild-Whitt describes as having a "non-democratic" character (1977:109). When feminists and other social movement activists challenge hierarchical, bureaucratic organization, they are challenging these values.

In reaction to the clearly defined and rigid structure of the bureaucracy, many of these activists attempted to form structureless, leaderless groups (Bunch and Fisher, 1976; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978) which were often unsuccessful. However, it is important to re-iterate here that far from being structureless, a well-developed collective has invented sophisticated techniques to assure its smooth functioning and to speed up its often cumbersome processes. Precisely because informal hierarchy and leadership do emerge to some extent in collectives, safeguards are built into the organization in order to avoid their development and entrenchment.
The development in collectives of these power-sharing structures highlights one difference between collectives and communes. Many communes either aim for freedom from all structures or organize themselves around a dominant leader (Gardner, 1978). Kanter (1972) concludes that rather than freeing themselves from all authority structures, many communes succeed only in subjecting themselves to different authority structures. Most present-day collectives, on the other hand, do not aim for a lack of structure. Rather, they aim to establish different, more flexible structures over which members have some control. Coover et al. (1977); Freeman (1975); Kokopeli and Lakey (1978); Joreen (1973); Lyons (1976); Mansbridge (1973); and Rothschild-Whitt (1977) are among those who have listed specific techniques for ensuring the equitable distribution of information, power and responsibility and therefore the limiting of personal autonomy within the group. These techniques include a plurality of tasks and wide distribution of responsibility for those tasks among members of the group; responsibility of each individual to the group, whether for accomplishment of specific tasks or authority for decision-making; redistribution of knowledge and skills by the skilled teaching the unskilled, by rotation of tasks of both a routine and a directing nature, and by study groups; meeting techniques designed to ensure that information is shared, everyone is heard, and the frequency and duration of each individual's speaking is controlled; participatory decision-making which may or may not be based on the consensus model; development of interpersonal skills and emotional support techniques, a support system for newcomers, and the use of professional group facilitators and criticism/self-criticism techniques.

Among the issues involved in the sharing of power, three stand out as deserving of a more detailed analysis. These are leadership, decision-making, and task allocation. Before proceeding to a discussion of these issues however, it should be re-emphasized that in addition to the techniques listed above,
members' personal commitment to the sharing of power and responsibility militates against the concentration of power. This sharing requires a commitment to the process of collectivity itself, an ideological commitment beyond that which most workers have to the traditional bureaucracies which claim eight hours of their day. The differences in commitment and motivation of workers constitutes one of the most striking contrasts between the nature of bureaucracy and collectivity. This contrast is illustrated by the following comments from the president of an automotive workers' local union and from a worker in a feminist collective.

The guys are not happy here. They don't come home and think, Boy, I did a great job today and I can't wait to get back tomorrow. That's not the feeling at all. I don't think he thinks a blasted thing about the plant until he comes back. He's not concerned at all if the product's good, bad, or indifferent. (Terkel, 1972:264)

I feel better about my involvement in the Collective than I've felt about anything else I've ever done...I feel that I've been totally honest with myself, and really expressed whatever I had to express. I've really played out a lot of qualities and that's been very satisfying...which makes it just impossible for me to imagine what else I'm going to do so that I can stay in a situation where I can really be myself, right deep down, at the basic level...(HC member, 1974)

3. Leadership

Both bureaucracies and collectives have to deal with very great differences among people in terms of aptitudes, competencies, knowledge and personality factors. Both organizational forms have also to deal with the need for direction, motivation and co-ordination of efforts. These two factors combine to shape issues of leadership within organizations.

Within bureaucracy, a need for strong leadership is assumed and the structures are firmly in place for responding to this need. In what Kokopeli and Lakey call "patriarchal leadership", whether authoritarian or paternalistic, the final responsibility is vested in one person...However much delegation of authority there is, the ultimate power rests with the person at the top. (1978:5)
What we commonly understand as 'leadership' qualities are cultivated in those who are moving upward in the hierarchy and actively discouraged or severely restricted among those who it is assumed will remain at the bottom.

In contrast, a collective is structured to preclude leaders. In theory, all members of a collective are equal participants in the running of the organization, both in making and in carrying out decisions.

...any groups that I've been involved in before, it's been like the president, the boss, you know, that whole kind of structure, and it just fascinated me in the beginning, that collective process, where there's actually no boss, or when...somebody from outside wants an answer to a question, say about whether we will agree to do a speaking engagement, and you have to say, "Well, I can't give an answer right now" and they say, "Well, who's the boss?" and you say, "Well, there is no boss" and they say, "Well, how can I find out?" and you say, "Well, it has to be brought up at a general meeting and we'll all decide"...that really flabbergasts people! (HC member, 1974)

In practice, however, most collectives do have leaders. Although all co-ordinating and chairing positions are rotated, members who are more experienced, knowledgeable, assertive or personally appealing do provide leadership, a fact which causes ambivalence and discomfort in the group.

There are definitely leaders in the Collective. It would be dishonest to say there are not. And that's okay for them to be leaders...my tendency within the Collective was to deny my leading ability. That wasn't always an honest thing for me to do. (HC member, 1974)

The following comment relates to the power of information as a basis of leadership:

One way [people get power at the Health Collective] is by being here a lot, and knowing everything that's going on. Another way is by being here for a long time, so that they have a lot of information to give to others. (HC member, 1976)

Partly because of techniques designed specifically to share information and power, such leadership is more flexible and open in a collective than in a hierarchical organization. Leadership that is not formalized and that is coupled with a commitment to sharing information, power and responsibility is less entrenched than is formal leadership in an organization committed to a
hierarchical structure. Kokopeli and Lakey point out that 'democratized leadership' spreads leadership functions around among more group members, and that where all group members can exercise leadership, members will take more responsibility for the group (1978:9).

Here I can be more of a leader than I would be elsewhere. I think we encourage leadership in each other. (HC member, 1976)

The Collective has been really good because I've had a chance to work out a lot of stuff...around being competent and being in charge, being able to do...things enough that I felt competent enough to take on lots of responsibility...I've developed a lot of confidence. I can go and speak now to groups of people pretty much at ease, and a couple of years ago you wouldn't have dragged me to speak to anybody. (HC member, 1974)

This empowering aspect is an important function of collectivity and has provided the motivation for many collective participants to remain involved in a group despite pressures of money shortages, time, and emotional confrontation.

The educational and consciousness-raising function of collectivity is also important in combatting non-democratic tendencies in participants (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). People who think of themselves as powerful and who have attained positions of strength have had to learn how to give up some of their power in order to avoid dominating other, less powerful members. Equally important as the empowering process is this experience of realizing personal power without using that power to control others.

The collective says a lot to me about learning how to share skills and learning how to give up all the things that you get from being good at something - being a powerful person and an important person. It just points up to me that all the ideals are possible. (HC member, 1974)

4. Decision-making

Decision-making differs in bureaucracy and collectivity in terms of who makes the decisions, the processes by which they are made, and what factors are admissible in making them. In a hierarchy, decisions are made at the top, by individuals or small committees, and passed down to those at the lower levels,
often resulting in dissatisfaction and resentments on the part of those who know that they have virtually no influence on the decisions that affect their jobs and their working lives (see Terkel, 1972). Where decisions are opened up to the group as a whole, voting is used, usually with little or no discussion at the rank and file level. The majority rules, often leaving a substantial dissatisfied minority. Even where attempts are made to get input or feedback from those at the lower levels, it is common knowledge within the bureaucracy that the power for the final decision rests with 'the boss'. In some cases, decentralized decision-making and even the appearance of participation is achieved without any relinquishing of control from the top, because the premises on which such decisions are based are controlled (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:86). In spite of personal resentments and frustration, most people throughout the bureaucracy accept the premise that such a system is the only way that decisions could be made. Many employees would not even be prepared to take part in the lengthy and demanding processes of genuine participatory decision-making (Pateman, 1970; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977; Terkel, 1972).

In collectives, decision-making is participatory, and decisions are negotiated (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:82). Not all collectives use consensus decision-making, but all collectives use some method of decision-making that is more participatory than that used in bureaucracy. Because consensus decision-making provides the most striking contrast with traditional bureaucratic decision-making and with voting and therefore best illuminates those aspects of the traditional processes that their opponents criticize, consensus will be the method described here.

Consensus decision-making stresses each person's contribution to the decision-making process. Each person's right to be heard is emphasized, and discussion continues until an agreement is reached. In both consensus decision-making and
in voting, although everyone may not agree that a particular decision was the best that could have been made, everyone must at least agree to accept that decision and to carry it out. Where the process of consensus differs from that of voting is that in the former, minority views are discussed at length and taken into account in the search for a solution. Because people are not polarized into a yes/no vote, there is increased opportunity for finding a middle ground; compromise is seen as a positive rather than an ineffectual solution, one which might not have been sought out in a different structure (Vancouver Women's Health Collective, 1977). One of the reasons why collectives do, in most cases, manage to reach an apparent consensus may be the degree of ideological homogeneity amongst members (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Participants' belief in the concept of consensus decision-making and commitment to searching for compromise solutions often override a specific disagreement.

I find that I respect people here. Even if I disagree, I'm willing to try something, because I'm committed to co-operating with people. It's commitment to the process. (HC member, 1976)

I don't think anybody goes away feeling bad...because if there's somebody feeling one way and somebody else feeling another way, there's usually somebody who can come along and pick up something that's in the middle of those two, that feels good to everybody. Just the fact that it's really working, that was the thing that amazed me most, from the very beginning...(HC member, 1976).

The innovative nature of collectives means that decisions are not made to stand for indefinite periods of time. There is a sense in collectives that if something does not work, it can be changed, or a decision revoked. This flexibility sometimes makes it easier for people to agree to try out a policy with which they do not feel entirely comfortable.

Group size is a crucial consideration in the selection of procedures for making decisions. The smaller the group, the easier it is to include all members as active participants in a decision. As the group becomes larger, more members are likely to remain passive and the process becomes more lengthy and
complex. Beyond a certain size, consensus methods involving all members are simply too cumbersome, and alternative methods of participation in the decision-making process must be developed. These alternative methods will necessarily include some form of representation but may also include consensus decision-making within a democratically selected body of representatives. Even within large groups, the possibilities exist for decentralizing decision-making and thus creating a situation where consensus methods are practical within manageable groups at a variety of levels.

Another way in which bureaucratic and collective decision-making differs is in the admissability of non-rational factors in the decision-making process. In bureaucracies, decision-making is above all a rational process; emotion is considered dysfunctional (Kanter, 1977; Shepard, 1977). This rational aspect of bureaucratic organization and decision-making was emphasized by Weber as a central strength of bureaucracy.

Hochschild is critical of Weber in his treatment of rational action, in which she feels he confuses rationality and emotionlessness and implies that:

...emotions and feelings are not positively required by the rational actions of individuals and the smooth functioning of institutions. (Hochschild, 1975:284).

Hochschild points out that emotions are a part of the everyday, rational functioning of organizations and are not restricted to crisis situations, when they may lead to irrational action. The bias against emotion and intuition in the workplace is nowhere as evident as in the decision-making process. To understand the extent to which this bias shapes that process, it is only necessary to imagine the form that decision-making would take if it was based on the assumption that emotion and intuition were the appropriate starting points for decision-making and reason was used as a check on emotional and intuitive factors and, in some cases, to further develop the ideas and concepts that they initiated.
Even the human relations model of bureaucracy did not challenge the primacy of reason as the governing factor in organizational decision-making (Kanter, 1977; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Shepard, 1977).

"Informal organization" - the play of emotion, sentiment, and politics - continued to be studied primarily among lower-ranking personnel, leaving the impression that only workers, and not managers, base their actions on "irrational" factors. (Kanter, 1977:24)

Kanter goes on to describe the rationale by which emotion was incorporated into bureaucracy.

When human relations theory filtered into the management level of corporations in the form of sensitivity training groups in the late 1950's and 1960's, it coexisted alongside theories and techniques for rational decision-making. Sensitivity groups were considered a vehicle for learning about relationships so as to master, not unleash, emotional factors counter-productive to the organization. (Kanter, 1977:24)

In collectives, on the other hand, emotion and intuition are incorporated into the decision-making process. Advocates of collectivity are committed to the development of the whole person, including both their intellectual/cognitive and their emotional/intuitive aspects; furthermore, participants recognize that emotion, in a practical sense, is an inevitable part of human interaction and therefore must be acknowledged and utilized rather than ignored or repressed.

As emotions are much more at the forefront of interaction in a small, participatory group than in an impersonal bureaucracy, dealing with them becomes much more imperative. Such an increase in emotional expression is likely to accompany any attempts to introduce aspects of collectivity into larger, more traditional groups.

In face-to-face groups, a person's ideas become heavily entwined with his emotional and psychological self...pressures increase to make decisions on the basis of feelings rather than on the grounds of 'rational', cost-benefit, self-interest. (Mansbridge, 1973:358)

One major effect of incorporating emotion into group processes is that participants have the freedom to express doubts or insecurities without fear of
being discounted in the decision-making process or losing the respect of colleagues (Galper and Washburne, 1976:50).

5. Division of labour

Bureaucratic organization is based on a principle of rationally dividing work up into separate, delimited tasks, which can be easily mastered and are not subject to the distractions inherent in 'trying to do more than one job at once.'

A structure built of separate roles rather than of whole persons allows the individual and the system to behave more rationally. (Simpson, 1972:1)

Herbst (1976) indicates that a basic principle of bureaucratic design is the splitting of decision-making from task performance. Roles are strictly limited (Kanter, 1977; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977; Simpson, 1972) and impersonal relations encouraged (Kanter, 1977; Gerth and Mills, 1958) in order to minimize distraction from the productive goals of the organization and maximize efficiency. Such a separation of jobs into specific tasks assigned to specific groups of people necessitates the creation of a new class of workers, called managers, to oversee and co-ordinate those responsible for specific parts of the whole.

In a bureaucracy, jobs, like everything else, are distributed hierarchically. The most creative jobs, with the greatest autonomy and responsibility are done by those at the top of the hierarchy, while the most routine, boring and circumscribed jobs are done by those at the bottom. Typically, people establish careers by advancing up the bureaucratic ladder. Such a pattern of work allocation, of course, supports the entire bureaucratic system: information and power are distributed accordingly so that those at the bottom can be more easily controlled by those at the top. Furthermore, jobs are assigned according to the sexual stereotypes of our society, resulting in men dominating the top levels and women predominating in the lower levels. Men do the thinking and make the policies, while women do the caretaking tasks (Kanter, 1977; Korda,
When the goals of an organization are not primarily rationality and efficiency, then there is no longer the same pressure to deal with individuals only in terms of specific roles. Indeed, when the goals of an organization include personal wholeness and the equal distribution of knowledge and power, then the rigid separation of roles becomes counter-productive. Rothschild-Whitt states that:

...the egalitarian and participatory ideals of the collectivist organization can probably not be realized where great differences exist in members' abilities to perform organizational tasks. For this reason, some alternative service organizations...devote a great deal of energy to rotating tasks and to cultivating a general knowledge about the work involved in the organization in place of specialized expertise. (1976:48, emphasis in original)

With a relatively high turn-over of staff, job rotation and task sharing help ensure that no one person becomes indispensable. One woman spoke of this practice in relation to power:

If a co-ordinating job is on a rotating basis, then it isn't as if one person has all the power, and everyone else will start turning to her for information...This is what we all have a real fear of, of not sharing information, and not sharing responsibility...(HC member, 1974)

Exclusive leadership depends on the mystification of tasks; therefore, one purpose of task rotation is to demystify the nature of all tasks in the organization and make the skills to master them available to all members.

...demystification...so well distinguishes the ethos of...collectivist organizations from that of bureaucratic organizations. For demystification entails, in its essence, the negation of the process of professionalization which occurs in most service organizations. The central purpose of this demystification process is to break down the usual division of labour and pretence of expertise, and to thereby allow all members of the organization to participate more equally in its control. (Rothschild-Whitt, 1976:82)

In such a situation, where there is no hierarchy of positions, career advancement is not a meaningful concept (Rochschild-Whitt, 1977).

The freedom and the challenge of the collective's approach to the division of labour is illustrated by the following comment:
Many of the things that were happening at the Collective were the kind of things I had always wanted to do in nursing, but because of professional restrictions...was never allowed to do. I was never allowed to really think and make decisions on the kind of level that I was allowed and encouraged to do at the Health Collective. (HC member, 1974)

At the simplest level, job rotation and task sharing is an attempt to enable everyone to share in both the interesting, creative tasks and the boring, dead-end ones (Galper and Washburne, 1976:48). At another level, it is an attempt to equally share the power and control of an organization. However, the issue is a controversial one; not all collective feminist groups have chosen to incorporate task rotation in the same way or for the same reasons (Hartsock, 1976-77).

6. Organizational style

A great deal of the difference between the organizational style of collectives and bureaucracies is illustrated by the process/product debate within the collective movement itself. Although there can be no simple equation of bureaucracy with product-orientation and collectivity with process-orientation, the nature and emphases of the processes used by each organizational form are very different. The process of bureaucracy is not unimportant, but it is not valued in and of itself in the same way it is in a collective.

The style of bureaucracy is ordered and predictable; the 'human element' is minimized and controlled by formal rules and implicit and explicit expectations.

The nature of bureaucracy, writes Weber:

...develops the more perfectly the more the bureaucracy is 'dehumanized', the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. This is the specific nature of bureaucracy and it is appraised as its special virtue. (Gerth and Mills, 1958:216)
In a hierarchical system based on relationships of superiority-inferiority (Herbst, 1976), where one must beat out someone else in order to gain a rung, the repression of emotion may be necessary for the maintenance of individuals' sense of themselves as acceptable people. If participants in that system allowed themselves to feel deeply - either the humiliation or anger of being constantly controlled by others, or, at the upper levels, the shame of oppressing others or the vulnerability that must be well concealed - the system would be in danger.

In his interviews with workers, Terkel (1972) has recorded this denial of emotions and some of the personal conflict and anger that it causes. A supervisor describes his conflict in a situation where he takes an older woman off the job in favour of a younger one:

My feelings can't come into play. What I do is what I have to do. This doesn't mean I won't get grey hairs, or feel kind of bad... (p.522, emphasis in original)

A president of a local autoworkers' union describes the situation at a General Motors plant:

...[they] try to take every movement out of the guy's day, so he could conserve seconds... to make him more efficient, more productive, like a robot... Our argument has always been: That's mechanical, that's not human.

