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EDITOR’S NOTE: Development planners distinguish between comprehensive and integrative planning, the former relating to planning in relation to all basic sectors of the economy — agriculture, industry and services — while the latter takes into account, for each phenomenon, the integration of its economic, social, physical and organisational aspects. It follows that the purpose of integrative development planning is to find universal models capable of providing adequate expression of all these aspects, at all levels of development and at all stages of economic growth.

In this article, the author deals with a specific segment of integrative planning of Israel’s rural cooperatives known as moshavim (singular: moshav).

DEVELOPMENT STAGES OF THE AGRICULTURAL FARM UNIT

According to a theory proposed by the author and used quite extensively, the agricultural farm unit undergoes three evolutionary stages, and there is a significant relationship between each of these three development stages and the socio-economic system surrounding it, on the one hand, and the economic, social and organisational components of the farm unit, on the other.

At the initial development stage, the agricultural farm unit is a “subsistence farm unit”. Such a unit was characteristic of the Arab peasant’s farm in the period prior to the Jewish settlement, as well as in the times of the British Mandate. Such a farm unit is rather typical of most of the developing countries, such as the countries of South-East Asia which rely on the “rice culture”, most of the countries in Africa; and some of the South American countries.

Dr. Raanan Weitz is the head of the Settlement Study Centre in Rehovot, Israel, and also heads the Rural Settlement Department of the Jewish Agency. He is the author of, i.e. “From Peasant to Farmer: A Revolutionary Strategy for Development” (Columbia University Press, New York and London 1971), and editor (with the assistance of Yehuda H. Landau) of “Rural Development in a Changing World” (The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England 1971).
The second stage is that of the "mixed farm unit". This was characteristic of the Jewish agricultural farm in pre-Israel Palestine between the two World Wars, as well as during the first post-independence decade of the State. Today we find mixed farms in some of the less developed European countries, such as Spain, Italy, et al.

The third stage is that of the "specialised farm unit", at the threshold of which Israeli agriculture stands today. It exists in such developed countries as the United States, and in such nations of Europe as The Netherlands, Denmark, and many others. Each of the above three stages exhibits nine characteristics of the agricultural farm unit:

1. Composition of production branches: In the "subsistence farm unit" these are aimed at growing basic foods, with an auxiliary farm for side crops. In the "mixed farm unit", the branches are varied. In the "specialised farm", there is one main branch of specialisation.

2. Production goals: The subsistence farm unit produces mainly to meet the food requirements of the owner and his family, i.e., for personal consumption; the mixed farm unit - for personal consumption and marketing; while the specialised farm unit produces only for marketing, not being intended to provide for personal consumption at all.

3. Value of the farm unit output: In the subsistence farm unit, the value of the output is characteristically low; in the mixed farm unit, intermediate; and in the specialised farm unit, it is high.

4. Proportion of income to output value: This proportion is high in the subsistence farm unit, viz., the input is small, and therefore, there is not much difference between output value and income. In the mixed farm unit, the proportion is intermediate, about 50 percent; whereas in the specialised farm unit, it is low because of the high input.

5. Security of the farmer's income from the farm unit: Such security is low in the subsistence farm unit; high in the mixed farm unit; and, in most cases (but for completely different reason), low in the specialised farm unit.

6. Distribution of the farmer's work burden throughout the year: The schedule worth is seasonal in the subsistence farm unit; always balanced in the mixed farm unit; and again seasonal in the specialised farm unit.

7. Level of professionalism required of the farmer and the need for technological "know-how": In the subsistence farm unit, there is professional specialisation, but on the whole, the technological level required is low; in the mixed farm unit, the specialisation required of the farmer varies in different branches, and the technological level needed is moderate; whereas in the specialised farm unit, the level of the required professional specialisation and the extent of technological knowledge needed are both high.

8. Dependence upon the supporting system: Such dependence is insignificant in the subsistence farm unit; only partial in the mixed farm unit; and total and complete in the specialised farm unit.

9. Dependence upon the community organisation (i.e., dependence upon the supporting system outside the village): Such dependence on organisation is insignificant in the subsistence farm unit; complete in the mixed farm unit; and again insignificant in the specialised farm unit.

Table 1 sums up these nine characteristics of the family farm unit.

