DOMINANT AND POPULAR IDEOLOGIES IN THE MAKING OF RURAL MANITOBANS, 1890-1925

by

Jeffery M. Taylor

A Thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Manitoba

ISBN 0-315-47959-0

DOMINANT AND POPULAR IDEOLOGIES IN THE MAKING OF RURAL MANITOBANS, 1890 - 1925

BY

JEFFERY M. TAYLOR

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study of the educational state structure that developed in Manitoba agriculture before 1925, the dominant ideologies that resided there, and the impact of those ideologies on the agrarian movement. There are six stages in our enquiry. First, the theoretical argument in chapter one establishes a conceptual framework for analysing the place of ideology in simple commodity agriculture. Second, the theoretical discussion is placed in historical context through a survey of ideologies, state structures, and agrarian movements in North America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Third, discussion moves from the general to the specific with an outline of the educational state structure in Manitoba agriculture during the period. In chapters four and five the theoretical and practical components of dominant ideology are analysed. In chapter four the theoretical categories of rural social science are discussed, while in chapter five we assess the practical language used to address Manitoba farm people in this ideology. Having established the institutional, theoretical, and practical components of dominant ideology, our focus shifts in chapter six to the language used in the Manitoba agrarian movement at the time. In the conclusion, we summarise how the various theoretical, historical, dominant, and popular elements interacted in the Manitoba experience.

INTRODUCTION

Popular, academic, corporate, and governmental analyses of western Canadian agriculture are all conducted within historically constructed systems of thought. The twentieth century, in fact, has been marked by three distinct periods of agricultural discourse. As the state became increasingly interventionist after World War II, attempting to stabilise working class and agrarian consumption while resisting challenges from the left, the contours of current social democratic and bourgeois perspectives on agriculture were put in place. In the preceding two decades, bourgeois and social democratic analyses of the countryside struggled with socialist, communist, and social credit ones for popular acceptance. And the essential foundations for discussion throughout the century were established between the 1890s and the 1920s as a dominant view of rural economy and society was consolidated and popular conceptions of the prevailing order were transformed.

This dissertation is a study of the educational state structure that developed in Manitoba agriculture before 1925, the dominant ideologies that resided there, and the impact of those ideologies on the agrarian movement. The general political and theoretical questions that govern our investigation are: how and through what process have the limits on public debate come into existence, and what are the conditions for transcending those limits? More

specifically, how is it that certain questions are asked and not others? How is it that some sets of assumptions guide political debate while others are absent? Why are agricultural constituencies mobilised on the basis of certain languages but not others? Are there specific identities that either account for or support the limits which exist? Can these identities be changed? Our analysis, while conducted in terms of these larger questions, has a more limited objective. By focusing on the formative period, we suggest how a dominant view of rural economy and society was consolidated in Manitoba, and how this affected existing popular languages which were critical of the prevailing order of things.

There are six stages in our enquiry. First, the theoretical argument in chapter one establishes a conceptual framework for analysing the place of ideology in simple commodity agriculture. By focusing on the notion of labour process, we suggest that the relationship between simple commodity production (in both goods and labour power) and capitalist production is best understood in terms of the subordination of labour to capital. Then various accounts of ideology and consciousness, ranging from Gramsci and culturalist historiography to Althusser and discourse theory, are assessed in arriving at a tentative theory of "ideology and the agrarian labour process".

Second, the theoretical discussion is placed in historical context through a survey of ideologies, state structures, and agrarian movements in North America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Western Canada's agricultural expansion is juxtaposed with central Canadian industrialisation and the transformation of world wheat production in order to illustrate that these phenomena were integrally linked processes of capitalist development. An account is then given of the growth of bureaucratic state structures--particularly educational systems--which accompanied these material changes. Finally, the general contours of the agrarian, working class, and women's movements are sketched to illustrate the ideological cross-fertilisation that occurred among these movements in the nineteenth century, and the divisions that developed within and between them in the twentieth century.

Third, discussion moves from the general to the specific with an outline of the educational state structure in Manitoba agriculture during the period. From the nineteenth century, but increasingly after the turn of the twentieth century, a provincial apparatus was established for the production and transmission of agricultural knowledge. In the 1890s this terrain was inhabited by agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, but the opening of Manitoba Agricultural College in 1905 made that institution its centrepiece. Chapter three is a history of

the internal evolution of MAC, the relevant academic disciplines, agricultural education for children and youth, and rural adult education before and after the formation of an extension service.

