binding on all members of the society, unifying within their fold all of the appropriate (ascriptively categorized) people, and cutting across all "parochial" kinship, local, etc., units. Secondly, these groups and criteria serve as foci of mutual categorization of people, and thus as one of the most important mechanisms of allocation of roles and rewards; i.e., also as integrative mechanisms. The fully institutionalized allocation of roles has been frequently mentioned and exemplified above. It assumes different manifestations in various societies, but the general picture is similar: definite roles of highest importance from the point of view of the social system and the concomitant rewards of prestige, authority, etc., with them, are ascribed to members of various age groups. Thus age group membership both regulates the flow of facilities available to any individual, and at the same time, through the distribution of rewards, gears his action to precisely ascribed roles. The solidarity of the age group system in these societies is not a purely internal affair; it forms a basis for the solidarity of the entire social system. Through these allocative processes the primacy of collectivity orientation is extended to the entire social system. This may be achieved either through making age group relations regulate the whole scope of social relations, or through making the age groups of smaller social scope (as among the Ibo, Yakó) identify themselves with community-oriented goals and perform various communal tasks.

The importance of age groups for the maintenance of the solidarity of the society can be clearly seen both in some of their educational functions and in the important part they always play in tribal ceremonies. From the educational point of view it should be stressed that the different age groups, age regiments, etc., serve not only as transmitters of knowledge and tribal lore, but also as channels of social communication, through which members of the tribe meet with its chiefs, and participate, whether actively or as spectators, in tribal discussions, judgments, etc.[94] As for the ceremonies, in some cases, e.g., among the Nuba and the Nandi groups, the age groups are the most important participants, while among the Yako they also constitute important elements in these ceremonies. In all of these tribes the inauguration

of an age set (or the transfer of government to a given age set) takes place in a "tribe-wide" ceremony.[95] These variations depend, as we shall see, on the extent to which other integrative mechanisms exist within the social system, and will be analyzed in subsequent chapters. But these variations do not affect the basic integrative role of age groups within these societies, an integrative role which has always been successfully juxtaposed with that of the family and kin group in kin societies.

This description of the functions of age groups both in the development of the individual and in the cohesion of the social system does not explain the conditions under which they occur. This explanation, which alone can furnish a full functional analysis, will be attempted in the last chapters of this book.

IX

We shall now turn to a systematic analysis of the emergence of age groups within the framework of various modern societies. "Modern society,"[96] which as we have already pointed out is only a synonym for highly differentiated societies, constitutes the fullest example of a universalistically regulated society. It is within the institutional framework of modern societies that the fullest implications of universalistic criteria for allocation of roles and of universalsitic value orientations have been worked out institutionally. Consequently, it is also within the framework of modern societies that the great variety and complexity of age and youth groups can be discerned and analyzed—a variety and complexity which are both similar to and different from that of the hitherto discussed primitive societies.

Our task will, then, be to analyze in broad lines the relation between these institutional arrangements of modern societies and the various types of age and youth groups. It should, however, be obvious that the term "modern society" (with its institutional implications) denotes but an "ideal type," constructed out of various elements the distribution of which varies to a very great extent in various concrete cases.[97]

We shall first analyze, in general terms, those aspects of modern societies which are most relevant to our problem and hypoth-

esis; and, secondly, the relative distribution of these significant aspects within various sectors of modern societies and their relation to the emergence of age and youth groups.

Almost all of the main criteria of a universalistically regulated society enumerated at the beginning of this chapter hold true in modern societies, and find their fullest realization within various modern societies. Their inclusive membership is usually based on universalistic criteria of "citizenship," and not conditioned by membership in any kin or particularistic group (except, of course, in so far as loyalty to a given total community as such constitutes a definitely particularistic value[98]). The family or kin unit does not constitute a basic unit of political and/or ritual activities. Economic specialization is organized in universalistically governed groups, and not, as for instance in the caste regime of India, within particularistic groups wider than the family. The family does not constitute a basic unit of the economic division of labor, especially not in production and distribution, and even in consumption to a lesser extent than in other societies. Moreover, the general scope of the family's activities is constantly diminishing, and various specialized agencies are, to some extent at least, taking over its function in the fields of education, nursing, recreation, etc.[99] The extent and scope of relations which are regulated according to kinship criteria is very small and, to a very large extent, not clearly defined.[100]

It should, of course, be emphasized that even in modern societies not all the sectors of society are regulated according to universalistic criteria. Here also many spheres—neighborhood, friendship, informal associations, some class relations and participation in a common style of life, ethnic and community relations—may be and are regulated according to various particularistic criteria. But the scope of these relations is, in these societies, more limited than in many others, and in the main institutional spheres of society universalistic criteria are much more prevalent. It should also be mentioned, as we shall see in greater detail later, that the extent to which universalistic criteria prevail differs from one sector of modern society to another. On the whole, however, modern societies are the purest type of nonkinship, universalistically organized societies.