In accordance with the basic assumptions of this theory, we shall now examine in detail the evolutionary process which the family farm unit in Israel has undergone. We shall also venture a forecast of its future development. In addition to examining the agricultural-economic development of the family farm unit, we shall also refer to its physical aspects in order to arrive at an integrative model which will determine the principles of the physical planning developed in each of the growing stages of the family unit, as well as its relationship to the characteristics of each type of farm. In the course of our examination of the physical aspects, we shall take into account the four main elements comprising the physical structure of the moshav farm unit: residential dwelling complex; farm buildings and yard; fields; and service centre.

THE SUBSISTENCE FARM UNIT STAGE

The typical subsistence farm which existed in pre-Israel Palestine was that of the Arab peasant. It was based mainly on dry crops, covering an area of one-
### TABLE I
**BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AGRICULTURAL FARM UNIT IN THE THREE DEVELOPMENT STAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Development Stage</th>
<th>Mixed Stage</th>
<th>Specialised Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Composition of production branches:</td>
<td>Growing basic foods (auxiliary farm)</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Specialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Production goal:</td>
<td>Mainly for personal consumption</td>
<td>For personal consumption &amp; marketing</td>
<td>Marketing only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Output value:</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proportion between income &amp; output value:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intermediate (about half)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security of income:</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mostly low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work schedule:</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Mostly seasonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (a) Type of farmer's professionalism required:</td>
<td>Specialised</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Specialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dependence upon supporting system:</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dependence upon community organisation:</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure No. 1: Moshav Nahalal*
hundred dunams,* with livestock as an auxiliary branch to meet the farmer's own requirements — one cow, a few chickens, one work animal. It required only 220 working days a year, with alternating seasonal peaks of work and "dead" seasons. In those days — some fifty years ago — the output of such a farm (in fixed prices) was $335 gross, yielding the peasant an income of $290. In other words, the input rate (cash investment) was very low, and the peasant's income only slightly less than the output of the farm.

The output and income of a working day were low, but then so was the basic investment in this kind of farm — about $200, on the average. If we look at the physical structure of this type of farm, we see that the farmer's personal housing, farm building and fields usually constituted a single unit. The need for services — both economic and social — was initially nil, given the low standard of living. Hence the size of the village in which the farm was located was unimportant: it might have been big or small, since the farmer did require services; in fact, there were no physical foci for such services. Such a farm formed a closed, self-sufficient unit.

The first moshav — Nahalal — was, at its beginning, a natural continuation of the type of farm just described, and its physical planning was based on the above-mentioned principles. Although there already existed in Nahalal a tendency towards a more diversified farm, still it was based, at the beginning, mainly on field crops. The burden of services was small, and the settlement constituted a closed economic and social unit. The moshav was not — relatively speaking — a big settlement: there were 76 families (farming units) without any connection or cooperation with other rural communities. In its first years, therefore, Nahalal may be regarded as an improved model of the Arab peasant's farm, both in its agricultural and physical planning. The physical structure of this farm suited its social and economic characteristics: residential dwellings, yard and fields all comprising a single functional (and therefore also a single spatial) unit (see Figure 1).

THE MIXED FARM UNIT STAGE

As Jewish settlements expanded and as water resources began to be developed (primarily through drillings for ground water), there emerged a sharper trend towards the mixed farm unit. The man who developed this type of farm unit during the 1930's was Professor Elazari Volcani who called it an "organic mixed farm unit." The establishment of similar, if slightly varying, farm units continued until the State came into being (1948), and for some time thereafter as well.

What are the main characteristics of this type of farm unit?

The land area is smaller — about 30 irrigated dunams. The agricultural branches are diversified: vegetables, industrial crops, animal feed and fodder. In the livestock branch, there are three to five milch cows, as well as 100 to 200 chickens for egg-laying. Because of the variety of branches, the work schedule is well-balanced throughout the year. The farm provides its owner with full employment, some 400 (correct) working days a year. The annual output of such a farm is about $5,000 — fifteen times more than that of the earlier subsistence-type of farm. The actual income, however, is only six times higher because of the higher input required, amounting to about 60 percent of the output value. The income per working day comes to about $4.70, or only 3.5 times than that earned by the subsistence farmer, because the number of working days invested by the farmer on the mixed farm is almost twice the number of working days required on the subsistence farm.