The workers said, We perspire, we sweat, we have hang-overs, we have upset stomachs, we have feelings and emotions, and we're not about to be placed in a category of a machine. When you talk about that watch, you talk about it for a minute. We talk about a lifetime... (Terkel, 1972:261)

Women who venture out of the reproductive sphere into the productive sphere are, with a few exceptions, subject to the same strictures as are men. A switchboard operator describes the expectations people have of her:

You have to have a nice smiling voice. You can't be angry or come in like you've been out the night before... You always have to be pleasant - no matter how bad you feel. (Terkel, 1972:61)

A long distance operator points out the irony of talking to people all day, yet
being unable really to talk to anyone:

A big thing is not to talk with a customer. If you get caught talking with a customer, that's one mark against you. You can't help but want to talk to them if they're in trouble or if they're just feeling bad...But you can't...I'm a communications person but I can't communicate. (Terkel, 1972:66, emphasis in original)

It is interesting to note that the impersonality and routinization of bureaucracies is not complete, however. Kanter (1977) uses the secretary-boss relationship to demonstrate a situation within bureaucracies where rules, rationality, and impersonality are relatively lacking. Unfortunately, such relationships are governed by considerations of status, by personal wishes of the boss, and by bosses' demands for loyalty which may go beyond consideration of what is functional for the organization (Kanter, 1977:76), rather than by any deliberate attempt to humanize an organizational relationship.

Some workers are aware of the pressures placed on them by the denial of such a large part of themselves and feel resentment, rage or depression. Most cannot express their anger at the people or the situation at their workplace, so they turn it upon their families or upon themselves:

I can't blow up at him...I'd probably get fired. So instead I just get depressed. I may not even know I'm feeling bad, but it's just a gray cloud of depression....(Lyons, 1976:61)

Others seem not to be aware of the magnitude or the implications of the restrictions placed on them by their work situations:

I'm the kind of guy, if I was due for a raise I'm not gonna ask for it. If they don't feel I'm entitled to it, they're not gonna give it to me. If I don't deserve it, I'm not gonna get it. I don't question my boss, I don't question the company. (Terkel, 1972:250)

The denial of emotion, of vulnerability is not unique to the lower levels of the hierarchy (Terkel, 1972; Whyte, 1957). A retired chief executive officer of a corporation describes the climb of the ambitious executive up the corporate ladder:

As he struggles in this jungle, every position he's in, he's terribly lonely. He can't confide and talk with the guy working under him
[or] to the man he's working for. To give vent to his feelings, his fears, and his insecurities, he'd expose himself. This goes all the way up the line until he gets to be president. The president really doesn't have anybody to talk to, because the vice-presidents are waiting for him to die or make a mistake...

He can't talk to the board of directors, because to them he has to appear as a tower of strength, knowledge, and wisdom...The board of directors, they're cold, they're hard...They're interested in profits. They're interested in progress... (Terkel, 1972:533-4, emphasis in original)

In contrast to bureaucracy, collective control allows workers to structure both the product and the process of their work in accordance with their political and moral philosophy and personal styles (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:95).

The general style of collective ways of working is informal: sometimes noisy, sometimes chaotic, always subject to spontaneity which ranges from schedule changes to emotional outbursts. One of the explicit goals of collectivity is the integration of the whole person, which is expressed in the emphasis on process, emotions, personal considerations of members, generalized knowledge of the group's operations, and shared power and responsibility. The organizational style of collectives reflects their goals of community; friendship ties are instrumental in recruitment practices and group solidarity provides a good deal of the motivation and continuing strength of groups (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Social cohesion, co-operation, self-expression and self-determination are considered more important than efficiency (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:82). These emphases of collectivity can be summarized by two comments from Health Collective members who compared their work experiences at the Health Collective with other jobs they had had.

The more I've thought and talked about the Collective, the more I feel that there is a kind of integration between what I feel and what I really believe and the way we're working, and I don't feel that terrible split that I nearly always felt in any job I've had...(HC member, 1974)

It was a real experience for me to be totally congruent with the people that came to the Health Collective, to be totally truthful with them
to literally express and show parts of me that I thought they could relate to, to not have to constantly be negating part of my existence, which is what I had to do in my professional life before... (HC member, 1974)

This integrative strength of collectives is confirmed by Coover et al. (1977); Galper and Washburne (1976); Kokopeli and Lakey (1978); Mansbridge (1973); and Rothschild-Whitt (1977).

7. Organizational stability and change

All organizations have as a primary goal the stability to sustain themselves over time, whether that time period is an indefinite one or only as long as it takes to accomplish a defined task. At the same time, no successful group is static over time or completely unresponsive to the needs of its members or its environment. Therefore, all groups must have some mechanisms for responding to pressures and accomplishing change while minimizing the disruption this causes to the group. These mechanisms and the ideology that informs them vary widely in bureaucracy and in collectives.

Stability, rather than innovation, is a central feature of established bureaucratic groups. There is of course some flexibility within bureaucracy, which is necessary as a response to demands of changing circumstances and to control tension or conflict levels among workers. This flexibility is more evident within the informal structure of bureaucracy than it is within the network of formal rules and expectations. Innovation and change within a bureaucracy, running counter to the status quo within the organization, are approached cautiously: they generally follow a pre-determined procedure, governed by rational, and usually conservative considerations (Gerth and Mills, 1958; Zald and Ash, 1966). A cumbersome machinery for implementing change and an ideological position which resists change make the process of change a slow one in bureaucracies.

While flexibility is certainly a desirable characteristic in workers in
settings other than collectives, it is, in bureaucracy, not the essential characteristic it is in a collective. Change in a bureaucracy rarely originates from the workers at the lower levels, but is instigated by managers or directors and passed down to the workers as a fait accompli. Such a top-down process, by minimizing workers' involvement in and therefore commitment to the change, increases the likelihood that change will cause disruption. In collectives, however, not only is change a positive goal toward which members are oriented, but changes come about as a result of decision-making in which everyone has the opportunity to participate. Changes are made and implemented by the same people. Pateman (1970) cites evidence that the implementation of changes occurs most smoothly when workers have taken part in the decision-making process.

Weber describes organizational development in terms of institutionalization, bureaucratization, and goal displacement (Gerth and Mills, 1958). He sees organizational maintenance as one form of goal displacement in which:

participants in [a] structure have a stake in preserving the organization regardless of its ability to attain goals. (Zald and Ash, 1966:327)

According to what Zald and Ash call the Weber-Michels model:

Whatever the form of goal transformation, it is always in the direction of greater conservatism (the accommodation of organizational goals to the dominant societal consensus). (1966:327)

Although this model of organizational development may apply to most bureaucratic organizations in this society, it provides an inadequate explanation of many social movement organizations (Zald and Ash, 1966), particularly anti-bureaucratic organizations such as collectives. Collectives stress organizational and personal flexibility; stability or longevity may not be a primary value of alternative institutions. These organizations may develop in ways which diverge markedly from the model of organizational development proposed by Weber and Michels. Where an organization maintains an anti-society/anti-bureaucratic stance, objectives may actually become more radical.
Alternative institutions may disband or radically change their goals or their tactics when goals have been judged to have been met, tactics are inappropriate, or when, for some other reason, the purpose for which they were formed is no longer being served.

On at least two occasions when the Health Collective faced crises of this nature, serious consideration was given to the possibility of disbanding. Lengthy discussion of goals, tactics, and members' commitments resulted in a re-formation of these in the direction of greater radicalism.

As the collective model of organization depends on innovation and experimentation rather than on well-accepted precedents, it is more often under discussion within its own ranks than is the hierarchical model. One of its explicit goals is to be responsive to the needs of its members and its clients. Members' ongoing evaluation of their activities creates a flexibility which helps to make organizations responsive to pressures for change. Women at the Health Collective understood that one of the reasons people did not follow through on some tasks was that their priorities had changed.

I think that it's true that some people don't do what they say they're going to do but I think that maybe they just aren't doing the same kind of things that people who had been here before decided the Health Collective should do. We need to look at what people want to be doing and what people are feeling very down on doing and what things people would like to explore because we don't have to be absolutely fixed or consistent, you know...people leave and new people come in, and that's how it goes on - goes on and changes... (HC member, 1976)

While the demands of creating collective structure in an ongoing process result in some problems for members, their commitment to the ideal of collectivity and the excitement of creating something new and something they feel is socially important goes a long way toward sustaining them in their efforts.

I find the way the Collective operates...a fascinating experience...Collectivity is really struggled for...in any group I've been involved in everyone bitches about the establishment and the hierarchy...and then as soon as they become an organization they just duplicate it...in the Health Collective there is this constant effort, this constant awareness not to let that happen... (HC member, 1974)
B. Problems and limitations of collectivity

1. Innovation

Probably the most pervasive problems of developing and working in a collective organization stem from the fact that it is a relatively uncharted territory.

As an emergent collectivity, the social movement cannot depend upon tradition, for it is in the process of making traditions, not following them. (Killian, 1964:39)

Unlike traditional organization, a collective way of working demands that decisions be made about how power will be shared, who will provide leadership in what situations, how decisions will be made, how tasks will be allocated, and how accountability will be maintained. At the very least, these decisions are time- and energy-consuming; at worst, they may generate tension and conflict which must be resolved.

The distribution of information, power and responsibility, for example, is far more problematic within a collective than within a bureaucracy because collectives are breaking new ground, trying to combat centuries of socialization and social organization which have geared its participants to inequality, competition, and direction by leaders. Collectives make a lot of mistakes and have relatively little experience or support from a counter-cultural institutional network to fall back on when they do. Not only do they lack support from traditional social institutions, but those institutions sometimes work actively to undermine them (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).

Partly because of the special difficulties of innovation and partly because collectives are trying to deal with people as whole people rather than limiting their dealings with them to one clearly segmented role, members have to work harder at being part of a collective than they would in a traditional organization, where expectations and limitations of roles are clearly defined. The experimental nature of the organizational form and the fact that innovation,
flexibility and responsiveness to changing situations are integral components
of the collective ideology make instability a constant factor in a collective.
While the innovative character of alternative institutions provides much of its
appeal to members, it also provides much of its frustration. The following
comment captures this dual nature of the innovative process of building a
collective organization:

I sat through meetings a year ago, and I heard the same things being
said and I heard the same discussions happening, and then a year later
we'd go through that again, and it's frustrating for me, but I know
that's part of the collective process. New people come in and things
evolve, and sometimes they go forward and sometimes they go back, and
there's a beauty in watching all that happen. There's an awful lot
of frustration in it too, but there is a beauty. (HC member, 1976)

Zurcher (1973) describes what he calls the "mutable personality type" as the
kind of person most likely to thrive in such a changing, innovative society.

2. Power sharing

...each individual brings to the group different levels of expertise,
personal attractiveness, verbal skill, self-confidence, access to
information, and interest in the task. Therefore each group must
(a) reduce inequalities that can be reduced and (b) understand and
find ways to deal with inequalities that cannot be reduced. (Mansbridge,
1973:361)

The amount of commitment these two tasks require is enormous and constitute one
of the greatest deterrents of all to the proliferation of the collective model
in society. Both problems are, to an unknown extent, a reflection of social
assumptions about the necessity of inequality. As one member of a women's
collective which was fraught with problems said:

People don't know how to relate to each other as equals. We have
lived so long either telling or being told what to do, we don't
know how to work with others in any other way. (1979)

Members must possess certain personality characteristics in order to adapt to
equality of participation, but there is evidence that these characteristics
can be developed by active participation itself (Pateman, 1970; Rothschild-
Whitt, 1977).
One of the most frequent criticisms of collectivity is the alleged tendency within groups to become bureaucratic and conservative (see Gerth and Mills, 1958; Zald and Ash, 1966). However, the criticism does not apply to all groups, particularly those in radical social movements. Zald and Ash (1966) demonstrate that bureaucratization and increased conservatism are not inevitable processes in social movement organizations. Rothschild-Whitt (1977) also demonstrates the resistance of alternative institutions to such tendencies.

Newman (1980) relates this tendency in collective groups to issues of money: she says that not only are groups forced to adopt bureaucratic elements in order to meet the requirements of funding agencies, but the introduction of the division between paid and unpaid workers causes hierarchical relations to develop within the group. Of the groups she studied, the most successful in maintaining non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic structures were those which were self-supporting and did not need to accept money from government sources. To some extent, Newman's conclusions were supported by evidence from the Vancouver Women's Health Collective, where relations between paid and unpaid workers, were problematic in terms of issues of leadership and responsibility. However, collectives have become increasingly aware of these and other dangers which accompany a lack of structure and a lack of institutionalized ways to deal with inequalities. The alternative organizational structures developed by collective groups have arisen partly out of this recognition.

The problem of inequality takes a variety of forms within collectivity: competition among members, resentments against too-powerful members, frustrations of the relatively powerless, guilt about taking too much or not enough responsibility, frustration at the time and emotional energy it takes to deal with these issues (Allison, 1978; Bunch and Fisher, 1976; Galper and Washburne, 1976; Freeman, 1975; Hartsock, 1974; 1976-77; Joreen, 1973; Kleiber and Light, 1978;
Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Mansbridge, 1973; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977; for an examination of tendencies to develop hierarchy within collectivity, see Newman, 1980).

Because it runs counter to the ideology of collectivity, leadership is more subtle and less acknowledged than it is in a hierarchy. As such it is a source of ambivalence and tension in the group, which is difficult for members to deal with honestly. In the Health Collective, leadership is seen both as positive, in terms of the energy and direction some people give to the group, and as negative, in terms of the maintenance of unequal relationships among members. The most powerful women in the Collective were both respected and resented for that power. The role of expert is looked down upon in collectives; to be a 'star' is to hoard knowledge and power for oneself. On the other hand, taking pleasure in one's expertise, one's competence, is seen as important, and is a difficult thing for many women to do (Bunch and Fisher, 1976; Harstock, 1976-77; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978). One woman spoke of her own experience of this conflict:

[As a result of working at the Health Collective] I'm much more conscious of my own authority and how I use that authority...I...got more in touch...with my conflicts around leading, because I tend to lead, and...I got much more in touch with not leading, and...I got to feeling very self-conscious about being a leader, and not wanting to be a leader, and I don't think that's good either. [Another Health Collective member] would keep on saying to me 'Don't suppress that, don't deny that part of yourself, because that's a very strong part of you.' (HC member, 1974)

One member of several feminist collectives spoke of problems of feminist leadership:

Women's competence is not trusted. Competent women are thought to be power tripping. We are just in the process of developing models of how to respect competence without letting competent people take over, or feeling threatened that they will. (1979)

Leaders feel guilty for their positions but also place some of the responsibility on those in the group who do not take power.
...Even talking about being competitive...isn't too easy for me to deal with...I'm not comfortable with the leadership role that I have...because it seems like my power trip...it made me really uptight, being referred to as the 'expert', because it just kept me doing those trips - like I dig being seen as the expert, and as long as people keep setting it up, I'll keep jumping in... (HC member, 1974)

The difficulties with the theory and practice of leadership in collectives have come about partly because of a confusion between the "role of leader" and the "functions of leadership" (Coover et al., 1977; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978).

This difference is important because groups, organizations and societies do need leadership but they do not need leaders! They need the functions to be filled, but not by one (or a few) leaders. (Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978:7)

Recognizing that we do not all have equal abilities, St. Joan says:

The idea of leadership among political equals, if leadership is seen as a function, is not the contradiction it appears to be. (1976:74, emphasis in original)

Hartsock (1976-77), too, stresses the necessity of recognizing the differing abilities which people can contribute to the group, the ability to provide direction or focus being only one of them. "Shifting leadership" (St. Joan, 1976) depends on an individual taking on certain leadership functions for a specified period of time, cultivating in herself the ability to let go of these functions, and the rest of the group learning at the same time to take over her functions. This recognition of "mutual dependency and responsibility" (p.74-5) is a central feature of sharing leadership among political equals (see also Bunch and Fisher, 1976).

Clearly, such a model of leadership is appropriate only under relatively benign conditions. In situations of crisis or serious conflict involving large numbers, for example, swift, arbitrary and authoritarian leadership may be imperative (Becker, 1978). If leadership models within collectivity are not flexible enough to incorporate such contradictions, they may founder under extreme stress. The existence of situations where collectivity does not offer the best solution to a problem is not a cause for rejecting collectivity as an
organizational form. Rather it demonstrates the need for advocates of collectivity to recognize the limitations of their model and to incorporate techniques from the bureaucratic model where such techniques can be useful.

The responsibility that goes with power is also a source of tension, both to those who assume the responsibility and to those who have trouble assuming it. One relatively new Health Collective member analyzed an incident that occurred between her and a more experienced member:

...I was afraid to accept responsibility and was laying that down as her fault. Here I am feeling like somebody who isn't important, like I couldn't do things very well, putting the blame on people like her for not teaching us how to work on phone information lines. When her trip was just the opposite...feeling angry at the new people for not taking more responsibility, and feeling guilty at the same time that maybe she should be teaching us more... (1974)

Accountability is a problem in many collectives because of the lack of formal rules, rewards and sanctions governing task accomplishment. Given the nature of hierarchical society and authoritarian socialization, it is not surprising that some individuals do not function well when they are not told clearly what to do and threatened with punishment if they do not do it. Although a collective is somewhat self-selecting in terms of members who are willing and able to take responsibility for themselves, irresponsibility is a recurring, if usually minor problem in collectives. Many collective members are loath to institute formal structures and procedures for accountability because they feel such structures are contradictory to their respect for individuals' autonomy and sense of responsibility. While such a position reflects collective members' positive attitudes toward their fellow members, it may cause problems in accomplishing the work of the group.

A variety of techniques used to address this problem have already been mentioned. In addition, discussions about group expectations of individual members, members' commitments to each other and the group, and the effects on the group of failure to fulfill responsibilities are used to educate and put pressure
on members (see Kleiber and Light, 1978).

The ideology of the group is a strong force shaping members' behaviour. Without this ideological commitment, collectivity will not 'work': consensus could not be reached, too much time would be consumed by constant struggles about objectives and procedures, and people would not be motivated to follow through on their specific task commitments. A similar degree of ideological homogeneity is required at the upper levels of bureaucracy (Kanter, 1977).

In both situations, recruitment procedures reflect this necessity for homogeneity; too-great discrepancies among members would undermine the system. The ideological commitment of most members of this society to the bureaucratic model of organization and to rational efficiency is one of the major factors sustaining the bureaucratic organizational form and therefore one of the major obstacles to introducing elements of collectivity into traditional organizations.

Collectivity's need for democratic personality types may also constitute a problem: participants who possess non-democratic personality characteristics can cause serious difficulties in some groups. However, there is some evidence that people learn to participate by participating, and that people actively involved in collective groups adapt to and become skilled at a co-operative way of working (Marković, forthcoming; Pateman, 1970; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).