The extremity of the nonkinship allocation of roles and institutional regulation within the modern (especially urban) society gives rise to a distinct segregation of family life (especially in its age-heterogeneous, parents-children relations) from other institutional spheres. The parent-children (and adolescents) roles enacted within the modern family are not only, as in other nonkinship societies, different in their general value orientations and organizational patterns from those of the other institutional spheres of the social system. They are also segregated to a very large extent from any roles enacted in the main institutional spheres of the adult society. The parents enact roles vis-à-vis their children which differ largely from those that they (and especially the father) perform in other institutional spheres. The discontinuity between the world of children and that of the adults may become sharpened and emphasized by this type of role organization.[101]

Accordingly, the difference between the particularistic family structure and the universalistic (and achievement-oriented) occupational and other nonfamilial spheres is also sharpened, and becomes very strong and complex, although it differs greatly in various sectors of modern societies. Owing to the limitation of the social spheres of the family and to the main value orientations of significant sectors of modern societies (particularly the "middle-class" achievement and individualistically oriented sectors) relations within the family are charged with deep emotion and characterized by strong emotional interdependence, with a very strong element of internalization of the parents' images. It is this strong internalizaztion of the parents' images that may serve for the children as the first bridge to adult society. Through it the child may identify itself, in a general way, not only with the concrete roles of his parents in the family, but also with their general disposition and roles in other spheres. While such an internalization does not, in itself, diminish the segregation of the family from other spheres, it may, if successful, provide the first basis for an orientation and transition to these spheres.

All these characteristics of modern families and societies have given rise to various kinds of youth- (age-) oriented groups and agencies. These agencies and groups have grown with the devel-

opment of modern economic and political systems, a development which was gradual and uneven in various societies and their sectors.

Unlike, however, in all the primitive and most of the historical (with the exception of Athens and the Hellenistic cities) societies, no one unitary organization of age groups can be found in modern societies. We may distinguish between three main types of such groups and agencies which develop within modern societies. The first is the educational school system, the second are various adult-sponsored youth agencies and the third are spontaneous youth groups. These three types usually develop concurrently, although in some cases they (especially the second type) may be absent. All of them develop in connection with the various problems stemming from the development of modern economic and political, etc., systems and their repercussions on family and youth life. From that point of view they may be seen as one system. But at the same time there exists a significant differentiation between them. Some are organized by adults, and aim at the preparation of children for their adult roles and the smooth transference of the social heritage; others are more spontaneously developed by the children themselves to satisfy their own needs. While there is a constant interaction and interdependence between these various types of youth groups and agencies, there does not always exist a full complementarity and harmony between them. It is highly significant that in modern societies, unlike even in the historical societies, there is a great dissociation between the educational system and other forms of youth groups and agencies. The analysis of the relations between them, and the factors which influence these relations—and foremost among them the family—is one of our main concerns in this section, as well as in other places in the book.

This transition to the universalistic sphere of adult society is, however, here much more difficult and complicated than in other societies. These difficulties are inherent in the structure of family relations and may often be accentuated because this transition involves, in particular, severance from the mother and her image—attachment to whom has necessarily been very strong, albeit at the same time ambivalent—because of her relative confinement to the family sphere and formally lower position in the authority structure.[102]

X *The school system.* Economic and professional specialization in modern societies is based on an accumulation of technical knowledge, the transmission of which lies beyond the powers of any family, and also necessitates a period of learning and preparation, the length of which is usually directly related to the extent of specialization. This also holds true of many aspects of ideological, philosophical and religious knowledge, the acquisition of which constitutes a necessary prerequisite for the performance of many roles and for the attainment of full membership and status within the total society. The transmission of this knowledge is effected in special, institutionalized, educational organizations—the schools. While various types of professional and educational schools exist in many societies, it is only in modern societies (and perhaps to some extent in certain sectors of the societies of classical antiquity[103]) that they have gradually become an almost universal institutional device for the transmission of knowledge necessary for the attainment of full social status. Their first distinct characteristic is that, unlike the so-called initiation schools of the primitives, they organize the life of children for a long period of time, usually for several years. The second basic characteristic is their very strong technical-preparatory emphasis.

Their universal institutional importance clearly bears witness to the shrinkage of the family's scope of activities, and to the inadequacy of the family as the sole educational agency. In other words, they arise because family and kinship age-heterogeneous relations cannot ensure the smooth and continuous transmission of knowledge and role dispositions. The social structure and the sphere of the school is obviously distinct from that of the family, and necessarily involves a different way of organizing relations between the various generations. The school society, becoming more formalized, is organized on the basis of age-homogeneous groups, which interact with each other and particularly with representatives of the adult society (teachers) more or less corporately, in an organized way. The world of the school is a

world of clearly defined age groups (grades, classes) which form a unitary heterocephalous hierarchy directed and oriented by specialized representatives of the adult world. Thus age grading within the school has, as it were, a dual differentiation. There is, first, the internal differentiation between different classes within the total hierarchy, and secondly, juxtaposition of the total organization of children and adolescents with adult society and its representatives who are the bearers of power and authority within the system.[104]

The internal age differentiation of the school society is primarily due to the exigencies of adapting the psychological (and to some extent also physiological) learning potential of the child to the various skills and knowledges which must be acquired by him.[105] The formal, official differentiation of school grades and classes is defined mostly in terms of advanced skills and knowledge: The overall juxtaposition of school life with adult society is defined in modern societies, more emphatically than in any other society, in terms of "preparation" for adulthood. The roles which are institutionally allocated to school children of various grades and ages are definitely preparatory; i.e., they are evaluated mainly in terms of their contribution to some future status, and do not constitute ends in themselves, or manifestations of full status and membership in the community. Age-heretogeneous relations within the school, between teacher and pupils, tend to emphasize the basic discontinuity between the social sphere of children and that of adults and the great difference in power and authority that exists between them. This preparation has both symbolical and technical aspects, and in so far as the symbolical aspects prevail, it entails a great extent of segregation—from the adult world. (In so far as purely technical aspects prevail, as for instance, in various technical schools, the exclusion from adult society is usually less marked.) In this respect the formalized age grouping of the modern school differs from formalized age grouping in any other society.