For a variety of reasons, the physical structure of the subsistence farm, and even of the improved type of such a farm, such as that of Nahalal at its beginning, did not suit the needs of the organic mixed farm unit. Nor did it provide an adequate standard of living for the farmer who earned his living from such a farm.

The need for such services as marketing and packing facilities, etc. as well as the need for certain agricultural supplies is great in the case of the mixed farm, where a considerable part of the product is destined for marketing, and the rate of purchase inputs is high. Furthermore, a rising standard of living entails a need for expanding civic and social services. The high proportion of the various purchase inputs (such as, e.g., concentrated animal feed for the livestock, fertilizers, pest control materials) increases the contact and expands the relationship between the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors of society, and more particularly with the industrial sector.

Also, there has been a kind of "clash" in the mixed

---

*A dunam equals approximately one-quarter of an acre (0.1 hectare or 1,000 square metres.)
farm unit between the farm unit and its physical components — the housing complex, the farm buildings and yard, the fields — and the service centre: a small moshav could not justify the provision of services of the required scope and level, and it became necessary to enlarge the number of families utilising them. In other words, it became necessary to plant bigger moshavim, i.e., large enough to carry the burden of centralised services. The physical solution was the establishment of larger moshavim consisting of 100 families, and sometimes even 140—150 families, each. On the other hand, the planners did not give up the principle of attaching the dwelling yard to that of the farm and to the fields. The result was the establishment of large villages, both in terms of the number of families in each of the total of the moshav and of its fields. Because of the large number of families, it was not possible to build a village on the scale of Nahalal because doing so would have created an empty inner circle in the centre of the village.

The physical solution, in the nature of a compromise, took the form of stretching the villages in a line: the houses were built along both sides of the already-existing village roads, and the fields were attached to each house and its farm yard. This gave rise to a new Hebrew slang term "Kfarei Magevet" or "Towel Villages", an appropriate phrase in view of their stretched-out, elongated shape.

The obvious disadvantage of this form of moshav is the long distance within the village, both between the houses located at either edge, and between many of the houses, on the one hand, and the service centre (situated in the centre of the village), on the other. The compensatory feature, at least in the view of the planners, was the fact that it enabled them to preserve the principle of retaining the attachment of the field to the house and farm yard of each family unit.

It has, however, become quite clear that the compromise of the "Towel Village" has not stood the test of time for very long, primarily because of further progress which has occurred since then in the agricultural farm unit (see Figure 2).

TRANSITION TO THE SPECIALISED FARM UNIT

As the years passed and new needs arose, there developed a transition from the mixed farm unit to the specialising farm unit, the latter being characterised by a central branch of specialisation, with some auxiliary branches. This change in the composition of the moshav type of farm also called for a consequential change in physical planning.

There was intensified demand for a variety of services, especially for economic services related to the branches of specialisation. At the same time, the importance of these services in the production process became as decisive as agro-technology and the production processes themselves. This meant that it was more important to secure the proximity of the service centre to the house than it was to have the latter close to the field. The result was a new type of compact village, promptly called in Hebrew slang a "Kfar Egroff", or "Fist Village", in contradistinction to the elongated "Towel Village". The first village of the new type was the multi-neighbourhood moshav in the Taanach region, in Northern Israel. In fact, it consisted of three nuclei of 60 family units each, centred around a common service centre.

Before very long, however, the specialisation process was further intensified, and it became clear that, to be efficient, a service centre must provide for more than 180 families. Consequently, there developed at the same time the structure of the "composite rural community", the first of which was established in the Lachish region. In this case, too, a cluster of compact villages was set up, each village consisting of a maximum of 75 to 80 farming units. Between five and seven such villages were built, not far from one another, with a service centre in the middle to furnish services for the whole bloc of villages, viz. for some 600 families. Such villages usually had a relatively small farm yard, and most of the fields were at some distance from the home and its yard.

The distance between most of the cultivated areas and the homes could be somewhat inconvenient at times, but the advantage of concentrating the services and keeping them nearby outweighed this inconvenience (see Figure 3).

But while this marked a great step forward, it did not provide the final answer to the question posed by the growing specialisation of the family farm unit. Once again, there arose the need of adapting to new conditions.