The problems inherent in consensus decision-making are typical of those inherent in the process of collectivity itself. The time it takes, the domination of the relatively submissive and ignorant by the assertive and knowledgeable, or conversely, the assumption that all can contribute equally to a given decision or task, the restriction it places on group size, the emotionality it engenders, and the need for a high degree of homogeneity among members are all potentially serious problems. Consensus decision-making, like collectivity as a whole, requires a considerable amount of commitment to the process itself.

In order to avoid constant struggle, members must decide first that the process
is one to which they want to devote large amounts of time and energy (see Bunch and Fisher, 1976:2). In groups using the consensus model, assumptions about the superiority of the method may be taken for granted and any suggestions to the contrary seen as 'heresy'. One Health Collective member admitted:

'It isn't necessarily self-evident why we have consensus, or what is is. I didn't understand at first why we didn't just vote, although I never admitted that to anyone.' (1976)

Some of the difficulties of this method are highlighted by a Collective member who had remained committed to the consensus method over a period of years:

Consensus decision-making can involve a very subtle form of coercion in a group. It is important that the group first agree on how decisions should be made, either by consensus or by voting. Once people agree on the method, then the decisions can be made without having to always and endlessly discuss the method. And you know, decisions can be made satisfactorily by voting. It is possible to use that method without being evil. It does work if people agree to do it that way. And it's true that consensus does often take a long time! It can be a very tedious process, especially if everyone is not really committed to it, or very skilled in the techniques. (1976)

Task rotation, while it serves positive functions in a collective, also creates problems of its own. Rothschild-Whitt comments on the sacrifice that many alternative organizations are prepared to make in order to demystify and rotate tasks and thus increase the distribution of knowledge and power.

...by collectively reassigning organizational tasks by considerations of who stands to learn the most from a job, who has been at their job 'too long', and who most wants to do a job, rather than who is most experienced and/or talented at the job, they are sacrificing a certain amount of organizational efficiency and productivity, at least in the short-run. (This flies in the face of the supposition in the Human Relations model that worker satisfaction is directly related to productivity and efficiency) (1976:82, emphasis in original)

Other feminist writers have pointed out the contradictions inherent in the rotation of tasks. Such rotation ignores the needs of a person to become competent in a role and to continue to develop and use this competence in a satisfying way. It also negates the value for the organization of the accumulation of knowledge and skills by any one person - as soon as a person becomes competent he/she is assigned to another task and a new person must be
trained. Hartsock argues that the division of labour and rotation of tasks in collectives fragments workers in the same ways that capitalist labour does, often preventing them from experiencing the satisfaction that comes from managing a task from beginning to end. She says that such a system:

...treats its members as interchangeable and equivalent parts. It reproduces the assembly line of the modern factory, but instead of running the work past the people, people are run past the work. (1976-77:12)

In face of such drawbacks many collectives are experimenting with various ways of accomplishing task rotation, in order to minimize its organizational and personal costs while still benefitting from its advantages.

3. Process/product tension

The tension between process and product is one that has to be dealt with in one way or another by all collective groups. While the problem of balancing a product-orientation with an emphasis on process may be greater for men than for women (Mansbridge, 1973), this shift in emphasis is likely to be difficult for both sexes within collectivity. The question is not whether the conflict can be avoided but whether it will result in rifts between the 'process people' and the 'product people' or in new ways of combining these two concerns (Crow, 1978; Riddle, 1978; Sparks, 1978).

Most would agree that a certain loss of efficiency is inevitable in work organizations that pay considerable attention to the process of how work gets done (Mansbridge, 1973; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977). Participants have to weigh this loss against the gains of a more human approach to work. On the other hand, there is a danger in alternate institutions of over-reacting to the production-orientation of bureaucracy by placing too much emphasis on process to the detriment of production.

Focus on product allows us to have the experience of conceptualizing goals, of having the power to create and implement. Exclusive product focus, though, can allow us to view persons, including ourselves, as objects to be used. We may push ourselves beyond the levels of good health and sanity because the product deadline can't wait...
Focus on process allows us to take ourselves and our experience seriously, to realize that our loving is inextricably intertwined with our working. Exclusive focus on process, though, can maintain focus so exclusively on the HOW that we never get to the WHAT and people get burnt out from feeling like they never get anything done. Continuous introspection is like pulling the scab off the wound to see if it is healing... (Riddle, 1978:23)

The balance between process and product is a shifting one. In the short-term, the problem can be solved by emphasizing process and product in differing degrees for different tasks, depending on the needs of the group. In the long-term, emphases of alternative groups appear to shift as members' goals and political analyses shift. The reaction in the early and mid-seventies to the rigid product-orientation of bureaucracy was a strong emphasis on process; at the present time, there appears to be a swing back in some groups to a recognition of the importance of productivity in a renewed attempt to balance the two extremes.

In recognition of real differences between members' goals, some conflict situations might be best solved by dividing into sub-groups focusing on different goals and means while remaining within the same organization.

4. Time

...a boss can hand down a bureaucratic order in a fraction of the time it would take a group to decide the issue democratically. (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:104)

Time is a major drawback of working collectively and is a central issue in many of the processes that distinguish collectivity from bureaucracy, including the process/product debate itself. It is a problem that has occupied most analysts of alternative institutions (see for example, Kanter and Zurcher, 1973; Mansbridge, 1973; Rothschild-Whitt, 1976, 1977; Pateman, 1970). A change in values is a necessary prerequisite to an acceptance of the expenditure of time on matters not usually defined as work. Women as well as men have been socialized to value efficiency and most experience some difficulty in adjusting to the slower pace of collectivity. One veteran of several...
successful collective endeavours commented:

I had to come to grips with reconciling myself to a loss of efficiency. I had to learn to appreciate the sharing and the collectivity for its own sake, and it was worth it. (1979)

Health Collective members expressed considerable frustration about the amount of time spent on 'non-business' issues. New guidelines have to be established about what does and does not constitute 'work'.

Part of me feels that the time I spend just talking with someone else I'm working with about what's going on in my life and in her life is crucial to how we and the organization are working. But it's still really hard to let myself see that as work, because traditionally, that just isn't. (HC member, 1974)

Not all the problems of time and efficiency in a collective are associated with this emphasis on the personal. Information dispersal throughout all levels of an organization; education to allow potentially equal input into policy-making; consciousness-raising to help reticent participants develop their potential for taking power and dominant participants to give up some of their power; consensus decision-making; distributing and rotating tasks; criticism/self-criticism sessions - all these take a great deal of time and reduce efficiency in a collective. Mansbridge notes that:

The great amount of time needed for participatory decision-making can make quick decisions in emergencies almost impossible, can lead to frustration and boredom among the members, and can cause divisions between those who see their time as more or less valuable. (1973:356)

There is a recognition in collectives that although some problems of time are inherent in collectivity, many of their operating procedures could be streamlined without sacrificing an attention to process.

I'm sure we're inefficient. In some ways we're very efficient, and we accomplish things that being highly businesslike we'd never get to, but there are other ways that we're not. There are duplications, because there aren't enough plans, not enough co-ordination. (HC member, 1974)

A belief that everyone must be involved in every single decision, no matter how insignificant, causes a lot of time and person hours to be wasted in collectives.

At some point in the collective's growth, you just have to recognize
that if every decision is made by every member, the collective will collapse under the weight of detail. You just have to have faith that other people will handle things okay. And you have to learn to live with disappointments when the decision made is not the one that you would have made! (member of collective food distribution warehouse, 1979)

Herbst (1976) also emphasizes this need for flexibility in decision-making and the role played by mutual trust and commitment to a common goal in obviating the need for group decision-making in all cases. He stresses that what is important in the assigning of certain decisions to small groups or to individuals is that all group members have access to the relevant information and an understanding of how the specific task or decision fits into the organizational strategy as a whole.

While the problem of time is a concern to advocates of collectivity, it is not the uni-dimensional issue it is to bureaucrats, to whom the equation of time with money is all-important. However, the collective's sacrifice of efficiency in favour of human well-being had led Rothschild-Whitt (1976, 1977) to point out that a collective organization is unlikely to be able to compete effectively with a traditional organization in the production of similar goods or services. Where it is able to maintain itself its goals are qualitatively different from those pursued by bureaucratic organizations.

5. Emotion

At the Law Collective a member warns that "plants die here from the heavy vibes". (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977:107)

In a small, face-to-face group where emotions are allowed relatively free play, tensions are inevitably generated. These tensions may be especially threatening because the group depends on consensus decision-making (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977: 108). An example of the kind of issue that causes tension in a collective is that of remuneration: in the absence of formal rules for the distribution of a group's scarce resources, tension may build up. Because material incentives are not acknowledged as important motives in collective groups (Rothschild-Whitt,
open discussion of these issues is not welcomed.

In a small participatory group which lacks formal rules to govern behaviour, avoidance of personal feelings can result in a build-up of emotional conflict which may be destructive of the group. On the other hand, too much time and energy devoted to emotional issues may result in little else being accomplished. Mansbridge (1973) emphasizes the time that such an organization is bound to spend on emotional issues, and the conflict that adjusting to such a shift in emphasis may create. The issue of dealing with emotions in a work organization is closely bound up with the process/product debate, and involves the same shift in values and need to re-define what constitutes 'work'.

Accepting the need to spend time on emotions also means reassessing the values given to 'production' and 'maintenance' activities in our society...both women and men often accept the larger society's judgement that achievement is more important than affiliation. (Mansbridge, 1973:360)

Mansbridge suggests the use of professional sensitivity trainers to help the group learn how to cope with emotional tension among members. Some groups prefer to structure their own ways of dealing with emotional tensions, such as the criticism/self-criticism sessions incorporated into many collectives.

Conversations and interviews with members of a variety of collectives reveal a range of positions groups have taken on this issue of emotion; however, almost without exception, informants have been aware of the power that this issue has to sustain or destroy a collective.

6. External constraints

While the focus of this thesis is on the internal dynamics and problems of collectives, it is important to at least note some of the external constraints on the development of collectivity.

At the present time, social requirements for efficiency and productivity militate against the large-scale democratization and, more particularly, feminization of organizations. Prevailing ideology, and especially prevailing ideas
about what constitutes 'progress' act as deterrents to the implementation of collective principles and practices in most work organizations in Western society. To the extent that large-scale organizations are organized around principles of maximum efficiency and productivity, and therefore subject to enormous pressures to produce and to be competitive by keeping costs down, organizational size acts as a constraint on the development of collectivity. Collectivity's requirements for participation, face-to-face interaction, and direct control place a particularly heavy burden on large organizations. While small organizations may be subjected to many of the same pressures as large ones, their smaller size makes the implementation of some aspects of collectivity less cumbersome and more easily manageable. Therefore, collectivity may be able to be introduced into these smaller organizations without major reductions in efficiency and productivity. See French and French (1975) and Meyer (1972) for discussions of the effects of size on organizational structure.

While organizational size, then, does act as a constraint on the development of collectivity, there are undoubtedly ways in which collective principles can be incorporated into large groups. Some of these ways are discussed in Chapter 5 under 'Implications'. Others, including feminizing practices not included in most existing projects, can, at this point, only be the subject of speculation. It is important to remember here that, in order for principles of collectivity to have some impact on organizational theory and practice, collectivity does not have to be applied to large-scale organizations in its entirety. Significant changes can be made by introducing elements of collectivity into large organizations without converting them into small collectives. (See French and French, 1975; Herbst, 1976; Pateman, 1970.)

Other external constraints on the growth of collectivity include lack of financial support, lack of institutional support, and in many cases outright opposition from the rest of society. Opposition is manifested often in such
practical forms as the over-zealous application of zoning or building regulations, or the posing of legal or regulatory obstacles to, for example, incorporation as co-operatives. Underlying this lack of practical and material support, and crucial to the failure of collectives to proliferate, is a lack of ideological support in the larger society for alternatives to bureaucracy. While ideological support from within the movement may be strong, so far, organizations out of the mainstream of social structures lack any financially strong, supportive alternative institutional network. Community-based co-operative credit unions, which offer low-cost financial help to non-traditional community groups, are one positive step in this direction.

The issue of funding is integral to the survival of collective groups, and overlaps with issues of group size, relationships with government and other funding agencies, lack of other institutional support, and lack of ideological support from the larger society. Newman (1980) has demonstrated that organizations which are funded by government have difficulty in maintaining a non-bureaucratic, non-hierarchical structure, whereas organizations that are self-supporting are relatively successful in that regard. However, Rothschild-Whitt has pointed out that most collective organizations cannot compete with traditional organizations in the production of goods and services. She says that the most successful alternative groups are those which produce something that is qualitatively different from that which is offered by traditional organizations. Loney (1974) has described the devastating effects on social movements of government monies paid to radical activists which redirects their energies into areas that are less threatening to the status quo.

Important as these considerations are, they do not provide a focus of this thesis and will not be explored in detail. It is worth pointing out, however, that in order for collectives to become an increasingly viable alternative they will have to solve some of the problems of their relationship with the larger
society. The nature of this relationship and its problems for the development of collective groups on a larger scale is a crucial area for future research. See Kanter and Zurcher for a discussion of some of these issues in the context of the evaluation of organizational alternatives. For discussions of some of the other external factors in the success or failure of collectives and other social movement organizations, see Curtis and Zurcher (1973); Loney (1974); McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977); Newman (1980); Simpson and Gulley (1962); Wilson (1977); Zald and Ash (1966).

C. Summary

In this chapter, I have compared the principles and practices of bureaucracy and collectivity. The greatest emphasis has been given to the ways in which power is organized: power is looked at in terms of control, accountability and responsibility, the distribution of information, and assumptions about human nature on which these organizational forms are based. Patriarchal and democratic leadership styles are contrasted and the fulfillment of leadership functions in collectivity examined. Consensus decision-making is described as the form of decision-making which contrasts most strikingly with methods used in bureaucracy. It's participatory nature and the incorporation of emotion into the decision-making process are stressed.

The ways in which labour is divided in hierarchical bureaucracies and non-hierarchical collectives are compared. The functions served by task rotation and task sharing in collectivity are discussed: the sharing of power, the distribution and demystification of knowledge, and personal integration. The styles of the two organizational forms are contrasted, noting bureaucracy's emphasis on efficiency, order, rationality, emotional control and predictability, and collectivity's emphasis on process, informality, emotion and the creation of community. The effects of bureaucracy's stress on stability and collectivity's...
stress on innovation are examined, with particular attention to organizational flexibility and responsiveness.

Finally, the problems and limitations of collectivity are examined in some detail. These problems include the instability inherent in innovation, the pressure of constantly inventing new organizational techniques; problems of inequality and domination; potential personal fragmentation in task rotation; tension between process-orientation and product-orientation; time consumption and inefficiency; emotional intensity; and external constraints. Some attention is given to the ways in which collectives attempt to solve these problems.

Throughout this chapter, emphasis has been placed on the high degree of emotional and ideological commitment of members which is necessary for successful collectivity and the role played by this commitment in solving the problems of collectivity and in sustaining members when problems cannot be solved. This commitment provides an attraction for collective members and is a source of strength for groups. Because of the demands it places on members, in terms of both time and emotional involvement, the necessity for this commitment is also one of the reasons why collectivity has not proliferated as an organizational form in this society.

Too little is known about the actual ability of collectivity to adapt to a society based on productivity, competition and rapid growth, or of the potential for applying in a limited way some of the principles and practices of collectivity in a bureaucratic setting. However, it seems clear that collectivity as it has been defined in Chapter 1 has limitations that cannot be ignored, in terms of its ability to compete in bureaucratic organizations in the production of goods and services on a large scale. Any adoption of collectivity as an organizational form necessarily involves a re-definition of goals which shifts the emphasis from productivity to qualitatively different aims of human devel-
opment. The smaller size and lesser productivity of collectives are integral parts of their ideological stance; how far collectives can maintain this stance while still remaining viable in society is an important question for advocates of alternative organizational forms.

In the next chapter, the connection will be made between the two organizational forms discussed in this chapter and the masculine and feminine principles set out in Chapter 2.

Notes
1. Because of the nature of human beings, however, autonomy, even in those at the bottom of the hierarchy, is unlikely to be completely destroyed (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977).

2. The extensive research done by Kleiber and myself on the Vancouver Women's Health Collective from 1974 to 1978 (see Chapter 1) serves as a source of many of the quotes included in this and the following chapter. When quoting members of the Vancouver Women's Health Collective, HC will be used to designate 'Health Collective'.

3. Joreen (1973) and Freeman (1975), whose discussions of structureless groups exhibit some confusion between structurelessness and alternate, flexible forms of structure, nevertheless do indicate some of the problems inherent in an avoidance of all structure. Unfortunately, partly because of writings such as these, structurelessness came to represent to the same people anti-bureaucratic organization, and were sometimes used to illustrate the unworkability of any organizational form that was not hierarchical and bureaucratic.

4. Further discussion of these techniques may be found in the above sources or in Kleiber and Light (1978).
5. Pateman (1970) offers some evidence to the contrary from democratic work enterprises in Britain. In addition, participants in alternative collectives in Vancouver have suggested that the efficiency of bureaucracy is a myth, and that the time consumed by collectivity's attention to process may, at least in part, be balanced by the time consumed by bureaucracy's concern with 'red tape'.

6. See Note 5 above.
CHAPTER 4

MASCULINE AND FEMININE ORIENTATIONS OF BUREAUCRACY AND COLLECTIVITY

A. Introduction

In this chapter, I will integrate the material in the preceding chapters into what is the central issue of this thesis: I will try to demonstrate the masculine nature of bureaucracy and the feminine nature of collectivity. The exceptions to these tendencies notwithstanding, I will argue that bureaucratic organizational forms embody much of what we have come, in this society, to recognize as 'masculine' and that collectivity embodies what we have come to recognize as 'feminine'. In so arguing, I will outline some of the connections between the feminist movement and the development of alternative, anti-bureaucratic institutions.

B. The development of bureaucracy as a masculine organizational form

The power structures of bureaucratic society have been largely male designed and developed.

Men have designed society and the structure of work around their own impulses and their sense of belonging together, as if they were in some mysterious way guardians of the sacred flame of progress, wealth, energy, achievement...(Korda, 1973:62)

Kanter (1975, 1977), tracing the development of bureaucracy as a masculine organizational form, points out that contrary to the definition of organizations as 'sex-neutral machines' (1975:46), masculine principles dominated their authority structures. The qualities valued in bureaucracy were those assumed to be present and socially encouraged in men.