That is why the relation of the school to the family and to the total society is a very peculiar one. On the one hand, it constitutes the first stage of transition from family life to a universalistically regulated society. The school's universalistic orientation

is obvious, and finds its fullest expression in bringing children of various separate families together. Within its basically age-ascriptive framework it also develops—to some extent parallel to the family, but much more intensively—within the children role dispositions for achievement orientation and for identification with universalistic values and symbols of identification. Through the persons of the teachers it also extends, in some measure, the children's identification with a wider cluster of adults, and gradually changes the nature of this identification from a very particularistic and personal one to a more universalistic and impersonal one.[106] On the other hand, however, it constitutes, together with the family, a children's world, segregated from that of the adults. This situation is explained by the fact that the adults who participate in this world enact roles which are specifically oriented towards it, and distinct from other roles in adult society. They specialize in dealing with children. And the very strong emphasis on "preparation" towards the adult world only emphasizes the segregation from this world.

This emphasis on preparation entails yet another problem. It usually involves the postponement of social maturity beyond the attainment of physiological and sexual maturity. The longer the period of preparation necessary for the achievement of any specialized task, the longer the corollary postponement of the establishment of a new family of procreation. Owing to the great stress on preparation for specialization and learning of various skills, the fact of sexual maturation does not receive as much symbolical recognition and ideological evaluation within the formal age culture of the school as it receives within most primitive age groups. It is usually vaguely defined and does not find prominent expression in the value system of the school.

This situation, of course, constitutes yet another difficulty in the transfer of identification from the family to the total society through the school, and in the development of the adolescent child's identity.[107] Because of all these factors, the age grading and culture of the school, the goals set up by it and the roles enacted within it do not usually constitute—within modern societies or within certain of their sectors—adequate objects for those needs which arise within the child's and adolescent's per-

sonality at the period of transition from the family to the total society. For this reason the child and adolescent always develops, although to various degrees, the predisposition to join in age groups in which the dignity of his current dispositions and values will be affirmed, within which a greater spontaneity of activities will be permitted, and which in some cases will also have a more direct relation to the symbols of identification of a total society, either the existing one or a new one to which he would like to develop. However varied the different age groups, peer groups, youth movements, etc., of various modern societies may be in their composition, organization, values, etc., the first two above-mentioned features are always characteristic of them, and, in certain cases, also the third. Even if they are concretely connected with the school, they are always somewhat distinct from it.[108] It is very interesting to note here that even in those societies which have established overall, institutionalized youth organizations (e.g., the U.S.S.R. and Nazi Germany), these youth movements are distinct from the school, however much they may be related to it in practice. Only under very specific conditions does the school system succeed in organizing all, or most of the life, of the children and youth, within the scope of the school. One such instance with which we shall deal in great detail later on, is the "classical" English Public Schools.[109] Another example can be found in the various "progressive" trends of education where there has been an attempt to encompass the whole of the children's life by establishing "children's republics." In all these cases, however, school life is infused with elements and relations which differ from those oriented to the distinct preparatory and specializing educational activities of the school system.

XI

The inadequacy of an educational system relying on the school as the sole instrument for dealing with *all* of the problems of youth gave rise to the second main type of youth organizations—the youth-oriented agency. This type includes various specialized agencies, sponsored by the institutional official representatives of the society to deal with youth and its problem.

The number and variety of the adult-sponsored youth organizations and agencies is legion, and there is no need to give a full list here. It will be enough here to give a very brief and general classification. First, we find various youth organizations and groups whose main aim is to find an outlet for the energies of youth by channeling them into various recreative and cultural activities, ranging from special recreational clubs to groups like the Scouts, Girl Guides, etc. All these groups, in addition to providing various recreative facilities, aim at molding the general character development of youth, at instilling various civic virtues in order to deepen their social consciousness and widen their social and cultural horizon. The most outstanding examples of this type are the YMCA, the Youth Brigades organized in England by W. Smith, Country Clubs and other types of youth clubs in cities, many of which are connected with religious and political groups, the Boy Scouts, the Jousters in France, the various types of community organizations and hostels of vocational guidance centers, etc. Secondly, there are many such organizations sponsored by specific political and religious organizations which, in addition to providing the above-mentioned facilities and instilling general virtues into the new generation, aim also at binding them to their own specific goals, at either maintaining or developing their loyalty to the specific party or group.[110] In short, in European countries, as well as in various colonial countries and in Israel, we find that most of the political parties and religious organizations attempt to organize various youth clubs and movements. Thirdly, there are agencies which deal with "problem children" of various kinds—delinquents, underdeveloped and underprivileged children—provide them with various facilities for adjusting themselves to what is supposed to be the normal condition of children within their specific societies.[111]

One may perhaps add, as a borderline case, between the second and the third type, the various vocational agencies and organizations whose aim it is to help children and adolescents, particularly those coming from underprivileged economic sectors, to advance professionally. The working-youth movements of Continental Europe (especially Germany) and of Israel constitute part of this category.[112]

All these organizations have in common the assumption that the complete integration of youth into society, the successful transition within the scope of the family from childhood to full, adequate citizenship and participation in community life can be effected only through allocating specific roles to youth and to adolescents, stressing their common youth-adolescent identity, and bringing them together in common life experiences. At the same time they stress the importance of expressive activities in the attainment of these goals and the importance of emphasis on orientations to common, ultimate values of the community.*[113]

The following excerpt from W. Smith's Manifesto about his Youth Brigades put before Church authorities is very typical:

> He laid before the Mission authorities his scheme for banding together the boys of school above the age of twelve into a "Brigade," in which they would be taught elementary drill, physical exercises, obedience to the word of command, punctuality, and cleanliness. It would be something they could regard as distinctively their own, to which they would become attached, and of which they would be so proud that they would be ashamed to do anything that might bring discredit upon it. Thus would be engendered that *esprit de corps* which public-school boys acquire as a matter of course, but which was almost entirely lacking in elementary schoolboys. Organized games would follow, and he believed that the outcome would be discipline and order in the Sunday School, the retention of the older boys (who in the ordinary course would cease to attend as soon as they became wage-earners), and increased interest in school and church. . . .