THE HIGH-SPECIALISATION STAGE

Of late, there has been emerging a new type of farm unit. In fact, it has already come into existence in some of the moshavim. There is no doubt that within the coming decade we shall witness the continuation of this process, one certain to affect
all agricultural settlements in the country. The characteristics of this new type of farm unit are a very high degree of specialisation of the farmer in a particular branch, leading to an increase in his income, even to the point of doubling it, as compared to the present average income of a family farm unit. As an example, we may mention two types of such farms: one a dairy farm, the other a glass or hot-house farm.

**Dairy farm:** During the stage of very high specialisation such a farm may own at least 40 milch cows, enabling it to reach a gross output value of about $40,000 per annum, yielding the farmer an income of some $12,500. As already mentioned, a few family farm units have already reached this stage, but they are still very far from constituting the average, let alone majority.

**Glass-house farm:** The highly specialised farm of this type will derive most of its income from the growing of vegetables (e.g. hot-house tomatoes). Being labour-intensive, this type of farm will also provide much employment. Another branch is that of raising turkeys. This type of specialised farm will require a relatively small area of land. Even so, the expected income is bound to exceed even that of the dairy farm mentioned above.

Table II sums up the development of the features of the different farm units in Israel which we have been discussing.

The development of the family farm unit in Israel in the direction of high specialisation will require considerable changes in the physical planning of the village and of the family farm unit. The main change will call for maximal separation between the residential area and the farm yard complex, including its various structures and facilities (which until now were located very near the home). These changes in the physical planning of the future moshav are intended solve six main problems:
I. NEED FOR SPATIAL FLEXIBILITY. The linking of home and farm yard introduces rigidity in the planning of the moshav. For example, the present farm yard is, in many cases, too small to permit chicken-coops or cow-sheds to be built in it. On the other hand, too big a yard would affect the compactness of the settlement, as we have already seen. This fact led to the idea of separation, so as to make it possible to adapt the farm yard dimension and structures to changing conditions as the need arises. One of the moshavim now being established is an example of this kind of planning: only the glass houses are attached to the house, whereas the chicken-coops were built in a separate area, all of the together although each will be looked after by an individual family rather than cooperatively (see Figure 4). A further example is furnished by another new moshav where the cow-sheds are built in blocs rather than as part of the residential courtyard (see Figure 5).

2. NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY IN OWNERSHIP OF THE FARM UNIT. In many veteran moshavim we witness today a tendency to establish "double farm units" for the farm owner and for his son. Joint operation of a farm by father and son increases efficiency through further coordination and rationalisation of work. However, families do not always want to build two houses in one yard. In the planning of the second above-mentioned moshav 100 family farming units are being constructed at the present stage. Each unit will receive a house with a residential courtyard and a farm yard (which includes a cow-shed) outside the residential area. The plans envisage the building, at a future time, of an additional external chain of units for another 100 families. Thus, the generational problem will be solved gracefully, and father and son will not be compelled to live on the same plot of land.
### Table II

**DEVELOPMENT OF TYPES OF FARMS IN ISRAEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Farm Unit:</th>
<th>Subsistence Farm (Arab Peasant Farm) (Circa 1930)</th>
<th>Mixed Farms (Circa 1940)</th>
<th>Specialised Dairy Farm (As of mid-1974)</th>
<th>Highly Specialised Farms [Estimates; Projections for near future: already reached in some instances]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kind of Crops and Area Allocated to Each: (Dunams)</td>
<td>Winter Crops: 50</td>
<td>Vegetables: 3</td>
<td>Fodder: 30</td>
<td>Dairy Farm Glass House Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Crops: 40</td>
<td>Industrial Crops: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vines: 10</td>
<td>Fodder: 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citrus Ornaments: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Irrigation: (Dunams)</td>
<td>Total Land: 100</td>
<td>Total Land under Irrigation: 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock:</td>
<td>Cows: 1</td>
<td>Milch Cows: 3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egg-laying chickens: 20</td>
<td>Egg-laying Chickens: 100-200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Animals: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load:</td>
<td>Total No. of Work-days (Year): 220</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum No. of Work-days (Month): 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum No. of Work-Days (Month): 28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitability (in U.S. Dollars at fixed prices):</td>
<td>Annual Output: 335.</td>
<td>5,000.</td>
<td>18,200.</td>
<td>40,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Surplus: *290.</td>
<td>1,900.</td>
<td>5,900.</td>
<td>12,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output per Working Day: 1.50</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Surplus per Working Day: 1.30</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Investment Required: 200.</td>
<td>9,000.</td>
<td>28,500.</td>
<td>50,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figure refers to 1930. Corresponding gross surplus of such a farm unit averaged $4,800. as of 1973/74.