This "masculine ethic" elevated the traits assumed to belong to men with educational advantages to necessities for effective organizations: a tough-minded approach to problems; analytical abilities
abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interest of task accomplishment; and a cognitive superiority in problem-solving and decision-making. (Kanter, 1975:43)

It was a logical step, for men who equate these qualities with manliness, to transfer them to the workplace, where men are paramount. Women's supposed lack of these qualities was used as a way of excluding them from positions of power in bureaucracies. Kanter (1975) cites a survey in which managers stated that women were "temperamentally unfit" for management (p.47).

The masculinization of bureaucracy resulted in the classical model of that form which, as Kanter says:

...was oriented toward, and assumed to be capable of, suppressing irrationality, personality, and emotionality, and people who had these unfortunate characteristics were devalued and kept from influencing the otherwise flawless machine...bureaucracy was the truly 'passionless' organization (1975:45)

Shepard (1977) observes that historically, the military was an effective training ground for men in bureaucratic organization, where the art of being a superior or a subordinate, and of giving orders unfeelingly or obeying them unquestioningly was all-important.

A major way in which efficiency is maximized in bureaucracy is by the reduction of distracting personal factors. Not only is emotion minimized or ignored, but roles are strictly segregated in order to avoid conflict between, for example, the concerns and values of home and family and those of the workplace. It has already been demonstrated in Chapter 2 how, in this society, such role segregation and emotional suppression represent masculine ways of being in the world. Unlike women, men are encouraged to see their occupation as central to their lives and home and family as secondary. Such a clear demarcation and valuation of spheres minimizes disruption caused by role conflict and makes it easy for men to fit into bureaucratic work structures (Coser and Rokoff, 1971). In a bureaucrat's life:
Work...is dominant. Everything else is subordinate and the executive is unable to compartmentalize his life. Whatever the segment of it - leisure, home, friends - he instinctively measures it in terms of how well it meshes with his work. (Whyte, 1975:161)

Shepard describes the traditional bureaucracy which:

produce[d] an adult male who was dedicated to the disciplined performance of his organizational role, and who was capable of subordinating himself for the purpose of moving upward...This depersonalization with respect to work extended to interpersonal communication. Articulate, rational, fact-based, cause-effect discourse was a critical success skill. Interaction with the boss should be businesslike. Subordinates were to be directed and evaluated. Issues among peers should be resolved by the boss.

Relationships with subordinates were to be impersonal - firm, but fair...If men experienced...anxiety...they were not to show it...careers could be damaged by a show of feeling, especially the warmer emotions...supportive behaviour of any kind was rare; admitting a need for help from others was a sign of weakness; offering help was a putdown. (1977:389-90)

Shepard, like Kanter, traces the history of bureaucracy through its most formal, traditional phase to its human relations phase. According to Shepard this latter phase recognized the need for a more humanistic model of organization which stressed co-operation, openness, trust and emotion. Although Shepard tends to become somewhat over-generous about the human capacities of modern organization, even he does not pretend that the basic objectives of the complex modern bureaucracy have radically changed. He observes that "Control is still the central concern of the manager." (1977:393). Effectiveness in terms of the product is still the guiding factor in the human relations model of bureaucracy. Any changes in the form, and there were important ones, did not represent a significant deviation from the goal of maximum productivity, from the model of hierarchical organization, or from the rational bias of that model (Kanter, 1975). Kanter points out that the human relations model of bureaucracy and the emphasis on informal rather than formal organization within the bureaucracy in fact supports the rationality emphasized in formal bureaucracy. Not only do workers emerge as the only participants to have emotions or engage in informal
organization, but any attempt to 'keep the workers happy', is done not for the sake of the workers but for the sake of the organization and its productivity.

While introducing social considerations and focusing on the human side of organizations, the human-relations analysts supported the concept of managerial authority and managerial rationality. In Mayo's view, workers were controlled by sentiment, emotion, and social instincts, and this phenomenon needed to be understood and taken into account in organizational functioning. Managers, on the other hand, were rational, logical, and able to control their emotions in the interests of organizational design. (Kanter, 1975:46-7)

Pateman (1970) addresses the same issue when she notes the "pseudo-participatory" nature of worker participation that merely enlists worker support for decisions already made. Such participation, she says, is directed only toward greater organizational efficiency and not toward increased worker participation for the benefit of the workers. (For a critical appraisal of possibilities for genuine worker participation, see Swartz, 1981.)

The focus on men and on rationality and impersonality in bureaucracy served not only to restrict women but also to limit the theory of traditional organization. Kanter points out this limiting function of the male bias:

At the same time these leanings of traditional organization theory also had intellectual consequences, limiting its analytic perspective. Larger issues of organizational structure and stratification and their relation to social placement in the larger society, the differential distributions of men and women, and the consequences of these for organizational behaviour - these questions were largely unnoticed. If the status quo of power in organizations and women's disadvantaged position was supported, it was as much because of intellectual blinders as because of deliberate intent. (1975:48)

Such a perspective supported not only the status quo of the sexual distribution of power within organizations, but also the status quo of organizational development in society, focusing on rationality and hierarchy as the only possible ways for organizations to develop effectively. Women, the guardians of emotion and intuition in our society, have thus been the major class of people excluded from bureaucratic power bases in this society up to the present time.
C. The feminization of organization

1. Factors affecting women's espousal of collectivity

At least three overlapping factors have contributed to women's attraction to collectivity as an organizational alternative. First, women realized that they were dissatisfied working in male constructed organizational structures - that these structures neither broke down patriarchal patterns nor accommodated female qualities. Against the background of bureaucracy as a masculine approach to organization, it is not difficult to understand why, when integrative feminists sought ways to combat male domination, they also sought ways to re-structure organizations. The reaction of feminists to male bureaucratic principles has already been discussed in Chapter 1. Kokopeli and Lakey also acknowledge this feminist reaction as a key factor in the development of alternate styles of organization.

The feminists saw in sexist organization the degradation and powerlessness of women. They recognized the lack of attention to feelings and nurturance in male-led organizations; at the same time they expressed newfound pride in some feminine qualities which patriarchy held in contempt. (1978:7)

Collectivity and integrative feminism thus not only share a critical view of patriarchy and other forms of domination, but they share a set of positive goals. These goals include: the equitable distribution of power and responsibility both within organizations and within society; the sharing of knowledge in order to facilitate that distribution; the opposing of personal fragmentation and the development of whole and integrated human beings; attention to process; and the integration of many of the polarities in our society.

Second, women have less to lose in a radical re-organization of power and priorities in organizations than do men. With less invested than men in the bureaucratic machinery of efficiency, production and success, women may be more willing to try new organizational forms, especially when those forms reflect more closely their own values.
And third, socialization has done more to prepare women for collective ways of working than it has for men. A comparison of the characteristics encouraged in women in our society (Chapter 2) and the characteristics embodied in collectivity (Chapter 3) illuminate striking similarities between the two. Many of the emphases of collectivity reflect the emphasis on nurturing, maintenance functions of women's daily lives.

2. Power, leadership and decision-making

In the initial period of feminist reaction against bureaucracy and patriarchal organizational style, emphasis was on the personal, the psychological, and the avoidance of structure and leadership. As women's reactions coalesced into a movement, women realized that their actions were political and needed focus and structure. Searching for form for their anti-bureaucratic, anti-patriarchal reactions, women began to develop organizational structures that could incorporate those qualities that were lacking in bureaucratic organizations. Informal consciousness-raising groups evolved into structured collectives, which had to deal directly with issues of power, leadership, decision-making and productivity, at the same time as they had to deal with integrative feminist ideals of incorporating female values and strengths into an organizational style.

Equitable distribution of power in organizations became one of the most important goals of many feminist organizational strategies. Learning how to be equals, a process of unlearning pervasive social lessons, is a difficult one for both women and men. However, it seems to be an easier process for women partly because of what each sex has invested in relations of domination and subordination and partly because of differing socialization patterns. There seems to be little doubt that leadership styles that emphasize power-sharing, flexibility, and co-operation reflect a feminist perspective. (St. Joan, 1976).

These concepts suggest a pattern of leadership far different from men's...Women's...organic...ways of leading may be a kind of "shifting leadership", which does not expect a leader to
always and everywhere perform that function...we call this view of leadership "shared" to emphasize the equal stake members...of the group see themselves as having in achieving group goals and maintaining group morale. (Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978:8)

Such a model of leadership does not embody the individual ego-investment of a more rigid and centralized model of leadership where the leader attracts respect, admiration and envy because of his/her position. Those who fill leadership functions in this more fluid structure have to give up a lot of the feelings of superiority they might have gained from a more traditional leadership role. Fulfilling such a leadership function therefore is likely to be harder for a person who has a great deal of ego invested in occupying a position of superiority in a group, which is more likely to be a man than a woman.

Women's relationship to competition is a complex one and differs in some important ways from that of men. While the socialization of women into traditional feminine roles emphasizes nurturing, affiliation and helping rather than competition, women have also been subjected to many of the same socialization patterns as men, including competitiveness as a valued aid to personal achievement. However, women have not been allowed to compete openly with men in the productive sphere; women's competitiveness has usually been focused on the private sphere. In this sphere of the personal, where emotional defenses are relatively absent, competitiveness is harder to accept as a positive characteristic. It may be that this lack of protective devices to buffer the effects of competitiveness in the personal sphere (which are present in the productive sphere in the form of, for example, rules and the careful guarding of emotions) combines with women's socialization toward cooperation to make women less likely to be highly competitive. Certainly competitiveness is not an open feature of feminine culture in the same way it is for men. Women's social structures, such as the family and 'helping' agencies, have not legitimated or institutionalized competition in the way men's have. Competition among women, therefore, is more often a source of guilt than satisfaction, whether that competitiveness
is a feature of a work situation or a friendship.

One result of women's ambivalent relationship with competition is that the non-competitive processes of collectivity are often welcomed by women.

[Working in the Collective has made me] trust people more than I ever have before. It has made me feel that people aren't just full of animosity and hostility and competitiveness. I think that my background has been a very competitive one, going through school and working very hard to get good enough grades to get into medical school, always competing with everyone. I had to be the best. And this has been good to learn about not being competitive, and to learn that everyone is not out to beat me, you know, and that I'm not out to beat everyone else either...I don't know what it is that the Collective has that has made that happen for me, it's hard to put my finger on any one aspect of it, but I think it's the sharing of ideas and the sharing of decisions, the talking about problems as they come up...(HC member, 1974)

I really feel that the Collective has been a very important learning experience for me, and that it's taught me many ways of being with people, other women, that I wouldn't have come across myself, and I think I would have lived a competitive and fairly isolated lonely life, if I hadn't been involved with this group and realized that there really are other ways of working with people and getting things done. (HC member, 1974)

I'm so happy when I see how well thirty women can work together. There are some problems but they are and can be worked out. But it's so contrary to the teaching I had as a child that women can't work together and are always competing with each other. (HC member, 1974)

However, years of socialization have made the issue of competition a complicated one that collectives have by no means solved. Competitive feelings still exist within collectives' members and competition has not been eradicated from their processes. Nor do all members agree that all competitiveness can or even should be eliminated.

I don't confront competition very well. I don't like it happening. I've taken on that thing that it's not cool, and you shouldn't be competing. That's another one of the women's movement trips, you know, that we shouldn't be competing. And that's just not something that I've dealt very adequately with. (HC member, 1974)

Male dominated institutions such as companies and sports teams, on the other hand, focus with pride on competition as a source of motivation and excellence. Writing of competitiveness primarily as a male value, Nichols says:
...Women have allowed themselves to accept this value too, although more covertly. It is among men, however, that competition occasions loud boasts. (1978:90)

While acknowledging women's competitive aspects, Miller argues that women are generally more co-operative than men partly because, not brought up to feel superior within the family or in the larger society, women do not feel the same sense of loss when they choose a co-operative mode of action (1976:43). She also points out that the social institutions in which most women spend most of their time are more conducive to co-operation than male-occupied settings.

Not only may women adjust more easily to collectivity because of their easier adjustment to sharing power, but they generally stand to gain more than men in terms of learning how to be strong and assertive and articulate. The consciousness-raising aspects and confidence-building potential of collectivity is as important for women as the knowledge and skill sharing, for without the confidence to use them, knowledge and skills will be wasted. That these effects of shared leadership are particularly important for women is demonstrated by comments made by Health Collective members:

People come to the Health Collective for a lot of reasons. One of the things that happens often is that they come there, and they're not really too together within themselves, and through a period of time they really do develop a feeling of self-esteem and a lot of self-confidence and really start to realize that they have a lot of potential and then they feel that they can move into something else...I think that's one of the most fantastic things that the Health Collective does. (1974)

[What I have gained from the Collective] is the feeling of strength that I'm having for the first time - that women aren't powerless. And that comes from being associated with women who are strong...Women who...will take on difficult tasks with optimism instead of just assuming that they can't do anything. Now...I'm much braver about what I think we can do. (1976)

The empowering process that results from being listened to and respected operates for men in collectives as well as for women, but the effect has been more dramatic for women because they have been the ones most consistently denied respect and power in this society's institutions.
...I just don't think I've ever had that feeling of power before, and I think this is true of a lot of women. We just kind of schlepp along through life thinking that basically we're no good, that nobody likes us, that we're not smart, that we're always making mistakes, that it really doesn't matter what we do...and working in the Collective has helped my self-image...and...made me just feel like I'm an okay person. And that's come from all the meetings where I very slowly began to open up and talk about how I was feeling about the way things were being done, and being listened to. Things that I said were accepted and discussed and if they were valid they were worked on. And that feels very good. (HC member, 1974)

I had worked for five months at another clinic. I felt powerless to change any of the things I felt needed changing. My involvement at the Health Collective gave me a feeling of power to help change. (HC member, 1974)

I'm really happy with the way the Collective is doing things. And I feel also that when I don't like the way things are going...I can change that, and that it's accepted for me to do that. (HC member, 1976)

The oppression of women is somewhat unique in that women are intimately bound up in primary love relationships with their oppressors. In the light of this particular facet of women's oppression, non-hierarchical organizational forms take on a special significance for women. To be free of domination, and particularly domination by men, has important implications for women's public and private selves.

Women's desires to structure situations to ensure equal participation is illustrated by collective methods of decision-making. The participatory nature of consensus decision-making has a particular appeal to women because they, more than men, have experienced the exclusion from decision-making in patriarchal structures. If women did gain a position in the hierarchy where they had access to the decision-making process, the way in which the process was constructed put them at a disadvantage. In a competitive situation where input into decision-making is based on rationality, articulateness, aggressiveness, where non-rational factors are considered dysfunctional, and where the other participants' propensity to hear the arguments is based to a significant extent on the sex of the speaker (Smith, 1974), women have little chance of exerting influence.
Integrative feminists saw in the restriction of decision-making to rational considerations a denial of part of what made up their lives. Learning to take pride in their non-rational qualities through their experiences in the feminist movement, they were able to recognize and gain the courage to articulate the necessity for this content in decision-making (see, for example, Wyckoff, 1977). To argue for the inclusion of emotion and intuition in decision-making, that bastion of rationality, was a revolutionary step. Adams' description of women's intuition highlights its usefulness for the decision-making process:

"An apparent capacity for picking up subliminal clues which, when put together, can produce a diagnostic assessment of individuals or situations with more penetrating insight than is achieved by more usual processes of conscious thought...is likely to be developed to a higher level in women. (1971:572)

3. Process-orientation and the incorporation of emotion into organizational structures

One of the major contributions of feminism has been the concept that the process, or HOW we do things, is as important as the product, or WHAT we do. (Riddle, 1978:23, emphasis in original)

The fact that, in many collectives, both process and product are seen as integral parts of the same goals of personal and social change reflects integrative feminists' views about the synthesis of the personal and the political and of emotion, intuition, and intellect.

The amount of time necessary to deal with process and with emotion requires a substantial adjustment on the part of most collective participants in terms of the values placed on productive and maintenance functions. Mansbridge points out that:

"Most men measure their worth by what they 'do' in the outside world, what they produce...Women are more inclined to judge themselves by the quality of their affiliative relations with others. (1973:360)

This value placed on affiliative, maintenance functions, combined with the fact that women are usually more comfortable with their emotions than men are, makes it easier in general for women to adjust to and often welcome process considerations in collectives."
Many women in collectives are self-consciously process-oriented, equating a product-orientation with the aggressiveness and competitiveness which they object to in male organizational forms.

According to process-oriented women, the principles of openness of feelings, co-operation, supportiveness and valuing sensitivity, empathy, intuition, nurturance, interdependence and trust are at the heart of the women's culture and the feminist movement. (Crow, 1978:78)

Others support a more integrative position:

What happened for me in being involved with the Health Collective is that I feel an incredibly strong connection between the process and the product. I've felt quite in touch with the process in other groups I've been in but felt that there was nothing being produced. That's the whole essence of the women's movement - C.R. and action... I would not ever separate those two things. (HC member, 1974)

Another aspect of the process orientation of collectives is its relationship with competitiveness. To reveal one's fears, insecurities, false starts, or mistakes is to demystify one's role and make oneself vulnerable both to loss of respect of co-workers (which is based not on being 'human' but on being 'super-human') and to competition; this vulnerability is almost certainly harder for a man to expose himself to than a woman.

I think that there's a lot of power to change things from women exploring their feelings and exploring different ways of doing things because I feel like so many of the institutions and so many things around us have been built by men and have been maintained by men in a very male orientated way of doing things...you know, like paying attention to the process of what we do...I just feel like a lot of changes can come about by having us talk about how we feel...I was thinking about how men go off in a corner and think about how they're feeling and come up and they've got the answer, they've got something, man, you know, and they'll throw it out and someone else will compete with them and say something else, and it just goes on... (HC member, 1976)

The co-operative ethos of collectivity puts pressure on participants not to be competitive and not to conceal either the information or the processes particular to a certain role or task. While such expectations may cause initial anxiety in participants, it appears that for many people, the rewards from such demystification exceed the difficulties. Galper and Washburne report that in the feminist social work agency which they helped develop:
While we had a great deal of autonomy and responsibility for administering an entire agency... We were also able to feel weak and scared and could admit our shortcomings because the atmosphere was generally a supportive one. (1976:50)

It seems apparent that this opening up of oneself to scrutiny is likely to be less problematic for women than for men. Because women are generally less emotionally defended than men, they are more accustomed to dealing with their vulnerability, take more pride in their interpersonal skills than in achieving instrumental tasks (Mansbridge, 1973) and are traditionally less ego-centred than men (Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Miller, 1976; St. Joan, 1976). The social message is that it is appropriate for women to be weak and even incompetent and to ask for help, whereas men are 'supposed to be' self-sufficient and skillful at accomplishing goals. All of these differences would seem to make it easier for women than for men to reveal the processes that they go through to accomplish a task and to ask for help or support along the way.