Different clubs and youth organizations laid different emphases on the various aspects of youth life and activities. Some—like the Brigades, various para-military organizations, Cadets, etc.—laid great emphasis on physical training, others on "spiritual" religious, etc., values, still others on conviviality, on sports, excursions, etc. But all of them paid some attention to most of the aspects mentioned, and wanted to provide full facilities for their realization. It was in this way that they thought to supplement formal education and to imbue youth with civic consciousness.

* A full list of such youth groups and organizations can be found in the various publications cited in references 112, 113 and 114 of this chapter. among working-class youth usually cover a shorter period of life, and become one of the mechanisms of secondary institutionalization.

The development of all these agencies and organizations is historically connected with the growing impact of industrialization and urbanization, with the so-called later stages of the Industrial Revolution, when very wide strata of population became involved in these processes.[114] Some developed as agencies for working and slum youth (various clubs and settlement houses), some—like the YMCA, etc.—in answer to various needs of the growing middle classes. In the United States the development of these agencies was connected with the continuous influx of immigrants, the evolution of metropolitan centers, etc.—in other words, all those processes which indicate the expansion of universalistic criteria and the diminution of the family's sphere of life.

Side by side with the development of special youth agencies we witness also a development of the conception of a special "youth problem" in the main spheres of cultural activity in Europe and the United States—in literature, art, educational thought, etc. The beginning of these developments may be traced perhaps to Rousseau, to the main trends of European, and especially German, Romanticism.[115] The consciousness of youth vs. old age and of the whole problem of generations could be traced in most literary and artistic movements, and in the great plethora of new trends and schools. The problems of youth, its place in life, its being the fullest expression of vitality—or decadence—the problems of strife between generations were evident in most of the main literary trends of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and even special types of literary works were developed to deal with it.

In educational thought the problem of adolescence and youth was developed and stressed in the works of Stanley Hall and his numerous followers. In social thought—especially in France and Germany—the problem of relations between generations and of their educational and moral repercussions was widely discussed, finding its apogee in K. Mannheim's brilliant essay.[116]

In most cases all these developments were very closely connected with periods of social upheaval, rapid change and spread of universalistic orientations and organizations.

XII Side by side with the development of these various adult-sponsored youth agencies, a great development and intensification of spontaneous youth life and spontaneous youth groups takes place. These are not in themselves, of course, entirely new developments. Children's groups, play groups, etc., which are universal in all human societies were also abundant in rural and urban Europe before the rise of industrialism, as all the chronicles of the past tell us most clearly. They performed also those general functions which we have analyzed before.

But with the development of industrialism and of modern political systems, and with the growing limitation of the scope of the family, their scope and vitality are intensified. They become more numerous; they extend over a much longer period of time—till late adolescence; they become much more solidary and self-conscious; they become more and more important in the lives of their members and of the community as a whole. They exhibit a great variety, and we shall not dwell on them here in any great detail. Some of their most pertinent characteristics have been described in Chapter II.

We have seen various forms of organizations—informal play groups, juvenile gangs, autonomous recreaitonal groups, student organizations, organized rebellious youth movements of the German and Continental type. Within all these groups, as we shall see in greater detail below, common youth consciousness and the importance of expressive activities, are heavily stressed. A strong predisposition for orientation to common values, and generally also a demand for a specific allocation of roles on the basis of age homogeneity and community of experiences, are also noticeable.

These various youth groups may be roughly classified according to the following criteria, indicating their relative importance both for the individual and for the society: (a) The scope of activities they cover; (b) the extent of their internal cohesion and corporate organization; (c) the extent of conformity with institutional roles or of deviancy from them; (d) the extent of ideological conformity or rebellion and (e) the extent to which adults or elder adolescents participate in them.

The interlinking of these spontaneous role expectations on the

part of youth with those allocated to them by the adult-sponsored agencies is not, in modern societies, a simple and harmonious process. Such interlinking may take place and succeed in various sectors of modern society, and the goals and activities set up by the educational system authority and the adult-sponsored organization may be found adequate for the need dispositions of the youth. And yet, because of all the above-enumerated reasons (and particularly the emphasis on preparation in many of these organizations), the mutual compatibility between the adolescents' attitudes and the roles allocated to them by the adult-sponsored organizations is not automatically effected, and constitutes one of the main problems of modern societies. Because of this also (as well as for some other reasons), it is within the orbit of modern society that the deviant tendencies and orientations of age groups may attain such scope. All these problems will be systematically investigated in the coming chapters. Here we only intended to show the general relation between the development of modern universalistic societies and the various types of youth groups.

XIII The connection between the development of "modern" social systems and the emergence of age groups can be seen in many instances. First, this connection can be seen in European society's transition from feudalism and absolutism to the modern universalistic and industrialized society. All the historical data show us how new, universalistic, educational systems and agencies and spontaneous youth groups developed during this transition. This can be seen in the rapid educational development in England in the 19th century, and in parallel developments in other European countries.[117] It can also be seen in the development of various spontaneous youth groups, in Students' Movements, in various ideological and semi-political movements and youth rebellions connected with the Romantic Movement in Europe and especially in Germany. The various social and national movements of the 19th and 20th centuries also gave rise to various types of youth organizations, youth consciousness, etc., as evidenced in such movements as Mazzini's "Young Europe," etc.