3. NEED FOR COOPERATION IN PRODUCTION.

The nature of the high-specialisation farm unit is such as to compel, in many cases, cooperation in production among two or three settlers. Such cooperation is required mainly in branches demanding year-round work; among other things, cooperation in production permits the division of vacation periods among the "partners", so that when one is absent, the other(s) take(s) care of the farm. The cooperative relationship can take several forms: there can be almost complete partnership, or there can be cooperation limited to mutual help with work; either way, the proximity of the farm yard makes a cooperative relationship easier.
4. USE OF AUTOMATIC AND CONTROLLED SYSTEMS. The great mechanisation in the high-specialisation farm unit is reflected not only in the introduction of automatic mechanical processes (such as automatic feeding) but also computer-operated electronic control systems. Thus in the dairy farm, a system based on facilities for the controlled feeding of each cow in the farm unit, is about to be introduced. This control will enable the desired balance of feeding of each cow so as to obtain maximal yields. Other examples can be found in poultry feeding and in controls in the glass-houses branch (automated irrigation, air moisture, etc.). Not only do such control systems not require proximity of home and farm yard, but separation is even desirable. The new system will make it possible to operate a cow shed from a distance.

5. MAINTAINING THE QUALITY OF LIFE. The separation of residential quarters and farm yards will considerably improve the quality of life of the farmer. He will no longer be affected by nuisances caused by the proximity of the farm yard to the house, such as exposure to animal odours, noise, dust, etc. Separation will also make it possible to keep the trucks which bring supplies and take the produce from passing through the residential part of the farm.

6. PROTECTION OF THE SETTLEMENT. In Israel, as in some other countries facing the problem of protecting their settlements, this is a matter of special importance. Separating residential quarters from the farming complex proper contributes to the compactness of the village. This, in turn, facilitates the defence and protection of the residential area.

ORGANISATION OF THE SUPPORTING SYSTEM
The development of the moshav farm unit, as described above, has brought about profound changes in the scope and structure of the supporting system, including the various services. As we have seen, the subsistence farm unit does not require any services at all; whereas the mixed farm unit is dependent upon a considerable amount of services. The farm unit of the future — i.e., the highly specialised farm — will require a system of services different from that of the past and even of the present. The service system for the highly specialised farm becomes more and more sophisticated; the scope of inputs for the farm unit is growing, as is the variety of inputs. At the same time, specialisation in a variety of branches is expected in settlements which are located close to one another. In many cases, different groups of specialisation may be found even within the same moshav.

In order to provide the services required for this structure, characterised by the diaspical of specialised farms within each region, it will be necessary to organise vertical regional services, markedly differing from the present structure of national vertical and regional horizontal services.

The scope of the services will have to be such as to ensure their efficiency and must be responsive to the “advantage of scale”, the importance of which is growing because the services themselves are becoming ever more sophisticated.

As a last point on this subject of organising services, mention must be made of the need to re-fashion the organisation of the moshav association in the light of the emergence of a variety of specialisation by groups within a single moshav. Until now, the structure of farms in the same moshav was homogeneous or, at least, similar. Accordingly, the various activities of the moshav association suited the needs of most farm units within the cooperative village. The creation of specialised groups changes the situation completely and requires a different kind of organisation, one capable of meeting the differing specific demands of each specialised group.

Summing up. With the economic and technological progress and the transition to the specialised farm unit, with its large-scale, varied investments, there comes to light a process of gradual separation between the various elements comprising the physical structure of the family farm. There is a certain composition of agricultural farm branches which is characteristic of each stage of the economic growth in any specific country; hence a different physical structure of the farm unit and of its various components becomes mandatory.

It is the task of the planners to find as flexible as possible a planning model, one which will make it possible to adapt physical planning to economic development of the agricultural farm unit. What is needed, then, is a planning model suitable to all stages of development seriatim, one after the other, without necessitating the destruction of what was built during one of the preceding stages. In our quest for such a model in Israel, we have achieved considerable — if so far still inadequate — flexibility as regards the physical side of planning.
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