In chapters four and five the theoretical and practical components of dominant ideology are analysed. This distinction, which comes from Althusser and is discussed in greater detail in chapter one (pp. 45-46), separates those aspects of ideology that form part of abstract, conceptual systems and those that are actually addressed to subjects in practical, everyday language. In chapter four the theoretical categories of a broadly conceived rural social science are discussed. Agricultural economics emerged in the context of the transition to marginalism in the parent discourse of bourgeois economics; home economics, too, was part of the marginal revolution, while also being influenced by scientific management. Rural sociology was a child of the new sociology of the late nineteenth century that rejected Social Darwinist natural laws in favour of an investigatory and interventionist approach to the social world. And rural education, as part of a reform in school curricula and the "invention of adolescence", granted young people and the educational system a special place in the constitution and resolution of sociology's "rural social problem". After assessing the ways in which these fields of knowledge constructed a theoretical understanding of

agriculture and rural society, our attention turns in chapter five to the practical language used to address Manitoba farm people in this ideology. Here we delineate the various elements in male, female, and youth identity as they were constructed in and through MAC, the extension service, and the public educational system.

Having established the institutional, theoretical, and practical components of dominant ideology, our focus shifts in chapter six to the language used in the Manitoba agrarian movement at the time. We begin by reconstructing the world view of the Patrons of Industry in the 1890s, showing that the Patrons employed a "radical" analysis which they shared with many other nineteenth century movements. We then move to an account of popular ideology in the main, or men's, section of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers' of Manitoba, paying particular attention to the incrasing authority of dominant categories on the one hand, and the declining presence of radical categories on the other. And finally, in an assessment of the language used in the Women's Grain Growers' Association and the United Farm Women of Manitoba, we note both a radical influence from the "main" agrarian movement and a dominant influence from the hegemonic ideology.

In the conclusion, we summarise how the various theoretical, historical, dominant, and popular elements interacted in the Manitoba experience, and we briefly

situate this study against an important analytical perspective in rural prairie scholarship.

CHAPTER ONE: A THEORY OF IDEOLOGY AND THE AGRARIAN LABOUR PROCESS

Abstraction is required in order to properly analyse the place of ideology in Manitoba agriculture. Although it is anathema to most historians, for whom truth is immediately apparent in historical experience, abstraction is an essential exercise in isolating the forces determining experience. In this chapter, therefore, a number of theoretical questions are posed and discussed. What is the relationship between household production and capitalist production? Why is the reproduction of labour power organised as it is in class societies, and how is it specifically organised in farm households? How is knowledge in the production process related to the production of meaning? How are gender and class identities formed?

I

The fundamental problem in analysing Western Canadian rural society is the simultaneous reproduction of a non-capitalist form of agricultural production with a dominant capitalist mode of production.(1) This is not peculiar to Canada or North America, of course; it is common to all social formations at the periphery of capitalism and to most agricultural regions of industrial capitalist societies. Most historical materialist explanations of this phenomenon, the earliest of which forms part of Marx's analysis of

capitalism, use one of three approaches. The first, the classical approach of Marx, Lenin and Kautsky, is based upon Marx's analysis of the extraction and distribution of surplus value in a purely capitalist economy.(2) The second, the dependency or world-systems approach practised by Gunder-Frank and others, uses the concept of unequal exchange. And the third, the modes of production or articulationist approach, expands Althusser's notion of articulation to include the relation between two or more modes of production in a single social formation.(3) Currently, another perspective is developing which moves beyond these three approaches to specify the way in which household production persists in capitalist societies while becoming effectively integrated into capitalist production and reproduction.

The classical position is based upon Marx's analysis of agriculture in Volume III of Capital. In the earlier volumes, Marx posited a general pattern of capitalist development--primitive accumulation, working class formation and so forth--through a study of the English economy. In assessing the place of agriculture in this development, Marx assumed a fully capitalist agriculture, with capital flowing freely between industry and agriculture. He also assumed (like Ricardo and the other classical economists) a triad of agricultural classes, namely landowners, capitalists, and workers. Based as it was on the apparent reality of mid-

nineteenth century England, Marx's analysis seemed to predict the gradual but progressive dissolution of non-capitalist forms of agricultural production as capitalism developed and expanded. Kautsky and Lenin, who took up the specific question of agriculture at the turn of the twentieth century, used Marx's general perspective to argue that capital in agriculture was becoming concentrated and was fostering the development of an agrarian bourgeoisie and a rural proletariat.(4)