The same applies to the emergence of the German youth movement following the rapid transformation which took place during the post-Bismarckian era.[118]

Of special interest from the point of view of our analysis, are the various instances of recorded and analyzed situations of "culture contact," which occurred both in the recent past and in the present. Among these situations of culture contact the impact of Western civilization on various primitive and traditional societies and cultures should be first mentioned, and also the transplantation of members of various particularistic, traditional societies into a "modern" industrial setting, mostly through migration.[119]

The literature on culture contact, on the impact of Western civilization on primitive peoples, repeatedly describes the disruption of family life which results from this impact. This disruption not only takes on various forms of family disorganization, etc., but always involves a change in the mutual evaluation of the generations as well—some extent of rebellion of the younger members of the family against the social roles imposed on them in relation to the authority of the older members. Within the former traditional social setting they were able to evolve their identity through specific forms of interaction with the members of elder generations; in the new situation, however, this interaction no longer provides them with such security. On the one hand, they may have been given access to various facilities for performance of roles which were barred from them in the traditional setting, or such as are inaccessible to the older generation, e.g., earning money in exacting manual labor, etc. On the other hand, general cultural orientations transmitted from the older members to the younger ones are inadequate for full orientation within the new situation. It may well be that no such fully integrating orientations and principles develop at all; but in any event the old orientations are obviously inadequate, and the elder members are no longer adequate symbols of role disposition within the new setting. The younger people usually start a search for new identification, and at one phase or another this search is expressed in terms of ideological conflict with the older generation as such, of the ideological identification of youth, of

young people as a distinct cultural category. Whether this rebellion really gives rise to new integration of the personality, or whether it results in a failure of ego integrity[120] is immaterial at this point of our discussion. The important point is that the transition from a particularistic to a universalistic setting gives rise to a specific "youth" or "age" ideology and identification. The extent to which such identification forms a basis for cohesive social groupings varies, but to some extent it always does form such a basis.

A very important example of such ideological and social transformation may be seen in some processes of social change in modern China, and in the transformation of the traditional Chinese society. Within that society, which constituted one of the most clear-cut examples of a relatively complex society integrated by particularistic kin criteria, the relative seniority of various age groups *within* the family unit was very much emphasized. The whole kinship structure of Chinese society was regulated to some extent by this principle, and differences between the various age grades within the family and kin unit were strongly stressed.[121] These differences were stressed, however, within a setting of mutual interaction. With the transformation of the traditional Chinese society under the impact of Western ideological, economic and military processes, which have necessarily given rise to more individualistic and universalistic ideas and criteria of social action, we witness increasing stress on absolute age, and on the growing common identification of the *ch'ing-nien* (the young adults). This common identification has served as the basis for many active social groupings, which formed parts of the incipient Chinese youth movement and of various social and political movements.

A similar development can be traced in the disintegration of the traditional Jewish community—one of the most familistic societies known—under the impact of emancipation and modern commercial and industrial development. Even in the traditional, familistic society, various youth groups of "bakhurei yeshiva" (youngsters of the college) would be formed in those centers of learning which drew students from many localities and in this way took them out of the familistic setting. With more modern

developments within the traditional society, these groups developed even more distinct youth ideology and activities. Later these groups also formed the nucleus of numerous Jewish Socialist and Zionist group activities.[122]

Similar developments can be found in most non-European countries which felt the impact of Western institutions. Most of the nationalistic movements in the Middle East, in India, Indonesia,[123] etc., consisted of young people, quite often students, or young officers who rebelled against their elders, against the traditional familistic setting in which there existed a very strong emphasis on the authority of elders. They tried to develop new social values and groups, and within most of these movements there was a very strong emphasis on a specific youth consciousness and youth ideology. In fact, the need to "rejuvenate" the country was strongly emphasized by these nationalistic movements.

One of the most striking examples of the emergence of youth and age groups through transition from a particularistic to a universalistic social setting may be seen in centers of migration, especially in the United States.

The importance of the "peer group" among immigrant children is a very well-known phenomenon, which usually appears in the second generation of immigrants. It is mainly due to the relative "breakdown," or, rather, shrinkage of the family life of immigrants within the countries of absorption; and the more highly these countries (or those sectors within which the immigrants are absorbed) are industrialized and urbanized, i.e., regulated according to universalistic criteria, the sharper the breakdown. This shrinkage and limitation is due mainly to two interdependent factors: (a) the limitation of the effective capacity of family life and relations caused by the necessity to concentrate most of the available energy on various problems of adjustment to the new country, i.e., the diminished capacity of (mainly) the parents to fulfill adequately their family roles; and (b) the general, more permanent trend of transplantation into a society where (unlike the situation in most of the immigrants' countries of origin, especially that of the peasants) the family

does not constitute a basic unit of the division of labor and where its general sphere of activities is much more limited.