Janeway (1980) and Miller (1976) point out that the ability to reveal one's vulnerability is a strength rather than a weakness, a fact which many women appear to intuitively grasp, but which, for men, has been overshadowed by society's prescription for manliness. Collectives institutionalize this strength, making it possible for participants to reveal vulnerabilities without allowing them to work to their disadvantage organizationally. In this way, collectives, at their best, are able to utilize more completely the potential of their members.

4. Flexibility and personal integration

Women and men have both suffered as a result of the demands of an efficiency-oriented society for the segregation of personal roles. Women, because in addition to their work outside, they bear the greatest burden of maintaining the home and family, have suffered particularly acutely from this demand for fragmentation. Unlike men, they have not been socialized to subordinate other
aspects of their lives to an occupation. Those women who combine another occupation with their role of homemaker experience a normative conflict (Coser and Rokoff, 1971) not only in terms of time and energy demands, but in terms of values: values and behaviour that are appropriate in the maintenance sphere are not always appropriate in the productive sphere.

The fact that women have had to accomplish such a combining of roles in their everyday lives at a high personal cost, is part of the situation that led to the development of collectivity in the first place. The recognition of the debilitating effects of personal fragmentation and the importance of integrating in the workplace the various roles one plays in one's daily life have been valuable contributions of women to collectivity. Although women cannot claim total credit for this change in organizational style, they have probably been the prime movers behind it, precisely because they have suffered most obviously from the fragmentation of their lives.

In developing collective workplaces, women sought conditions that allowed them to be whole persons and yet still enabled them to accomplish the work of an organization. The incorporation of emotion; the extension of the caring, nurturing role into relationships at work; flexible hours; the provision of facilities for children - all of these are direct results of women's struggle to integrate the various parts of their lives. Galper and Washburne cite this integration as one of the primary benefits of working in a feminist agency.

...it felt terrific. One major effect our style of working had was to enable us to mesh our personal, political, professional lives. We were not separated selves. The more we brought our personal experiences into our work, the more effective our service was... (1976:50)

For many feminist workers, an important part of their ideology is the fact that their satisfaction with their work is of equal importance with the satisfaction of those whom they serve. The reasons for this approach are not just a knowledge of the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of
output, but a feeling that they have a right, even a responsibility to enjoy what they do and to work at what they want to do. This attitude is, in part, a reaction to the tendency toward 'martyrdom' with which many women have grown up. For some women, this has meant that their work, in order to be of value, must be for others, never for themselves. The experience of collectivity has changed this for many women.

The thing that I particularly like about the Collective is that it doesn't feel to me that I'm doing something for somebody else, I'm doing it for me, too. I worked all of last year down at Skid Row, and sure, the drunks may need stuff, but I'm not one of them. It was very much a missionary kind of role. Even though I'm not yet ready to say that all those agencies should leave, I knew that I no longer wanted to do that. This work [at the Health Collective] doesn't feel like that because I know that I'm learning stuff for myself. It doesn't have that kind of hierarchy... (HC member, 1974)

I've had a lot of trouble with self-confidence and a concept of self-worth. And I find that I feel really valuable in the Collective and I'm getting much more confident. And I feel like I'm doing something worthwhile, and that I'm doing it well, and it's really good for me. (HC member, 1976)

More than just a personal whim, this belief is part of an ideology that insists that women take responsibility for their own well-being. One result of this philosophy is that personal satisfaction and exhilaration with one's work are sources of great strength for women in the movement.

At the same time that women's desire for integration is probably more acute than that of men, so is their tolerance for the situation that results. Women's flexibility, emotionality, and intuitiveness are qualities needed for successful adaptation to collective ways of working, which, unlike bureaucracy, are not rigid, orderly, or exclusively rational. The flexibility required in a collective is closer to the norms of women's lives than those of men's lives. (see, for example, Adams, 1975; Janéway, 1980; Miller, 1976). Therefore it may be easier for women to adapt to the uncertainty and the constant change in a collective and the need to be responsible for several quite different spheres at the same time and to play several potentially conflicting roles within a normal
working day. Such flexibility is familiar to women who simultaneously play the roles of mother, wife, and worker.

This flexibility is more characteristic of what Zurcher calls the "mutable personality type" which he sees as most adaptive in a society that is changing and innovative. This "mutable self" is less attached to social structures than to social processes, more flexible:

a self which transcends the compartmentalization, absorbs the conflict, mends the factionalism...and is involved more deeply in the family and micro-community [than in the dominant institutions]...[and tends to] seek integration of work/leisure/family/friendship...and to welcome the experience of shifting among many roles... (1973:373)

Society has rendered women closer to this "mutable personality type" than men. Although Zurcher does not mention sex as a variable in discerning the personality types he describes, a careful reading of his description of the "mutable self" indicates that if he is right, women have a head-start in adapting to change-oriented alternative social structures.

In an article dealing with new leadership styles for women, St. Joan describes characteristics which she sees as central to the leadership roles women can play:

More often than men, women pay attention to the connections in life, and can focus on the relationships between things, events, ideas, people...At our best, women can communicate very concretely without the splits between mind, body, emotion, and values. Women can combine the rational and the intuitive - hold two contradictory beliefs at the same time, accept that as reality, and still make a decision - still use our power. (1976:72)

Adams writes that "flexibility of operation" and the "capacity for intuitive awareness" are attributes particularly strong in women:

Flexibility is a characteristic that most women have had to foster in order to survive their limiting circumstances without paralyzing frustration. Because their skills and creative energy have been mainly expressed through promoting the successful growth and functioning of others, they have developed unusual versatility concerning their own preferences and goals, a heightened ability to grasp opportunity when it occurs, an equal capacity for withstanding disappointment when it is withdrawn, and unlimited competence in making things over... (1975:571)

By way of explanation for women's greater capacity for intuitive power, she says:
When women's satisfaction and raisons d'etre depend upon the skillful manipulation of other people's well-being, it is incumbent upon them to develop a very finely calibrated skill for tuning in to the needs and moods of those individuals...this...quality gives women an invaluable tool for divining subterranean stresses in larger group systems and alerting the participating individuals to their presence and to the possible courses they will take if not controlled. Men have not needed to develop this subtle influence to the same extent because their exercise of power has been overt and explicit. (p.572)

Such an awareness has obvious value for a collective work setting. This capacity of women to combine the strengths of reason and intuition, and its importance both to women personally and to society, are also noted by Janeway (1980) and Wyckoff (1977).

D. Women in bureaucracy

If bureaucracy is, indeed, a masculine organizational form, and collectivity a feminine organizational form, what happens when women work within a bureaucracy or men within a collective?

Before proceeding to the first of these questions, a distinction must be made between the positions women occupy in bureaucracies, which are in general quite different from those of men, and the attitudes and behaviour of women in bureaucracies, which may or may not be different from those of men. These two issues are related in that both reflect the lack of integration of productive and maintenance spheres, the inferior value that has been placed on what is designated as feminine, and the fact that certain attitudes and behaviour are considered appropriate to certain positions within the organization. However, in order to see the ways in which these issues interact, it is useful to recognize them as distinct.

The predominance of women in the less powerful and lower status positions within the hierarchy (Coser and Rokoff, 1971; Kanter, 1977) is important here insofar as it demonstrates the extent to which bureaucratic organizations in our society are male dominated and the extent to which female values and strengths are not recognized or rewarded within bureaucracies. Coser and Rokoff (1971)
show how the inferior position occupied by women in most bureaucracies is related to the lack of integration of the maintenance and productive spheres. Many of the values, norms, and behaviour patterns of women are related to their central role in the maintenance sphere, which is considered extraneous and contradictory to the productive sphere. In general, what is adaptive for the maintenance sphere is maladaptive for the productive sphere as it is now defined. Women, caught between conflicting sets of norms, values and time commitments, are discriminated against within the bureaucracy. On a practical level, for example, lack of child care facilities in the workplace and lack of extra sick leave for parents of children make it impossible for most mothers to participate in the productive sphere without neglecting their child-raising functions. On the level of values and personality characteristics, the male-oriented values of rationality and suppression of emotionality make it difficult for women to 'be themselves' at work. Men do not experience this contradiction because their commitments are clearly to the productive sphere and its values. They are rewarded within the bureaucracy for attitudes and behaviour that reflect this more unidimensional commitment.

In their positions within bureaucracy, women's attitudes and behaviour are in part functions of their relative power or powerlessness within the organization (Kanter, 1977) and in part functions of the socialization patterns that have imbued them not only with attitudes appropriate to work within bureaucratic organizations but with characteristics and values appropriate to the maintenance sphere.

The evidence regarding women's attitudes and behaviour within bureaucracy is limited because there appear to have been few studies which look specifically at the behaviour of women as opposed to that of men in bureaucracy (Kanter, 1975, 1977). What evidence there is on women in the upper levels of bureaucratic organizations is unclear - while some data suggests that there are differences
in the leadership styles of women and men, others contradict this. There seems to be little doubt, however, that people's behaviour in groups is to a significant extent a function of their power and status position (Kanter, 1975:55). This relationship between behaviour and position is part of the explanation why differences between men and women appear to be less evident at the managerial level of bureaucracies than at the lower levels. Therefore, in writing about women in organizations one must take into account the fact that women are operating as a minority within a context which has been structured by men to favour men. Although there are many women in bureaucratic organizations, they are concentrated in the lower levels of the hierarchy. In the higher levels, among the managers, who are the most successful bureaucrats, women are in a very small minority. Kanter argues that structural factors involving sex ratios

...play a major role in determining how women behave in organizations. What we know about women's leadership, for example, we know from a context in which very few women have power. What we know about women as professionals we often know from settings where a woman is the only female in a group of men. What we know about the majority of women workers we have learned from studying occupations carrying female sex stereotypes, like nursing, teaching, or typing. (1977:372)

If women act like 'typical bureaucrats' in situations where only typical bureaucrats succeed, it is not surprising. They have had to compete hard in 'a man's world', on male terms, and have, in many cases, had to be better than the men who were competing for the same job. And neither can a woman relax once she has got the job: being a 'token woman', or at least in a striking minority, she must constantly prove herself just as good as her male colleagues in accomplishing bureaucratic goals. Therefore, it is understandable that some studies within a bureaucratic framework have shown that there appears to be little difference between the behaviour of men and women in that context (Kanter, 1977:300).

Some leadership studies, however, appear to affirm that women retain some
aspects of their feminine strengths within a bureaucracy. Kanter cites a study done by Hennig of successful women executives which found that in their choice of 'leadership strategies':

The women tended to minimize the authoritative exercise of power and maximize subordinate autonomy and learning through delegation. (1975:62)

Kanter (1977) says that women in positions of authority in organizations differ widely in the ways they use that authority, some using authoritarian leadership styles and some using more nurturing, humanistic ones. She concludes that once individuals are in positions of power over others, psychological differences between the sexes have little or no effect on their leadership behaviour. This similarity between men and women probably reflects both the overlap in the ways in which they are socialized and the bureaucratic power structures in which they work.

However, there is some evidence that certain of women's particularly feminine strengths may survive, at least at the lower levels of the bureaucracy. As Kanter (1977) points out, the routinization and depersonalization of bureaucracy is imperfect. While the exclusively female secretarial role is central to, and in fact was created by bureaucratic organization, it is still one of the roles that remains the most personal, the most resistant to rationalization. Within the bureaucracy she studied, it was the secretaries who added the personal touches to their spaces, talked about personal things, acknowledged personal aspects of co-workers' lives, and were expected by their bosses to look after the personal needs both of bosses and of their guests. It is significant that it is in this female realm that many unresolved tensions and contradictions in bureaucracy remain.

Kanter also presents other evidence that women in groups act and are motivated differently than men. She notes that within mixed-sex work organizations, interpersonal relations with peers are more central to a woman's work than to a man's. She also demonstrates that:
Women in female groups may be more oriented toward immediate relationships than men in male groups...women in organizations...limit their ambitions, prefer local and immediate relationships, and orient themselves to satisfying peer relationships. (1975:53)

Executives' voluntary isolation and the avoidance of intimacy described by Terkel (1972) and Whyte (1957:174) is more often and perhaps more easily accepted by men than by women, who value affiliation more than do men. Kanter's own study of women in a corporation showed that women will sometimes forego an opportunity for promotion because it would mean sacrificing their female peer group (1975:54).

Kanter also points out that the famous Hawthorne experiments which first focused on informal organization as an important factor influencing workers in organizations, neglected to consider sex composition of groups as a significant variable. She notes that the two groups who were found to be "co-operative and trusting of management" were composed entirely of women, while the third group, "counterdependent, aggressively controlling, and suspicious" was composed entirely of men (1975:52).

She cites studies that show that:

Female game-playing strategy in several laboratory studies was accommodative, including rather than excluding, and oriented toward others rather than toward winning, whereas the male strategy was exploitative and success-oriented. All-female groups' themes in a comparison of single-sex and mixed laboratory groups included affiliation, family, and conflicts about competition and leadership, self, and relationships, in contrast to the male themes: competition, aggression, violence, victimization, practical joking, questions of identity, and fear of self-disclosure. (1975:53)

One study compared all-male and all-female groups and found that among nine different conditions, only persuasability was higher in female groups and level of aspiration higher in male groups (Kanter, 1975:53). Other studies show consistently, Kanter says, that groups of women and of men differ primarily in orientations toward interpersonal relationships and levels of aspiration (1975:54). This evidence seems to reflect both the different
socialization patterns of women and men, and a realistic response to different organizational conditions for women and men. Whatever the reasons, however, these differences in the orientations of men and women to organizations are significant in relation to their participation in collectives. Orientation toward interpersonal relationships, willingness to be persuaded, and a lack of emphasis on personal ambition are all qualities which facilitate participation in a collective organization.

E. Men in co-operative ventures

1. Men in collectivity

Although there are few all-male collectives, there are men who work more or less successfully within egalitarian structures. If some of these do not fit the generalizations that have been made here about the attitudes and behaviour of men in relation to collective ways of working, it must be remembered that the men who work in collectives comprise a self-selected sample and are more likely than most men to possess qualities adaptive to collectivity. While a similar argument could be used in the case of women in collectives, it is maintained here that many of the qualities exhibited by women in collectives are representative of the qualities shared by women in general.

In discussions at the Health Collective, several women who participated also in a mixed collective noted differences in the collective process when men took part. The major difficulties they saw that men had in working within collectivity centred on maintaining egalitarian relationships within the group rather than dominating ones, and on an acceptance of a great deal of attention being paid to process.

Miller (1976) points out that while men do undertake co-operative endeavours, the competitive settings in which most of them spend most of their time make such endeavours difficult to sustain. Miller relates this difficulty in co-operative settings to men's experience in the family, where they are led to
believe that they are superior to female family members and entitled to receive services.

From then on, cooperativeness may appear to men as if it were somehow detracting from themselves. To cooperate, to share, means somehow to lose something, or at best, altruistically, to give something away. All this is greatly augmented by men's notions that they must be independent, go it alone, win. (1976:42)

Ideologically, men may be committed to working toward social change through egalitarian, co-operative groups. However, many masculine attitudes and behaviour patterns, embedded in them throughout years of socialization and experience, militate against such co-operation and egalitarianism (see also Fasteau, 1975; Korda, 1973; and Nichols, 1978).

Activists confirm that both men and women have more trouble with men's dominating behaviour in collectives. Kokopeli and Lakey point out that male leadership styles are less adaptable to collective structures than are women's. They describe that style as one in which:

...the group focuses on the leader in the centre, with him and his constituents fortifying their egos back and forth. The expectation is that he is the leader now, and always and everywhere will be the leader...Male defined leadership necessarily implies a political inequality between the leader and the constituents. (1978:8)

Moyer and Tuttle also argue that although women sometimes dominate in groups, it is more likely to be men who do so. They therefore call this domination a "male behaviour pattern" (1977:1).

Within a mixed-sex radical activist group in Vancouver, one female member reported that she remained a part of the group longer than she wished in order to prevent the male members from dominating the group's development. She observed that a male-female split had occurred in which strong, assertive men, experienced in radical political activity, did most of the leading, most of the talking, and were listened to most.

Experience in this collective indicated that the dominance of men in groups is a pattern re-inforced by some women as well as by men. It was clear that
certain key male members' comments carried the most weight in discussion. On one occasion, a suggestion put forth by a woman was not taken up by the group for discussion. Half an hour later, the same suggestion, put forth by one of the male 'stars' in the group, attracted a lot of support. This incident illustrates a pattern of covert female subordination in groups, also identified by Smith (1974).

Many of the most articulate men in this group opposed consensus decision-making on the grounds that it was unnecessary and wasted too much time. Most of the strong assertive women, on the other hand, had political experience in collectives where a great deal of attention was paid to group processes and where the egalitarian, participatory nature of the group was epitomized in the group's commitment to consensus decision-making. The disagreement within the mixed-sex collective over the method of decision-making became a focal point for differences in opinions and in style between the two 'factions'. Although these two 'factions' did not split completely along male-female lines, the argument came to symbolize the differences between the women and the men in the group.

Another mixed-sex collective in Vancouver made public difficulties they experienced with male oppression. Fed-up co-operative food warehouse published a women's issue of their newsletter in the early 70's to air grievances of the women members, who felt that they were being exploited by the men in the group.

What is significant in this situation is the inherent sexist attitudes in the co-op movement. Women work; men think and instruct, and project, and take credit. (Fed-up Newsletter, undated)

In the same issue, one woman published an article stating that she was quitting her work with the co-operative movement because it was sexist. Her description of the relations between men and women in the co-operative movement is similar to descriptions of that relationship in the New Left of the 60's. She writes
that men dominated the meetings and men's ideas governed policy formulation.

I felt disgusted with myself when I saw how many male structures I took for my own in order to "make it" as an equal within the co-op movement, to the extent even of taking on a competitiveness which is not part of my personality. But which I developed fighting my way from being ignored to have men pay attention to my ideas (but ignore them when it came to long-range decision-making and planning)... I was accepted as a spokeswoman only if I didn't seriously challenge the fundamental ideas and goals which men saw for the co-op movement...

(Kenny, undated)

Kenny left the mixed co-op to work in a women's collective printing shop. The struggle at Fed-up subsided; although no formal split between men and women occurred, and men are not excluded, the co-op has become primarily a woman-oriented collective.

It may be that the dominating behaviour observed in mixed collectives is related to men's patterns of dominating women, and that within an all-male organization some of the patterns of domination would give way to co-operation and egalitarianism. The lack of research on all-male collectives, makes such a speculation impossible to substantiate.

Many men in collectives recognize their difficulties in egalitarian structures and are striving to overcome them. Men's consciousness-raising and support groups are used for this purpose, and at least one set of activists has published guidelines specifically designed to help men overcome oppressive behaviour in collective groups (see Moyer and Tuttle, 1977).