From the point of view of the immigrant or second generation child, his family of orientation is inadequate as a general point of orientation towards the new social structure. On the one hand, the parents' status images and cultural orientation generally difguidance of their children as the latter need. On the other hand, the parents' status-images and cultural orientation generally differ from those accepted within their new social setting, and even under the most favorable conditions they can serve only as basic, general symbols of role predispositions, and not as guides to concrete roles and role expectations within the new social setting. The attainment of full ego identity within the new country is, among immigrant children, definitely connected with a detachment from the setting of their family of orientation and a stronger identification with the universalistic patterns of the new country.[124] For this reason there arises among some of them a very strong predisposition to join various "peer groups" which may sometimes facilitate their transition to the absorbing society by stressing—both in their composition and in their activities—the more universalistic patterns (and achievement orientation) of the new society or which may express their rebellion against this society. Within such groups a distinctive youth ideology develops, sometimes stressing the distinctiveness of "Americanized" youth in relation to their immigrant parents, or on the other hand, stressing their rebellion against the new society and their rather romantic attachment to their old culture. While the disposition to participation in "peer groups," "youth cultures," exists in most sectors of American society, it seems to be especially noticeable among immigrant children.[125]

Here, as in the above-mentioned instances of culture contact, these dispositions may give rise either to a new ego integration and identification or to ego and personality breakdown; but what is important for our discussion is the fact that in these cases no adequate ego integrity can be attained within family and age-heterogeneous relations.

The same connection between immigration from particular-

istic societies to universalistic ones and the emergence of youth movements, etc., is clearly seen in Israel, among the legitimate youth movements and especially among the so-called Oriental Jews, i.e., those who come from the nontraditional and particularistic setting of the Jewish communities of the Ottoman Empire, and among whom the percentage of juvenile delinquency, etc., is greatest.[126]

XIV

We have seen above that the development of various types of youth groups and youth-oriented agencies broadly follows the development of a universalistic, achievement- and specificity-oriented division of labor in modern societies.

But we may go beyond the establishment of such general correlations, based on historical material on the one hand, and studies of culture contact on the other. The material at our disposal, although not always very systematic, lends itself to a more detailed analysis, which is important for the further elaboration of our general hypothesis. We may study the distribution of age (youth) groups in various sectors of modern societies, and analyze the relation between the degrees of their importance and cohesion, etc., and the extent of prevalence of various institutional derivatives of universalistic role allocation. While the general prevalence of such role allocation in modern societies, as compared with other societies, is clear, it does not mean that there exist no significant differences within the various sectors of modern societies. The extent of these differences may best be analyzed by means of comparison between the extent to which the family or kin unit still constitutes at least a semi-autarchic economic unit of production and of transmission of status.

Here we already encounter some other variables—such as specificity, and ascription or achievement—besides the basic difference between particularistic and universalistic criteria. Here, however, these additional variables are not treated and analyzed for themselves, but only in so far as they constitute institutional derivatives of the universalistic criterion. The specific ways in which these variables influence the structure and composition of age groups will be discussed in the following chapter.

If we analyze various sectors of modern society from the standpoint of our comparison, the most important difference is that between rural and urban sectors. It is obvious that within most rural sectors the relative importance of the family as a semi-autarchic unit of production, as the main property-owning unit, etc., is much greater than within urban traditional peasant communities of Europe,[127] French Canada[128] and various sectors of Latin America, while the importance of the family greater than within some more mechanized and market-oriented rural sectors of the United States.[129] When discussing the Israeli Kibbutz we shall see that the importance of the family unit is not necessarily connected with the *technical* requirements of the agriculture, as in the traditional patterning of rural life in Europe and the United States. If we compare, on the one hand, more traditional and less traditional rural sectors, and, on the other hand, rural sectors with urban and urbanized sectors of modern societies, we shall immediately see that the greater the "familism" the smaller the articulation of youth groups and of the "adolescent problem."

In rural sectors family transition at adolescence is not as acute as in urban centers. The life of the adolescent is apt to run within the framework of his family unit or a similar unit, and the postponement of social maturity owing to a long period of preparation is neither a very acute nor a pressing problem. Consequently there does not also arise the consciousness of specific age and youth problems, as in more modernized and urbanized sectors. The age groups that do arise take mainly the form of loose play groups, with very little stability or cohesion. It is only the formally organized age grading of the school that impinges on rural life to a very large extent, claiming, as it were, the dues of belonging to a universalistic society. But it has been shown in many researches that, in so far as the traditional "familism" of rural life maintains its hold, the impact of the age-graded school is not very significant; sometimes it even realizes fully the formal requirements; sometimes—more often—it does not leave any permanent traces on the social life of the community. It is only in proportion as the rural sectors becomes more and more mechanized and market- and achievement-oriented that the school can claim its full due.[130]

In general it may be said that in a period of rapid social mobility,

industrialization always gives rise to a great plethora of youth groups, youth agencies and general consciousness of youth as a problem. There is plenty of relevant evidence from the United States of America, the U.S.S.R. and several other European countries. Similar consequences may be noticed when the scope of various universalistic agencies is widened—as for instance, in the raising of the school age in England.[131]

A systematic comparison directly related to our problem is afforded by an analysis of the distribution of various types of age groups and youth movements in the various sectors of Israeli society. It was shown there that the intensity and importance of youth group life is invariably correlated with the extent to which the family is the main unit of economic division of labor and social allocation of roles, and positively correlated with the formalization of the educational system, the prolongation of the schooling period, and the extension of the space between leaving the family of orientation and attaining full status within the family of procreation. Age groups are of almost no importance in the traditional and stable sectors of the Oriental Jews, among whom the community is still constituted, in a way, as a "federation" of extended families and family-centered synagogues. Age groups are still negligible in rural sectors based on private family ownership of land (the *Moshava*), somewhat more articulate in the family-based co-operative settlements (*Moshav Ovdim*), very much emphasized and varied in the urban sectors and in situations of culture contact between the Oriental and the more modern community (see above), and attain their fullest formalization and importance in the Kibbutz. It was also shown that the importance of age groups in the rural sectors has increased considerably with the weakening of their economic self-sufficiency, with the impossibility of settling all the sons on the land, and the necessity for broadening their occupational choices.[132]

Within the framework of rural Israeli society there exists another possibility of testing our hypothesis almost on an experimental level: namely, through comparison of the two main types of co-operative rural settlement in Israel: the communal settlement, the Kibbutz, and the co-operative settlement, the Moshav. Many of their social and economic characteristics may be treated

as almost totally equivalent. Both these types of agricultural settlement are about 35-40 years old, and were formed by Zionist pioneers who have striven for the normalization of Jewish economic life and have conceived of work on the land as their highest ideal. In their conception the ideal of return to the land was coupled with that of social justice, of establishment of a social commonwealth—hence the co-operative and communal framework of their settlements, although there exists a stronger collectivist tendency in the communal settlements. The level of the settlements' development is roughly similar, both forms having developed relatively high mechanized techniques of cultivation, and attained similar levels of economic development and standard of living. Both forms have developed rapidly throughout the last 30 years, the number of settlements and members has grown, and a second—and sometimes even third—generation has grown up and stayed on the land. Both also have similar school systems which form part of the general educational system of the Jewish community in Israel. And yet they differ very markedly, both in their family organization (and the place of the family within the total community) and in the prevalence of formalized age groups. We have described earlier the very formalized age grading system of Kibbutz children, connected with and yet distinct from their school. No such parallel systems can be found in the Moshav. There we find the formal age grading of the school and the very informal and loose play groups of children and adolescents. They usually constitute part of the country-wide youth movement, but their participation is very weak and rather ineffective until the "transitional age" before marriage. When compared with that of the Kibbutz, the age group and youth organization of the Moshav is of small social and individual importance. What is the reason for this difference in view of the great basic similarity between the two types of settlement? On the one hand, the difference may be ascribed to different ideological emphases and planning: the establishment of children's groups in the Kibbutz constituted a part of the ideological setup. The existence of this difference cannot, however, be based on ideology alone, and must also be explained in structural terms. It seems that this difference is most clearly con-

nected with the different types of family organization in the two types of settlement, in both of which it is conceived mainly in terms of ideological precepts and values. In the Moshav the family constitutes the basic unit of agricultural production, and agricultural familism constitutes one of its main ideals. The life of the children runs its course mainly within the family unit, in close participation with the parents, all sharing the same roles and performing similar tasks. There exists almost no discontinuity between the world of the parents and that of the children, and it is through participation in age-heterogeneous relations with his parents that the child gradually attains his social and economic maturity. When he grows up he will continue his father's work, either inheriting his farm or receiving a similar one on which he will establish his own family. It is only in relation to school and to some nation-wide activities (necessarily universalistically patterned) that the scope of the family is inadequate. The reverse is true of the Kibbutz. Here the family's social sphere is more restricted than in any other sector of modern society. The family is not a unit of production, nor even of consumption; most meals are eaten in the common dining hall of the settlement. The children usually do not sleep with their parents, but in separate establishments. It is only in the sphere of housing, by sharing a common room, that the family group (the married couple, the parents) forms a formal unit. There exists no institutionalized occupational or specialization continuity or inheritance between generations. In the Kibbutz we find, then, very strongly marked discontinuity between the world of the adults and that of the children; the children live in a world of their own which is somewhat sheltered from the exigencies of adult pioneering life (e.g., children's houses are built when their parents still live in tents). The children meet their parents only for a few hours a day, when the parents try to be "at their best," enacting very distinct, artificial roles. The strong dissociation between parents and children is an outcome of the desire to establish a completely communal life, without personal inheritance of any kind and with a very strong orientation on the common values, which seem to be opposed to any emphasis on family life. And it is within his age group that the child in the Kibbutz is oriented towards this

common life, maintaining from the outset a strong identification with it, which, at least formally and officially, outweighs his more emotional identification with his parents. The age groups, especially those of the adolescent period, serve as preparatory stages for full participation in the community, and it is through them that general identification and solidarity with the community is maintained.[183] This semi-experimental comparison constitutes one of the most striking validations of our main hypothesis.

XV The material on modern societies presented here also validates our general hypothesis, by establishing the correlation between the extent of universalistic social relations and the emergence of age groups (with modern societies, mostly "youth groups") and the consciousness of a youth problem. As in the case of primitive societies, the mere establishment of such a correlation is not enough; it should be supplemented by a more detailed analysis of the types of activities of youth groups and the types of social relations and goals they develop and maintain. We have already alluded to some of these in the course of our discussion, and analysis of some of these characteristics must be relegated to subsequent chapters. Yet we may point out here some of the most general characteristics, particularly those which are important for comparison with the primitive and traditional societies discussed above.

As within primitive and historical societies, there, too, a very strong emphasis is laid on the relation between leaving the family, and achieving social maturity, reaching forward to attain full social status. Even within most of the informal groups of children in modern societies, relative separation from family life is stronger than in primitive societies; the smallness of the family and kin groups does not enable them to encompass these children's groups. The urge of the children to leave the family, to emancipate themselves from the limitations and restrictions of family authority, becomes stronger in adolescence and forms one of the main bases for joining peer and youth groups.[184] One of the most important bases for this urge is the possibility of renouncing the restrictions of family status, the strong emphasis on preparatory activities, and the "preparatory" evaluation of

their status. It is the possibility of attaining full equal status within a group that is of crucial importance here.[135]