Both aggressive, competitive behaviour and a product- rather than process-orientation relate to the fact that men have a great deal more invested in their productivity than do women; they must achieve a lot, fast, in order to prove themselves. Therefore, they may experience difficulty in adjusting to the slower pace of collective groups and to what many consider an excessive attention to process (see also Mansbridge, 1973). The evidence already cited from Kanter (1977) also supports this argument that for men, achievement is far more important than interpersonal relations.
Some evidence indicates that men's and women's behaviour in relation to non-task-oriented and to task-oriented groups may differ. In arguing against the differential distribution of power and status among women and men in corporations, Kanter uses her own and others' work to demonstrate that men's and women's approaches to tasks do not differ significantly. She notes in passing, however, that in informal, non-task-oriented groups with a higher emotional content, women's and men's interaction patterns differed (1977:300). (Although Kanter does not say here just what those differences were, she does say elsewhere that some studies have shown that men are more oriented to achievement than to interpersonal relations, more competitive, and less accommodative than women.) While Kanter passes over this information because of her interest in women and men in structured, task-oriented groups, it may have some importance for the present discussion of collectives, which are less formal, less structured, less narrowly focused on a specific task, and more oriented toward process and interpersonal relations than bureaucracies.

The pressures on men to appear strong, competent and always in control, and their corresponding fear of vulnerability also make it difficult for men to be open about the processes they go through to reach a decision or complete a piece of work. They have been raised to work in a bureaucracy, where processes and tasks are mystified in order to be more easily retained as the 'special property' of a particular position, where the illusion is perpetuated that only certain people in certain positions are able to perform certain activities, and that these people are different in important ways from those who are not in those positions.

Male leaders often just arrive at a certain [decision] and proceed to give orders. They often present their position on certain issues as accomplished fact, without sharing with their constituents how they got to that position...many male political leaders fail to present the contradictions, the diversity, and the struggle which comprised the decision. (St. Joan, 1976:76)
A Health Collective member presented a similar view:

Women find it easier to get involved in the process, the human processes. The whole male thing is being afraid of contact, needing a professional place to hide behind. As women, it seems much more easy to come into a group and make close contact without losing a lot...that whole male thing about not letting your feelings out makes that harder...it's hard for them to give that up. (1976)

2. Men in communes

The prominence and apparent success of some men in the commune movement has been offered as an argument against the claim that collectivity is more a female form than a male form. At least two problems exist here. First of all, this thesis in general excludes a specific consideration of communes because of the quite considerable differences between the goals and practices of communes and the goals and practices of what I have defined as collectives. Very briefly, the collective is a task-oriented group organized to develop new ways of accomplishing work and with specific political goals of influencing larger social structures. In contrast, communes are focused more inward, usually aimed at re-structuring family relationships and often lacking a coherent political analysis or program. Commune residents are often content to create an environment where their way of life can thrive, without trying to change social institutions. While both collectives and communes require a great deal of commitment from their members (Kanter, 1972), the most successful communes, unlike collectives, have tended to be religious rather than political (Kephart, 1976; see also Chamberlain, 1980).

Another problem in discussing the success of men in communes concerns the definition of success in terms of men's roles in that context. Unlike the collectives on which this thesis focuses, many communes either repudiate all structure or have established authority structures with strong, dominating leaders (Gardner, 1978). Very often, leadership in an apparently successful commune involves authoritarianism and ego-centrism which would exclude such a
group and its leaders from any definition of success considered appropriate here, where egalitarian considerations are paramount.

The sexism reported in many communes and kibbutzim provides another example of inequality built into some communal groups (see Abrams and McCulloch, 1976; Baker, 1980; Kolmerton, 1980). Success in combating sexism appears to depend in large part on whether or not the ideology of the community includes a direct opposition to sex-role stereotyping. In some 'hippy' communes, for example, the goal may be not to re-structure sex-roles but to re-establish what participants feel is a natural division between the sexes (Kanter, 1973; Vessey, 1973). The Farm in Tennessee, one of the most 'successful' of modern North American communes, is led by a powerful male leader. Although women are strong, active and high status members of the community, they perform traditional female tasks. Women as midwives fulfill one of the most important roles in the community. However, members see sexism as a spiritual rather than a political issue and therefore make no deliberate attempt to change sexual stereotyping (Kilchenstein, 1980).

Sexism and authoritarianism were present in early communes as well as contemporary ones. Baker (1980) looks at the roles of women in three nineteenth century intentional communities - the Shakers, the Oneida community and the Mormons. Although in all three, the position of women is radically altered from the norm in the larger community, in none do they achieve true equality with men. Kolmerton (1980) makes the same points about sexual stereotyping in her discussion of the New Harmony community led by Robert Owen. Furthermore, although the groups were all collective in the sense of shared property and work and dissolution of the nuclear family, all were to some extent authoritarian in their allegiance to a charismatic leader, a benevolent dictator, or a strict religious code.

However, it is certainly true that some communes have made significant gains
in reaching goals of egalitarianism and that men have often played important roles in these. One such community is the Philadelphia Life Centre, which focuses on feminism as one of its central issues, and runs both men's and women's support groups (Kilchenstein, 1980). The developing role of the feminist movement within the commune movement will likely result in feminism becoming an active force within an increasing number of communes.

The role of spiritual, religious and political ideology in shaping the attitudes of both men and women in communes and collectives is likely to be a significant factor in the success of individuals in achieving egalitarianism. Whether or not the adaptation to egalitarian structures is easier for women or men, ideology may act as a strong motivating force for both sexes.

Mizora (Lane, 1889), a novel written in the nineteenth century depicts a feminist utopia in which men were "unable to compete - or even survive - in an environment of love and co-operation" (Baker, 1980:56). Unable to adapt to the peace of Mizora, or to rise above their greed and aggression, men engaged in wars until they became extinct. Whether or not the extremity of this fantasy reflects the true picture of men in egalitarian communities, it highlights some of the arguments presented in this thesis and provides an interesting view from the perspective of an earlier century.

F. Summary

This chapter provides the culmination of all the arguments presented in the preceding chapters. It makes the central point of the thesis: that bureaucracy is largely a masculine organizational form, and collectivity largely a feminine form. To support this argument, it describes the development of bureaucracy as a masculine organizational form in which traditionally masculine traits are paramount and traditionally feminine ones suppressed. It describes the feminization of organization, emphasizing the dissatisfaction of women with male-
constructed organizations, the differential investments of women and men in these male structures, and the role of socialization in predisposing women to collectivity. It examines the ways in which power, leadership and decision-making in collectives reflect female values and strengths; the female orientation of an emphasis on process and emotion; and the particular ways in which personal and organizational flexibility and integration are important to women. It then focuses on the roles of women in bureaucracy and men in collectivity, looking at the ways in which their behaviour both confirms and conflicts with the arguments presented in the first part of the chapter.

The argument of the thesis is now complete. In the final chapter, I will consider the theoretical and practical implications of the points made here, for social movements, for sexual arrangements in society, and for social development.

Notes

1. It may be argued that men have, throughout history, formed groups for social or support purposes, many of which have been based on shared work experiences. However, such groups are not comparable to the collectives under consideration here: they have not been directed primarily to work purposes but have been largely compensatory in function, meeting needs not met in the work situation; and they have often been hierarchical and bureaucratic in nature. An example of such groups is the working men's groups described in Thompson (1963).
CHAPTER 5

THE IMPLICATIONS

A. The integrative goal of feminism and collectivity: a summary

One of the most pervasive critiques of contemporary life is that it fragments the person. (Kanter and Zurcher, 1973:391)

The major theme of this thesis has been the polarization of society and of individuals along sexual lines and some of the ways in which these polarities can be integrated, in order to shift society away from its present destructive course. The thesis has taken as its focus the split between maintenance and production, and has seen this split both as a real, empirical separation of women's and men's work, and as symbolic of the pervasive separation of what is considered feminine and masculine in our society.

The separation of home/family life from work/professional life is a primary factor in the lives of every member of this society, whether their centre is at home or at work. The separation is physical, social, emotional, moral and political: standards of behaviour, thought and feeling are different for the two spheres. This thesis has shown how the two spheres and their value systems are strikingly divided along lines of male/female, and that what is masculine is considered to be superior to that which is feminine. Although, in modern times, changes are occurring in relation to women's involvement in the work force and men's involvement in the family, the effect has not been to bring the male and female spheres together, but to create more pressing conflicts for women who attempt to straddle both spheres (see Coser and Rokoff, 1971).

This tension experienced by increasing numbers of women has been a factor in the attention the women's movement has brought to bear on the lack of integration between the worlds of family and of work (see Kanter and Zurcher, 1973).
The split is very much deeper than one of how and where women and men spend their days. It extends to the values, attitudes, feelings and behaviour that women and men consider appropriate for their sex, to the entire way in which they conceive of themselves and each other. Many authors have shown how current social arrangements result in each half of humanity being cut off from the other half (see, for example, Dinnerstein, 1976; Hughes, 1979; Janeway, 1980; Kanter and Zurcher, 1973; Miles, 1980; Miller, 1976).

The workplace misses those emotional bonds that create solidarity and commitment to shared endeavours; the family misses the emotional satisfactions that derive from shared goals and the accomplishment of concrete tasks. To the extent that men still tend to be oriented to the world of jobs and women to the world of family, and by consequence, men to achievement and women to relationships...people are further cut off from a full range of human experiences. (Kanter and Zurcher, 1973:392)

While these polarities have been depicted here as ones of sex - of masculine and feminine - they are in fact contained within each of us, whether female or male, and within all our organizations, whether traditionally masculine or feminine. The potential exists either for increased dichotomization or for more creative ways of bringing the polarities together.

The integrative feminine principle provides a value framework and an alternative rationality for feminist radicals' political struggle, in that it consciously posits an alternative definition of human nature which is broad enough to include and value equally, characteristics now seen as, and generally in fact distributed between, male and female. It challenges the separation of man from nature, and women, and his control of both as measure of his humanity, and defines feminisms' means and end as the healing/transcending of all of industrialism's dichotomies and fragmentations, i.e. between male/female, society (man)/nature, reproduction/production, means/end, investment/consumption, capital/labour, mental/manual, leisure/work, personal/political, etc., that shape and limit people's existence. This involves, again, as a means and end of the struggle, the development of new human beings with different relations to each other, to themselves and to the world... (Miles, 1980:23)

It is in relation to this issue of polarization that integrative feminism and collectivity as an organizational model, each stemming from a different theoretical basis, coincide in striking ways. It is to mend the fragmentation
and to bridge this gap between masculine and feminine that many alternative institutions are directed. They are trying to bring the values of the family into the workplace and to make it possible for both women and men to participate equally in both spheres, without having to fragment their physical, social, intellectual or emotional lives. Such immense gains are not to be achieved without some losses. Alternative organizations are prepared to sacrifice some degree of efficiency, some degree of material success, and to deal with problems of time, instability, and emotional intensity in order to achieve what they feel are more valuable gains in terms of human values. The implications of these gains and losses are far-reaching, for movements for social change, for the organization of work, for the state of knowledge in our society, and for the future of the world.

A radical re-organization of society in the direction proposed here presupposes a positive view of human nature:

In a state of alienation all human relations suffer from excessive competitiveness, envy, mutual distrust and aggressiveness. Independent, autonomous individuals and communities, free from any external domination, tend to develop relations of mutuality and reciprocity while dealing with common problems and sharing common interests. (Marković, forthcoming)

Idealistic as this view may be, it nevertheless represents a goal of human relations toward which integrative feminists and many collective participants strive.

B. Implications of integrative feminism

1. Introduction: four levels of application of the arguments

Integrative feminism has implications for the development of individuals, of groups, of social structures and of the world system. The interaction among these four levels and the significance of integrative feminism for each of them is recognized in this thesis and by radical activists; however, it is more feasible, at this point, to focus both in theory and in practice on the
possibilities for integrative feminism and for collectivity at the levels of the individual and the group than it is at the societal or world level. It is therefore at these levels where the present arguments are focused and where most activists direct their energies. Speculations about the possibilities for radical change in these directions at the macro-levels, while stimulating and necessary, are nevertheless, at this point in history, still speculation. Both integrative feminism and collectivity, therefore, emphasize the individual and the group as starting points for social change.

2. Implications for movements for social change

Any theory that places sexual polarities at the centre of the malaise of our society has important implications for movements directed at change in that society. The arguments presented in this thesis imply that any attempt at change must take into account the dependence of much of social malaise on destructive and limiting polarities between the sexes. Any movement for radical social change toward the left that does not recognize its connection with the women's movement, and any arm of the women's movement that does not attempt to address social polarities from an integrative point of view is, in the terms of this thesis, incomplete. A brief discussion of varying points of view within the women's movement will serve as illustration here.

Although many socialists and feminists believe that socialism and feminism cannot exist independently of each other, the tension between the two sometimes has been a destructive one within the women's movement (Ware, 1970). The debate has centred on whether classism or sexism is at the root of humanity's present troubles, and whether, therefore, social problems should be addressed primarily from the point of view of capitalism and social class or sexual polarization.

Miles argues that advanced capitalism has reached a stage which demands a re-affirmation of feminine creative principles and that as a result the focus
of humanity's historical struggle against alienation is shifting from class to sex. As the balance of emphasis in capitalism shifts from the productive to the reproductive (maintenance) sphere, she says, the demands of the latter become "equally determinative of the shape and possibility of social change" (undated:2).

The shifting weight of production and reproduction opens up the possibility of women's equality and power, putting patriarchy and sexual oppression centre stage politically in this period, in a way never before true of a struggle against alienation which has, until now, been largely restricted to the sphere of production and dominated by men's resistance to class oppression. (Miles, undated:2)

The differences between socialist feminism and integrative feminism are often expressed in stylistic terms: socialists are often accused by other feminists of emanating a male style, based on aggressive confrontation, excessive rationality, and dominating leadership (see, for example, Morgan, 1978; Ware, 1970). In the face of integrative feminism's identification of the importance of the unity of means and end, of personal and political, such stylistic differences assume great significance. Miles says of feminist socialists:

In their practice these women began to accept the traditional dichotomies between the political and personal and means and end...they retreated from their earlier synthesizing vision in favour of traditional political analysis and forms of organization. The integrative feminine principle...was abandoned. With this principle went any basis for a uniquely feminist integrative rationality, leaving these socialist feminists essentially a female pressure group...within male radical politics. (1980:12-13)

While this thesis does not minimize the seriousness of this debate, or its basis in real differences of points of view, it does argue that attempts to integrate the two approaches and to avoid seeing the issue in confrontative terms could be productive. There is room for an integration of the two approaches which does not imply complete elimination of the differences between them. Such an integrative position would "go beyond traditional class analysis without abandoning it" (Miles, 1980:5) to recognize, on the one hand, that
feminism alone will not transform the workplace or the family without fundamental economic and class changes, and, on the other, that to alter the power bases of society and class relations will not by itself ultimately alter society in the ways that integrative feminists see as necessary.

The connections between patriarchy, capitalism and class oppression have been made often in the radical feminist literature (see, for example, Firestone, 1970; Hartsock, 1974, 1976-77; Kokopeli and Lakey, 1978; Morgan, 1978). Magas (1972) stresses the connections between the feminist movement, the movement against the Vietnam War and the black militancy in the U.S. Integrative feminists recognize such connections. Some form of socialism or social democracy is virtually always seen as a necessary component of an integrative feminist world. Whether socialism is seen as sufficient, or as the primary condition for feminism is the crux of the problem between socialists and feminists.

The integrative approach also has implications for liberal feminism, for liberalism does not attack the basic polarities within society, or the basic power relations which are dependent on these polarities. The focus of the liberal position is to re-organize society so that women receive a bigger slice of the pie (Miles, 1980; Ware, 1970). As long as women achieve more power, more status, more freedom and greater economic success liberals will have succeeded in their aims. They have no goals of radically restructuring society with an emphasis on feminine values and re-educating individuals to undermine prevalent ideas about power and competition and human worth. Masculine principles still predominate. Power is still conceived of as domination rather than as autonomy and self-actualization; capitalism is still seen as an appropriate way of organizing society and the class basis of society is not threatened.

The liberal approach does not demonstrate an understanding of the pervasive influence of sexual polarities on the way society is organized and on all of
society's members, and of the necessity of integrating those polarities in order to achieve any real equality between women and men or any basic change in the direction in which society is developing. In missing this connection between extensive polarization along sexual lines and women's inequality, liberal feminists have failed to see the necessity for social change of the depth described here. Miles describes both feminist socialists and reformists as falling short of the totality of vision embodied in integrative feminism.

By explicitly refusing to root their identity and struggle in human reproduction and the integrative feminine principle they leave the industrial predominance of production unchallenged and have remained unable to provide any more concrete definitions of liberation than... male radicals. (Miles, 1980:13)

One of the dangers of the feminist focus on personal/political integration is a reduction of political issues to personal problems, a reduction which, since the sixties, has taken various forms. Some feminist approaches have not progressed beyond consciousness-raising, group therapy or sex-role theory that ignore the role of social power in women's oppression.

Feminist separatism is seen as one form of the reduction of the political to the personal. Lesbian separatism "reduces the politics of feminism to the personal choice of lesbianism" (Miles, 1980:15) and in extreme cases implies that the choice of lesbian separatism, the choice to become exclusively woman-identified is a necessary and sufficient route to true feminist liberation.

Another type of separatism takes the form of feminist concern with an historical understanding of women's power and wisdom. While its contributions to women's understanding of and respect for themselves and their place in history are considerable and undeniable, this concern has led in some cases to a glorification of the feminine character and a belief in a pervasive biological determination. This position does not advocate an integrative feminism but a separate spiritual and cultural feminist community (Miles, 1980).

The responses of feminists to the reduction of the political to the personal
sometimes has succumbed to an opposite danger, that of reducing the personal to the political. Some groups have re-affirmed a traditional radical position that narrow political practice must be used to combat personal oppression, that personal problems must be taken out of the personal realm and dealt with entirely in the political arena. In their reaction to the over-emphasis on the personal, they reject all concern with means/end integration as 'liberal' (Miles, 1980:17).

Another form this reaction to the personal has taken is a rejection of all feminine functions of nurturing as sexist. It therefore calls explicitly for a rejection of motherhood. Such a feminism falls far short of the goals of integrative feminism, which, neither rejecting nor glorifying the feminine capacity for nurturing, seeks to place it in a central position in all human endeavour.

The result of the factionalism of the first decade of the feminist movement was:

...a debate between the personal and the political (in the name always of "the personal is political" which all tendencies of the movement continued to proclaim), which implicitly denied the synthesizing potential of the assertion of the integrative feminine principle. (Miles, 1980:18, emphasis in original)

Miles asserts that, while feminist reductionism persists, feminism has resisted the devastating fragmentation of the New Left and has become an increasingly integrative political approach. Such an approach rejects the entire capitalist/industrial/military complex that exploits humanity and nature; it opposes all hierarchy and all dichotomies between leaders and led, all dis-integrating divisions between work and 'life', the debilitating dependency of women on the nuclear family, and the denial of full humanity to all people.

Because the ways in which women have been oppressed and rendered insignificant are so profound and so pervasive, the analysis and practice of their liberation must ultimately involve a challenge that cuts deep into present
concepts of human nature and the way the world is organized.

...this alternative rationality, called here the integrative feminine principle, has made it possible for the growing number of feminists who subscribe to it to challenge alienation, fragmentation and domination more concretely and directly than any other radicals have yet been able to do. (Miles, 1980:3)

3. Implications for the social organization of work

If it is not part of the sociologist's job to save the world, or any segment of it, it may be part of his responsibility to discover alternative forms of social organization that have some chance of acceptance or survival. (Moore, 1948:390, as quoted in Gouldner, 1954: 244)

a) The significance of work organizations. Work dominates much of an individual's attitudes and behaviour patterns in both the private and the public spheres. The quality of one's experience as a worker, therefore, is crucial in the development of concerned, active, socially effective citizens. It is in work organizations where people experience some of the most pervasive powerlessness and oppression and where the masculine values predominate. It is also among work organizations - factories and alternative institutions - that some of the most hopeful experiments in participatory democracy and organizational feminization have taken place. Pateman asserts that the authority structure at the workplace is the most significant authority structure with which an individual comes in daily contact and that opportunities to share power at work are important for the development of an individual's sense of general political effectiveness (1970:49).

Some political thinkers and activists see the humanization of the productive process and the democratization of the workplace as inevitable in the historical unfolding of social development. Miles sees the humanizing process as inherent in the advanced development of capitalism.

While fragmentation, compartmentalization and alienation are the basic objective tendencies of capitalism, there are signs in late capitalism that there is a point where the very logic of separative processes requires a return to integrative ones. The very requirements of rationalization appear to demand humanization after a certain threshold
According to Miles, it is at this point that the maintenance (reproductive) sphere regains its crucial importance. It must reassert itself in order to combat the tendencies inherent in a one-sided emphasis on the masculine productive sphere, which has been integral to the oppression of women and the dehumanization of the work experience. Seen in the light of the tradition that human history is a history of the struggle of people against their alienation, toward a sense of meaning, power and integration in their lives (Miles, 1980), the struggle for humanization and democratization of the workplace takes on a special significance. Miller, too, views social development as humanity's struggle to combat alienation and find a sense of meaning. She feels that we have reached the end of the road in terms of what masculine traits can offer society and must turn now to the feminine, with its emphasis on affiliation. She advises that we must not try to work out how women can fit into existing organizations, but must remake these organizations to include women.

For [integrative feminists'] vision to flourish, they and other women will have to create new social institutions to support and enlarge it. ...to achieve ways of living that will attend to all women's needs, the forms inevitably will have to include more mutuality, cooperation, and affiliation, on both a personal and a larger social scale. (1976:113)

Kanter also recognizes the far-reaching importance of what she calls women's work issues (1977:264) for the future of American society. She identifies three concerns that make the struggle for humanizing organizational changes increasingly imperative: growing social pressures for equal opportunity for women and minorities; organizational ineffectiveness resulting from worker dissatisfaction and the inadequate use of workers' potential; and a growing recognition that:

improving the quality of work life and considering the human consequences of organizational arrangements are as important a measure of a system's "effectiveness" as economic indicators. (1977:265)
Whether the current social crisis is met with optimism or pessimism, some attempt must be made to explain humanity's persistence in choosing what appears to be a clearly destructive path of productivity unbalanced with human, moral concerns. Schumacher observes that it is greed that has made the machine paramount and caused the present resistance on the part of all the rich nations to strive toward humanizing the work process.

It is only necessary to assert that something would reduce the 'standard of living', and every debate is instantly closed. That soul-destroying, meaningless, mechanical, monotonous, moronic work is an insult to human nature...and that no amount of 'bread and circuses' can compensate for the damage done - these are facts which...are met with an unbreakable conspiracy of silence - because to deny them would be too obviously absurd and to acknowledge them would condemn the central preoccupation of modern society as a crime against humanity. (1973:33)

It may be, as Miles predicts, that as the crisis of industrialism and imperialism increases, so will the possibilities for creative change.

The traditional indicators of public opinion, including opinion polls (Kanter, 1977:265) and the popular literature and other media, as well as sociological studies, leave little doubt about the dissatisfaction of workers with their work situation (see, for example, Pateman, 1970, Chapter 3; Terkel, 1972). If people's striving for a satisfying life are to be taken seriously, clearly there is an urgent need to reverse the trend in industrialized society toward meaningless, fragmented work controlled by those not involved in the actual work processes themselves and geared primarily toward productivity with little regard for the rights and needs of those who are working.

Increased control of people over their own work situations, and an incorporation of feminine values are crucial components in the increased humanization of the work process.

b) Varieties of organizational change. There have been a variety of approaches to this problem of humanization of work (see, for example, Bunker and Alban, 1979; Cooke and Coughlan, 1979; Galper and Washburne, 1976; Herbst, 1976;
Hunnius, 1971; Kanter, 1977; Marković, forthcoming; Pateman, 1970; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977), most of which have concentrated on increasing worker control rather than on changes that would feminize the workplace. Most changes in the direction of feminization have occurred as a byproduct of this thrust toward participatory democracy rather than as a goal in its own right. This failure to incorporate feminine values into the work process constitutes the most serious limitation of workplace democracy as it has been practiced in most experiments. Even the goal of participatory democracy has been incompletely met: in most experiments noted, although some decentralization and flattening of the hierarchy did take place, hierarchy was not eliminated. Although some power to participate in decision-making was accorded to workers, the lower the worker's position on the hierarchy, the fewer opportunities there were for participation (Pateman, 1970:50). A notable exception to the incomplete nature of most worker self-management experiments is the development of the collective alternative organizations which form the focus of this thesis. It is the total and integrated nature of the changes within collectives which give them their special significance for the issues discussed here.

Their limitations notwithstanding, however, worker self-management projects have contributed both to the body of knowledge of and expertise in participatory democratic organizational forms and to the belief that alternatives to the bureaucratic hierarchical form are possible.

In addition to the collective alternative institutions discussed in Chapter 3, experiments in worker democratization or self-management have included all-encompassing efforts such as those in Yugoslavia and China; efforts to transform sections of industries or specific factories, such as those in the automobile industry in Scandinavia or coal mining in Great Britain; and limited reforms in otherwise bureaucratic organizations.

An impressive example of the workability of alternate ways of organizing
was provided recently by an ad hoc group of women who organized the Women and the Constitution conference in Ottawa in February 1981. Within three weeks, a highly successful conference of 1,300 women from all over Canada was organized and run in a co-operative, egalitarian fashion, surprising experienced politicians with its non-traditional use of political expertise, including a rotating chair.

Skillful chairing and co-operative spirit allowed the heterogeneous group to operate by consensus, again on an ad hoc basis. It was a parliamentarian's nightmare, and yet somehow it worked. Women do do things differently. (Kome, 1981:92, emphasis in original)

Nowhere is the issue of reform versus revolution more relevant than in this arena of organizational change. Many radical political analysts are struggling with the inadequacy of organizing limited social movements or small alternative institutions around a single issue, on the one hand, and the paralysis of fighting the entire capitalist or authoritarian system on the other. In arguing against both these approaches, Hunnius says:

Power in our society is not located in one monolithic state apparatus - it is dispersed throughout society and it must be challenged and undermined wherever it appears. But our struggles must not be restricted to quantitative demands, important as these are (increase in wages and welfare benefits, for instance) but must also include demands for change in social relationships and the quality of life (for instance, the abolition of the welfare system and demand for meaningful work for all). We must insist on the primacy of human needs over the "efficiency" of the profit-making system. We must insist that demands, once won, be administered by the people and not by bureaucracies, so that the struggle and the victory are a collective experiment in the possibility of our emancipation. (1971:87, emphasis in original)

Kanter believes that:

...the best solutions ultimately lie in the development of viable alternatives to large, overly hierarchical organizations. (1977:286)

However, she also argues for undertaking the substantial improvements that are possible within present organizations, to improve the quality of life of the millions of people who work within them. But she does not believe that the serious search for smaller, more manageable and egalitarian models of organ-
ization should be stopped in favour of these reforms. It seems clear that to work on both fronts simultaneously will bring the most benefit in both the short and long run. (See Sidel and Sidel, 1976, for a critique of self-help organizations from the point of view of their ultimately anti-revolutionary potential.)

It has already been said that collectivity as it has been presented here probably cannot compete with traditional organizations within North American society in the production of goods and services already produced by those bureaucratic organizations. A radical restructuring of society is necessary before collectives can become successful on a large scale. However, some forms of large-scale worker democracy may be possible within present Western society without total restructuring of that society. Pateman (1970) argues that examples of full worker participation which takes place not as part of an experiment but in the course of workers' daily work routines offer some evidence of the possibilities for converting our present democratic societies into participatory societies.

...it is possible, at least at the level of the everyday work process, for the authority structure in industry to be considerably modified, for workers to exercise almost complete control over their jobs and to participate in a wide range of decision making, without any loss in productive efficiency. (p.62)

However, to focus a great deal of attention on the very difficult and currently improbable task of converting multi-national corporations into collectives would only divert energy from the more elementary and more immediately possible task of developing and refining collective practices in more manageable groups.

Here...we are primarily concerned with the small-scale communal workplace. There is no particular theoretical reason not to extend this approach to the entire society, great economic units as well as small. As China demonstrates, a considerable degree of communalism can be built into even the most elaborate industrial operations. But to speculate at this point about the transformation of a General Motors
assembly plant along communal lines would be an exercise in self-indulgence. We would like to see such a thing happen, and we believe that workers would in all ways be better off for it. But it is not an event of great imminence, and it seems preferable here to deal on a scale appropriate to smaller groups of people who may now be poised for experiments in communal work. We hope that General Motors and its equivalents will follow in time. (French and French, 1975:181-2)

Marković argues that workers' self-management is a basic necessity for a non-alienating work experience, but that self-management cannot ultimately survive in a society that is dominated by an authoritarian power structure. The implications are, according to Marković, that for truly egalitarian power-sharing to succeed in the workplace, it must co-exist with self-determination in its deepest sense in a radically restructured society.

Small egalitarian socialist islands cannot easily prosper in the ocean of a small market economy and sharp social stratification. (Marković, forthcoming)

He describes how slow Yugoslavia's development was in the direction of worker's self-management until it went beyond an abstract ideal held by small groups of radicals.

When it became a new institutional framework of life for millions of Yugoslav workers after the conflict with Stalinism in 1948, these workers began to change quickly their working habits and lifestyles...[becoming] much more active, responsible, and concerned about the care of social property and the optimal functioning of the productive process. (Marković, forthcoming)

But after a decade of enormous development, the state:

...imposed an economic policy which favoured a market economy, an increase in social differences, and the rise of technocracy, all of which eventually provided a very unfavourable setting for the further development of workers' democracy and equality. (Marković, forthcoming)

French and French (1975) support this view of the Yugoslavs' failure to achieve genuine democracy and humanitarianism in work, where, they say, the profit motive has diverted any efforts at communality in the work process. They point to China as the only example of possible large-scale success in this direction, where efforts toward worker control and an integrated, meaningful
work experience have so far been, to a greater degree than elsewhere, embedded in a supportive socialist environment. However, this democracy and integration will become increasingly hard to achieve, they predict, as the economy expands.

In countries such as Norway and Sweden, where experiments in worker self-management appear to be taken relatively seriously by established industry within a social democratic context, more institutional support is needed if such organizations are to flourish and if the existing legal and administrative framework is to accommodate such organizations (Herbst, 1976). The experience of worker self-management within social democracy might well be useful in pointing to some of the ways in which adaptations will have to be made in order to facilitate such developments in North American society.

As part of the larger struggle for social change, experiments in worker self-management continue in virtually every European country and in North America. Contrary to one popular image of collectivity or other non-traditional organizational forms, worker self-management experiments have not attempted to eliminate organizational structure. Rather, they have attempted to modify it to ensure worker participation and, at its best, to render the structure and processes of the organization subject to the control of all participants. The implementation of such steps toward self-management as workers' councils; shop-floor participation; worker education; decentralization; flattening the hierarchy; job enrichment; flexible hours; autonomous work groups; job rotation; workers on boards; profit sharing; and the inclusion in collective bargaining of issues that have been traditionally reserved for management (see Bunker and Alban, 1979; Herbst, 1976; Kanter, 1977; Pateman, 1970), has undoubtedly improved the quality of workers' lives. Some of these innovations foster new challenges, new definitions of success, and new criteria for human worth which are not based on rising up a hierarchical ladder, changes which are
essential for work in situations which de-emphasize hierarchy.

Clearly, no one organizational mode is appropriate to all types of groups. A doctrinaire adoption of collectivity as it is defined in Chapter 1 as an organizational answer to all problems of co-ordinating people in groups would likely be as disastrous as a doctrinaire espousal of bureaucracy. Becker (1973) has pointed out how participatory democracy and consensus decision-making may be inappropriate for some crisis situations. Hartsock (1975) shows how even within the principles of collectivity, group size and the amount and type of structure will vary with the purpose of the group.

It is clear that size alone does not determine an organization's effectiveness or its degree of humanization; large and small organizations may be ineffective in both maintenance and productive terms. As Marković points out, a great deal of oppression has taken place at the hands of small businessmen and landowners. Nevertheless, it is probably true that small, decentralized enterprises have a better chance of being democratic, non-mystifying in terms of technology and knowledge, independent, less polluting to the environment, and able to provide more interesting, varied and autonomous work (Kanter, 1977; Marković, forthcoming; Schumacher, 1973). French and French (1975) note that both the Israelis and the Chinese have found it easier to achieve communalism - participatory democracy and a humanized work process - in small-scale rather than in large-scale industry. Kanter (1977) is critical of the limited possibilities of reform within traditional organizations and points out that powerlessness and lack of humanization appear to be inevitable in large, bureaucratic organizations. French and French go even further:

With few exceptions, all these institutions [large-scale corporations] are simply too large for us ever, under any conceivable system of ownership and direction, to have more than a marginal part in their affairs. (1975:10-11, emphasis in original)

Just as there is no inevitable liberating effect of smallness, neither does smallness automatically preclude technology. Although radical changes in the use and
magnitude of technology are almost certainly required for the humanization of social development, technology can ultimately be used in the service of greater rather than less humanity (Schumacher, 1973; Marković, forthcoming). French and French detail some of the technological possibilities of collective work process (1975:Ch.10).

It is predictable that radical changes in organizational structure and work styles will bring about changes in the responses workers have to their work, to their fellow workers, and to themselves. Just as competition separates workers from one another, so co-operation brings them together (Fasteau, 1975; Hartsock, 1976-77; Korda, 1973; Miller, 1976). Just as hierarchical organization and exploitative relationships require some repression of workers' feelings toward one another (Lyons, 1976), participatory, co-operative organization allows and encourages their expression. Just as bureaucracy encourages rationality, rigidity and predictability, collectivity utilizes emotion, intuition and flexibility. As these latter qualities are more highly developed in women than in men in our society, it is argued that women have a crucial role to play at this point in the history of organizational development.

The importance of small-scale collectives as an alternative model for organization should not be under-estimated. Perhaps the most significant role alternative institutions and experiments in worker participation can play is to provide enough examples in enough different contexts to change people's consciousness.

...the purpose of protest has to be changing the minds of enough people so that the cause one presents gets to be seen as conceivable, then as possible, then probable, then normal and desirable. That's no guarantee of success, but without that purpose made clear, there's really no chance of success at all. (Janeway, 1980:302)

c) Alternative evaluation criteria. Any consideration of collectivity as an organizational alternative to hierarchy is met with doubts about its workability, its efficiency and its ability to sustain itself. It is evaluated by outsiders
and sometimes by its own participants according to criteria appropriate to more traditional organizational forms. Traditional evaluative criteria have evolved from the goals of traditional organizations, which have emerged out of a masculine, materialistic, technocratic society. Many of these goals are directed toward material rather than humanistic gains, toward maximum productivity for minimum cost, at the expense of human needs.

The rational bias of evaluation, which focuses on productivity, efficiency and other measurable forms of success, reflects the polarization of masculine and feminine in society. Bardwick and Douvan point out that this culture places a higher value on masculine productivity than it does on feminine productivity.

When male criteria are the norm against which female performance, qualities or goals are measured, then women are not equal. (Bardwick and Douvan, 1971:233)

Evaluative techniques based on these goals include, for example, cost effectiveness measures and time and motion studies. Organizations that are structured according to values, characteristics and goals that have been traditionally defined as feminine will, if judged by a masculine yardstick, emerge as inadequate.

...we need to develop new standards for evaluating the "success" of an institution that deliberately rejects the success standards of the established society. (Kanter and Zurcher, 1973:387)

Kanter and Zurcher (1973) point out some of the positive values of many alternative groups, which could be wrongly interpreted as negative attributes by traditional evaluators: the small size of groups, emphasis on process rather than product, power-sharing rather than centralization of control, and integration of the whole person rather than the rigid separation of roles characteristic of bureaucracy. To these may be added the transitory orientation of staff (Rothschild-Whitt, 1976), the flexibility and changeability of internal structures and policy, and the short lifespan of a group. All of
these may be seen by evaluators as negative attributes, but in fact may contribute to the innovative strength and integrity of the organization.

While the small size of alternative groups is often pointed to as a sign of the weakness of the movement which they represent, in fact, it may be a deliberate attempt to avoid the problems inherent in bigness which is integral to traditional ideas of what constitutes 'progress'.

Similarly, if groups emphasizing process and integration are judged by traditional standards, they are bound to be seen as failures. If, on the other hand, process and integration are seen as primary goals in themselves, such groups may be seen as highly successful. Even in groups which fall apart, the process of learning which took place within them may be seen by participants as an important measure of their success (Kanter and Zurcher, 1973).