This emphasis on attainment of status can be seen clearly in the great difference between children's play groups and the adolescent cliques and gangs that develop from them (just as in primitive societies the various age groups and sets develop out of informal children's groups). The adolescent cliques are more than just groups with some common transitory goal. They constitute cohesive primary groups with a very strong mutual identification of the members. Their members are "ego-involved" in them.[136] One of the most interesting and significant indications of this craving for status may be found in the various informal and semi-formal initiation rites which most of these groups evolve. Even if these rites lack the full dramatization and official sanction of the society, yet they imply the strong emotional strivings for maturity and status.[137] This ego involvement is due mainly to their (the group's and its members') importance as objects of the adolescent's need dispositions, particularly his craving for the attainment of status in terms different from those of the family and the school, and different from the obviously "preparatory" character of the roles allocated to him by the adults, both in the family and in the school. These roles are either too much enclosed within the family circle and segregated from wider spheres of social relations, or may have—because of their "preparatory" character, as in the school—very strong instrumental emphasis. It may be said that within these adolescent "peer groups" the adolescent seeks both to transcend the limits of his family roles and the family discipline imposed on him (or her), and to attain some more direct goals and gratifications in interpersonal relations with equals which would counterbalance the strong emphasis on instrumentality throughout his preparatory years.

Within these groups, as in the primitive age groups, new types of discipline, effected through the autonomous participation of the group, entirely different from those of family life, are imposed on the individual adolescent. The main difference lies in the fact that any individual is evaluated, as it were, according to his own worth and not according to his place within a given family; he is judged by universalistic criteria. At the same time

his (or her) worth is not judged according to any specific achievement (as, to a great extent in school, in anticipation of his adult specialization), but according to his total personality and its harmony with both group values and goals, or according to diffuse and collectivity-oriented criteria. This diffuse image is defined in terms of new status aspirations and evaluations which emphasize the emancipation from family discipline.

However, unlike in most primitive age groups, in modern society the new status is not fully attained in these youth groups. Participation in them, even if it is legitimate and fully sponsored by the official agencies of the social system, does not confer full status and social maturity, because the youth groups cannot overcome the preparatory nature of most roles allocated to adolescents in modern societies. In modern societies complete harmony does not always exist between age group membership and age role allocation by the society, and consequently adolescents do not necessarily attain full status through participation in these groups.

This characteristic forms one of the most important attributes of modern youth and age groups. In this very important respect, the youth groups and organizations in modern societies seem to differ from that of primitive and historical societies analyzed by us. While, on the one hand, they share with them some of the most basic characteristics of all age and youth groups, on the other hand, some very important differences exist between them.

XVI

In the foregoing pages, we have described and analyzed how various types of age groups emerge in nonkinship, universalistic societies. The age groups which have been described are characterized by a great variety and diversity, a variety and diversity which have already been analyzed in general terms in the second chapter of this book. Despite this diversity some general characteristics common to all types of age groups have clearly emerged, and we might briefly summarize them before proceeding with our analysis.

In all societies age groups are formed at the transitional stage between adolescence and full adulthood, and are oriented towards the attainment and acknowledgment of the full status of their

members. Through participation of the group its members develop their identity and self-evaluation, and it is in terms of such evaluation that the common identification and solidarity of the group is evolved and maintained. This strong emphasis on common experience, common values and mutual identification is found in every type of age group, and serves as the essential driving power for its individual members. It is this common characteristic that explains the universal fact that everywhere the nucleus of an age group organization is a small, usually face-to-face, primary group of peers with a strong sense of solidarity and of mutual identification. The main characteristics of such a group have already been defined and analyzed. First, its membership is, in principle, based on general age criteria, i.e., a member may be anyone within the age category (age grade). In practice, however, the strong bonds which evolve between such members become, with the passage of time, more personal, although in principle (and in practice in so far as it is interwoven within an institutionalized age group hierarchy) the group retains most general criteria of membership. Whatever the actual composition of its membership, the common symbols of its identification and its values and ideology bear a strongly universalistic flavor, emphasizing as they do the universal attributes and image of an age, an image common to every member of the society.

Secondly, this image and the value orientations of the age group are necessarily ascriptive and diffuse. This is so by definition, but it may also be explained by their important function for the development of the member's identity and its incorporation into the common identity of the community. As has already been explained several times, this function could not have been fulfilled but for the preponderance of these criteria. It is important to emphasize here that this ascription and diffuseness are not related to any segregated, marginal clusters of roles, but to the most central and crucial aspects of one's roles and activities—those connected with one's overall status and integration within the community.

It is this that explains the third, and last, common characteristic of age groups, namely, their very strong internal solidarity and sometimes also community orientation. This community orientation, when it exists, is not confined only to the solidarity of the nuclear primary age group. It extends then beyond their narrow limits towards the total community and its values. This extension may be fully institutionalized and legitimated, as in most primitive tribes, or be of an outspokenly deviant type as in the German youth movements, but whenever it exists, it forms an important element in the structure of the nuclear primary group and constitutes a basic element of its value system and ideology. It is most clearly related to the status and community-integration aspirations which form the driving power of these groups. Even when such an orientation to the total, or wider, community does exist, all youth groups evince a very sharp *internal* solidarity which, under appropriate conditions, may be extended.[138]

It is clear that all these characteristics bear out the postulates behind the main hypotheses of this work. Beyond them the various types of age groups evince a variety of characteristics and structural arrangements which have been described and briefly classified in this chapter and in the previous one. Until now only the main common characteristics of age groups (and some of their ramifications) have been explained. It is the task of the next chapters to go beyond these common characteristics and to explain their diversity and variety. Our analysis till now has shown that age groups are an agency to which under certain conditions important tasks in the social structure are allocated. The exact nature of these tasks would, however, differ in different societies, according to the extent to which other types of groups perform such tasks. It is with this problem that the next chapter will deal.