The longevity of a group is also open to misinterpretation: there is no simple equation of longevity with success or effectiveness. A long life may in some cases be used as a measure of the success of a group where in fact it reflects organizational or personal self-interest rather than adherence to original goals (Zald and Ash, 1966). A short lifespan may say more about the lack of support an organization has received from other social institutions or about the integrity of a group's members in maintaining original goals than it does about the effectiveness of a group's mode of action. Many alternative organizations are self-consciously aware of these pressures to change in order to stay viable; they may decide to disband rather than to change their goals or tactics simply in order to stay alive.

On the other hand, change is the lifeblood of alternative institutions. Frequent change of policies and tactics may be seen by evaluators to signify instability when in fact it is more likely to reflect a group's commitment to innovation and experimentation. In an effort not to develop attachments to certain decisions or ways of doing things beyond the usefulness they serve,
collective groups' members are often self-consciously flexible. 'If something doesn't work, change it' is one of the organizational motifs of collectives.

A high turn-over of staff is also sometimes used as evidence of the unsatisfactory nature of collectivity. In fact, turn-over of staff is sometimes seen by collectives as a positive development insofar as new members introduce a fresh outlook and new ideas to the organization. (Rothschild-Whitt, 1977), and allow those remaining members freedom to take on greater responsibility (Kleiber and Light, 1978). Leaving may also in some cases be a positive move to prevent what has become a well-known syndrome of burn-out in movement and service groups (see, for example, Maslach, 1978; Freudenberger, 1974).

Kanter and Zurcher argue that not only have 'establishment' institutions developed "a monopoly on what our standards of viability are" (Kanter and Zurcher, 1973:384), but they have been well-funded, run by people well educated in the principles and practices of bureaucracy, and have had many years to evolve, to learn by their mistakes, and to prove themselves. Furthermore, the authors argue, most of the established institutions in our society provide massive ideological and financial support for each other, support which is strikingly absent for alternative institutions. It is unrealistic to expect the same degree of demonstrated success from innovative organizations that exist not only in isolation from, but in opposition to these established institutions.

Kanter and Zurcher also make the point that higher standards of perfection are applied to alternative institutions than are applied to established ones. Society accepts from established institutions a considerable degree of imperfection without dismissing them as unworkable. "More is somehow expected of alternative institutions, just because they strive for more." (1973:385). They caution against seeing the values held by alternative groups as standards, rather than as goals:
The essential question is whether the quest — the processes and their direction — implied by the values of the alternative leads toward the desired outcome, even if the ideal state is never reached. (1973:385, emphasis in original)

Finally, a word must be said about the difficult nature of the task undertaken by anti-bureaucratic organizations. Balancing their alternative goals with more traditional goals of staying operative and producing something is a source of tension for most alternative institutions. To 'take on' the bureaucratic structures of society and to combat centuries of socialization is a mammoth task. Such an undertaking realistically requires a great deal of time and effort and allowance for many mistakes to be made in the process of building up a backlog of experience. To meet such efforts with too harsh or with premature judgements is to do a disservice not only to the organizations themselves, but to the possibilities for change.

Alternative evaluation criteria notwithstanding, however, collectivity's failures should be studied and its potential for organizational problem-solving analyzed, both in their own right and in comparison to those of more traditional groups. Consistent with the integrative theme of this thesis, success probably depends ultimately on a synthesis of the strengths of both organizational forms.

4. Implications for the pursuit of knowledge

In discussing the boundaries within bureaucratic organizations as essential characteristics of such organizations, Herbst comments on the implications of such boundaries for the field of knowledge:

If we take the field of knowledge as a whole, then we split this up into humanities and science. Science is split up into chemistry, physics, biology, etc....and even if bridging disciplines are established...these tend to become specialized subjects. In this way the field of knowledge can acquire the characteristics of a bureaucratic hierarchy within which each unit has a single exclusive boundary. (1976:28)

An integrative feminist consciousness renders possible, and in fact requires, a
whole new critical perspective on knowledge and its production.

Bardwick and Douvan point out that not only does the culture value the masculine more than the feminine, but that:

The essence of the derogation lies in the evolution of the masculine as the yardstick against which everything is measured...women are defined as not-men and that means not good, inferior. It is important to understand that women in this culture, as members of the culture, have internalized these self-destructive values. (1971:234)

The implications of this definition of women in terms of not being men are enormous for the methods and directions of knowledge production in this society. Reason has dominated the pursuit of knowledge since the advent of the rational scientific method. Not only is reason considered superior to non-rational factors such as emotion and intuition, but the latter are considered destructive to a sound basis for knowledge. Objectivity is paramount; subjectivity is invalid as a way of knowing.

We are...taught a soulless 'scientific neutrality' as part of our alienation training: a high school student history paper, speaking up against U.S. slavery, earns a red-pencilled marking from the teacher: "Your feelings are showing too much. This is dangerous to objectivity". (Lyons, 1976:60)

Not only has the approach to knowledge been a masculine one, but the subject matter has been chosen by men, in the pursuit of their own interests. Kanter (1975) points out that organizational theorists, limited by the rational models of organizations, tended not to 'see' the women in those organizations. The role of women in organizations has consequently been underexamined in the literature. Those values and characteristics that constitute an extensive part of women's world - emotion, intuition, personal integration, interpersonal cohesiveness - have been left out of both the method and the content of the study of organizations, resulting in a body of knowledge and a way of knowing about organizational behaviour that is seriously one-sided.

Part of the explanation may be found in the social sciences' struggle to be seen as 'scientific', a struggle which has resulted in its almost exclusive
concentration on 'objective' and measurable aspects of social interaction (Hochschild, 1975). However, as Hochschild points out:

Those who posit a model of the rational actor generally do not deny that actors feel...they imply that little is lost when feelings are ignored... (1975:282)

A large part of the explanation may also be found in the polarization of women and men in society, the assignment to men of the rational, cognitive, intellectual realm and the assignment to women of the emotional, intuitive one, which is considered inferior to that of men. Men, who have had control of the productive world, including the production of knowledge, have tried to eliminate from it those non-rational factors which are considered feminine.

Although the omission of emotion and intuition from the pursuit of knowledge and the development of theory has consequences for both men and women, its consequences for women are more pervasive and obvious than those for men. When the production of knowledge is devoid of non-rational content and method, a large part of women's experience is invalidated.

...when a woman knows something in her guts but is unable to prove it logically, she will be discounted by men who refuse to acknowledge the importance or accuracy of her intuition. (Wyckoff, 1977:27-28)

The only theory and method of knowledge production that is consistent with the integrative approach is one that takes account of the whole range of thought, feeling and experience of both women and men. Such a mode of knowledge production requires new assumptions about human nature and new methods for exploring behaviour. The old rational research techniques are no longer adequate; qualitative methods, making use of emotional, intuitive and other non-rational factors must be developed. Researchers and all people will need to develop and refine their abilities to judge the relationships between and relative merits of rational and non-rational elements in any given situation. In the world envisaged by integrative feminists, reason and logic constitute only one of several ways of making sense of the world. Wyckoff describes the
complementary functions served by intellect and intuition:

...by itself [intellectual understanding] is sterile and dry; it lacks feeling and soul. Its natural complement is intuition. [Intuition] is knowledge that draws on our feelings and guts. It feels and senses things like body language which our rational side is not equipped to detect. Whereas intellectual understanding proceeds in a straight line to achieve certain goals, intuitive understanding tends to be circular and imaginative. Intuition is comfortable with ambiguity and tolerates contradiction.... Many people feel our intuition is underdeveloped and overshadowed by our reason... (1977:24-25)

The implications of integrative feminism for theories of human nature are considerable. The integrated personality is not one which is restricted to a feminine or a masculine way of being in the world. Sex-role socialization is not considered to be a necessary component of socialization; nor is sex-role differentiation considered necessary for healthy psychological development in either children or adults. Human nature is characterized by flexibility and elasticity, able to incorporate a wide variety of personality characteristics and roles at the same time or to emphasize different aspects of self in different contexts without losing touch with other aspects. An emphasis on compartmentalization is no longer seen as a necessary or desirable aspect of the healthy personality.

The implications of collectivity for organizational theories are equally striking. New models of organization and of leadership are seen to be possible. Present relationships of people to their work indicate that basic changes are necessary in the way that people think about and accomplish work if they are to find satisfaction in their productivity. Demonstrations of alternate ways of organizing work indicate that genuine possibilities exist for those changes. Although most current changes have taken place in isolated instances and primarily in small organizations, possibilities exist, under certain conditions, for changes on a larger scale. If the ideological framework that focuses on efficiency, increased material productivity, and growth as central to progress
can be altered to focus on concerns for increased human satisfaction and to encompass an emphasis on the process of how work gets done, then genuine changes may, indeed, be made. From the perspective of integrative feminism and collectivity, hierarchy and bureaucracy are not the only ways to organize the work process; relationships of inequality are not the only type of social relations possible. Co-operative relationships of equality and shared leadership can be the basis on which work is organized.

The costs of increased human satisfaction and personal integration are probably some decrease in material productivity and some slowing of the growth of Western industrialism. In the light of the ultimately destructive potential of too-rapid growth and over-consumption, such costs may, in the long run, be viewed as benefits.

New areas of research that might be opened up as a result of a broader base for the pursuit of knowledge and a recognition of a wider range of practical organizational possibilities include the search for effective alternative organizational forms in a wide variety of contexts; the role of sex as a determining factor in such organizational issues as power and leadership, personal aspirations, peer and inter-group relations, and group goals; the effects of single-sex versus mixed-sex composition on group functioning; factors affecting the adjustment of each sex to alternative organizational forms and to co-operative rather than competitive behaviour; the present and potential role of non-rational factors in group behaviour and decision-making; the effects on individuals and on organizations of an integration of masculine and feminine personality characteristics and roles; the ideological bases of social organization and the validity in different contexts of traditional criteria of organizational success; and the use of technology in humanizing ways.

The ideological underpinnings of modern organizations, such as the connection between a "masculine ethic" and a "spirit of managerialism", 
need further examination. To understand the structural conditions for
men and women in organizations and the organizational behaviour of
men and women is critical for both social inquiry and social change.
(Kanter: 1975:64)

5. For the future of society

...the point is that the characteristics most highly developed in
women and perhaps most essential to human beings are the very
characteristics that are specifically dysfunctional for success in
the world as it is. That is obviously no accident. They may,
however, be the important ones for making the world different. (Miller,
1976:124, emphasis in original)

The implications of the integrative approach extend into all aspects of human
social development to include the use of technology, the relation between
people and nature, large-scale organization, international relations, and war
and peace. Prevailing ideas about progress and growth and about the power
bases of social relations are central to the ideology that sustains the
bureaucratic organizational form as the only appropriate organizational form
for most small-scale and virtually all large-scale organizations in Western
society. Some thinkers see the aggressive, competitive, imperialistic approach
of the major nations, which is exploitative of humanity and nature, as a result
of the masculine emphasis which predominates in all of them (see, for example,
polarization extends into all areas of life, resulting in a dominant/submissive
pattern which governs all social relations from the personal to the international.
We have built a society that is based on hierarchy, on 'have' and 'have nots',
on racism, classism, and sexism, and that, as a result, lives under the constant
shadow of the reality and potentiality of war. Miller relates our most press­
ing social problems very directly to the polarization of men's and women's realms:

Much of current literature, philosophy, and social commentary focuses
on the lack of human connection in all our institutions. There is
widespread concern about our inability to organize the fruits of
technology toward human ends; it is, perhaps, the central problem of
the dominant culture. But human ends have been traditionally assigned
to women - When women have raised questions that reflect their concerns,
the issues have been pushed aside and labeled trivial matters. (1976:24)
Adams (1971) points out the destructive nature of economics, organizations, and personal relations in this society and discusses how such a pattern sabotages even that work of women which is aimed at mutual support, nurturance and social cohesiveness.

Janeway identifies the lack of control over human beings' drives to conquer the natural world as the crucial issue which has led the human world to its present precarious position. She says that the only hope for a world whose "drive to conquer and exploit" has run amuck lies in:

...acknowledging and strengthening a community that surrounds, and should contain, the urge to mastery, for this is the only force that can direct it toward co-operation.

By dividing the world into two, into males and females and, by extension, into powerful and weak, we have let go the unity of life that limits any threat to domination. The drive to achieve, the urge to lay hands on the decisive powers of the mighty and to plan and govern well for others, all this is invaluable — as long as it is held in place within the human context. It is this context that the powers of the weak address ...They express...the underlying awareness of community both as a limiting factor strong enough to tame vainglorious ambition and as a source of creative potential. Out of this creativity will come our new definitions, our new social contract. (1980:314)

Schumacher also recognizes the centrality of the problem of integrating polarities. Although he does not couch his analysis in terms of gender, his assertion of the need for a re-emphasis of human values in social and economic organization fits easily into the analysis of sexual arrangements presented here. He stresses the need to integrate the material with the spiritual, mechanical efficiency with humanity's need for creativity, and economic advancement with morality. He argues for a re-definition of basic notions of what constitutes 'progress' in our society, in terms of values that are distinctly feminine.

Scientific or technological 'solutions' which poison the environment or degrade the social structure and man himself are of no benefit, no matter how brilliantly conceived or how great their superficial attraction. Even bigger machines, entailing even bigger concentrations of economic power and exerting even greater violence against the environment, do not represent progress: they are a denial of
wisdom. Wisdom demands a new orientation of science and technology toward the organic, the gentle, the non-violent, the elegant and beautiful. (1973:29)

The functions served in our society by inequality, sexual polarization, hierarchy and bureaucracy - for example, social stability, the division of labour, and the regulation of interaction between the sexes - may be falsely viewed as necessary and desirable social functions which can only be served by a maintenance of the status quo. The costs of this kind of stability are high: personal dissatisfaction, frustration, and fragmentation; widespread social unrest; conflict between the powerful and the powerless. Situations which have the outward appearances of stability - from marriage and the nuclear family to bureaucratic social organization - may have an inner and not always well-concealed component of destructiveness. Not only is dissatisfaction pervasive but supposed stability may erupt or degenerate into a situation of dangerous instability wherein 'haves' and 'have nots' engage in open confrontation. Seen in the light of present human suffering and the potential for destruction, the instability inherent in a radical challenge to the status quo may not appear so threatening. On the contrary, the goal of personal and social integration proposed by integrative feminism is based on a model of human organization firmly grounded in cohesive rather than divisive principles.

Assumptions about the dominant/submissive nature of all social relations results in a definition of power which implies that in order for one person to have power, power must be taken away from someone else. Firestone (1970) recognizes the pervasiveness of this power psychology and its rootedness in sexual, class and family structure, but goes on to say that if any movement can successfully challenge the psychological and social pattern of dominance/submission, radical feminism will. Watson discusses the possibilities contained in the women's movement for working through these personal and social interpretations of power:
Separating conceptually the power that depends primarily on personal domination of others from the power that depends on civil rights, educated skills, and the management of energies, some women in some positions of power, may be able to reject megalomania without allowing themselves to be shunted into illusory...or peripheral forms of power. If women cultivate...their dearly bought insights into the abuse of power...it may be possible to make some progress toward detaching the ego from power and experimenting with more humane and liberating uses of power. (1975:118)

If it is true that women's capacities for co-operation, affiliation, flexibility, and intuitive understanding are more finely developed than men's, then women do, indeed, have a special role to play in social change at this moment in history. Adams says that in a period of accelerating social change, women's capacity for flexibility may provide a valuable contribution to the movement toward revolution by setting a model for nondoctrinaire policies and goals (1975:571). Of women's intuitive understanding, she says:

...this seismographic quality gives women an invaluable tool for divining subterranean stresses in larger group systems and alerting the participating individuals to their presence and to the possible courses they will take if not controlled...in a social setting that is unstable and unpredictable, men's power tactics tend to be outmoded and lack the capacity for adroit maneuvering, rather like the Spanish Armada when naval warfare took on a new style. (1971:572)

While the elimination of destruction and hostile confrontation is imperative in this world as it has never been before, the elimination of conflict is not. One possible additional role for women in a revolutionary context is to reclaim the creative nature of conflict (Miller, 1976). To recognize the necessity for conflict while at the same time creating new forms for its expression, can be a great strength. This strength may come more easily from women than from men, not only because of the traditional characteristics developed in women, but because of women's position outside the power structures of the world.

Schumacher (1973) recognizes the dynamic and on-going nature of the reconciliation of opposites, as did Marx in his theory of the dialectical relation of thesis and antithesis. A perfect union of the sexes is not only impossible, but undesirable. Such a union would lose the cutting edge of challenge; it
would lose the power and excitement that comes from pitting one set of strengths against another and emerging with something that is different from both. If such a synthesis is to be a dynamic and growing one - a process rather than a product - then creative conflict must be built into it.

Feminism, then, must go beyond demands for equality of the sexes to demands for a basic restructuring of society. Integrative feminism calls for an invigoration of the maintenance sphere and its values, a harmonization of the feminine (maintenance) and the masculine (productive) spheres in ways that appropriate the best of each. Such a restructuring involves an interpretation of human nature which recognizes the value of so-called feminine characteristics in the development of fully integrated human beings, and the real and potential power of these characteristics in shaping the world.

Notes

1. As mentioned in Chapter 3, Pateman (1970) has shown that some cases of full worker participation, for example, in the coal and automobile industries in Britain, have demonstrated that such control by the workers of the everyday processes of their work not only may not harm the efficiency of the operation, but may increase it. On the other hand, evidence from such researchers as Rothschild-Whitt indicates that collectivity as it has been described here, which entails a feminization of the work process, almost certainly would cause such a loss.

2. Here, again, Miles uses this term in the broad sense, focusing not just on the biological processes of reproduction, but on the whole range of what I have called maintenance activities.

3. Pateman (1970) identifies a lack of control over the content and conditions of their work as the main reason people give for disliking their jobs.
4. Pateman, however, argues that all degrees of participation probably have some benefits, that partial participation or participation at lower levels is a valuable educational tool and prepares individuals for fuller participation at higher levels.

5. Among other factors affecting the success of collectives within a largely unsupportive environment is that of financial support. The issue of money within collectives is a crucial one in terms of, among other things, their continued existence, possibilities of bureaucratization, task allocation, and interpersonal relations. The issue includes such problems as where money will come from (fee for services, government grants, private donations, or members' other jobs); how much compromise the group is willing to make in order to obtain money; and on what basis money will be distributed within the group. The implications of such questions are enormous for collectives, but are beyond the scope of this thesis. See Kleiber and Light (1978); Newman (1980); and Rothschild-Whitt (1977) for further discussion of this issue. See Loney (1974) for a discussion of the effects of government monies on the radical youth movement in Canada.

6. For a discussion of an attempt to introduce collective decision-making among school staff see Cooke and Coughlan (1979). For reactions of North Americans to participation in a simulation of industrial democracy see Bunker and Alban (1979).
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