The world system or dependency approach is a critique of bourgeois development theory and the evolutionary stage theory of classical Marxism, both of which are considered (northern) European-centred. What Frank, Wallerstein and others propose is an expanded conception of capitalism which shifts analysis from specific modes of production (forces and relations of production) to a single capitalist world system. They reject the original Marxist view that the central process of capitalist exploitation occurs at the point of production. Instead, they argue that western development and third world underdevelopment should be understood in terms of world-wide accumulation through unequal exchange in the capitalist market. Every form of production that intersects with the world market--whether slave, feudal or household--is deemed to be capitalist in that it yields a surplus (through exchange) to the process of global accumulation. "For Frank, as more recently for

Wallerstein," Aidan Foster-Carter has written, "there is but a single 'world system'; and it is capitalist through and through."(5)

As part of Althusser's broader impact on historical materialism over the past twenty years, a critique of dependency theory now exists that shifts attention back to modes of production, while consciously addressing the evolutionist bias of the classics. Known as the articulationist school, this group has expanded Althusser's original concept of articulation (which applied to the relationship between the ideological, economic, and political levels in a mode of production) to include the ways in which the capitalist mode of production relates to non-capitalist forms and modes of production that it dominates. They criticise the world systems approach for locating capitalist contradiction in the sphere of circulation, neglecting production relations, treating developed countries as monolithic entities, and generally subordinating class struggle to relations between hinterland and metropole. By moving mode of production back to centre stage, articulationists suggest that production relations and, most importantly, the co-existence of more than one set of production relations in a particular social formation should form the core of analysis. And contrary to more classical approaches, where transition to a new mode is viewed in terms of the systematic dissolution of older forms

of production, articulation conceives of capitalism co-existing with, buttressing, and sometimes creating non-capitalist forms. P.P Rey, one of the foremost proponents of articulation, distinguishes three stages in this process: an initial link in the sphere of exchange, where interaction with capitalism reinforces the non-capitalist form; capitalism "takes root", subordinating the non-capitalist form but still making use of it; and the total disappearance of non-capitalist forms, even in agriculture. He concludes:

> Capitalism can never immediately and totally eliminate the preceding modes of production, nor above all the relations of exploitation which characterise these modes of production. On the contrary during an entire period it must reinforce these relations of exploitation, since it is only this development which permits its own provisioning with goods coming from these modes of production, or with men driven from these modes of production and therefore compelled to sell their labour power to capitalism in order to survive.(6)

While articulationists have focused on production relations, they agree with dependency theorists that the medium through which capital extracts surplus product from producers is exchange and circulation rather than production. Capital, it is argued, only gains control of production when labour becomes a commodity. But, is it possible to expand the concept of capitalist production to include production that is formally non-capitalist but is dependent upon capitalism for its reproduction?

In the case of North American agriculture, capitalism has become entrenched without having transformed the

relations of production into fully capitalist ones. The maintenance and persistence of household production in most areas of North American agriculture in the twentieth century can be accounted for in terms of the obstacles to complete capitalist transformation in those sectors. Capital always chooses a safe investment and the quick turnover of capital in its search for the highest possible rate of profit. But most aspects of agricultural production, notably livestock and grain, are relatively risky ventures which do not provide an immediate return. These spheres are characterised by lengthy production cycles during which labour is only sporadically applied, making them unattractive to capitalist penetration since capital realises its profit through the consistent and intensive exploitation of labour power. Hence, capital finds it difficult to compete with households that, not being governed by production for profit, only require that the realised value of commodities sold meet their costs of production. Capitalist producers in the late nineteenth century, for example, withdrew from wheat production in the face of competition from family households.(7)

As Harriet Friedmann has argued, however, there are two types of household production in agriculture: peasant production and simple commodity production. Peasants, while they may purchase and sell some products in the capitalist market, do not depend on the market for their livelihood.

Such things as food, clothing, labour, credit, and production tools are obtained through kin and community ties that are unaffected by the market. Simple commodity producers, meanwhile, depend on the capitalist market for the disposition of their produce and the purchase of all of their inputs other than labour. Labour, although it may be purchased occasionally, is normally supplied on a kin basis in simple commodity production, and this distinguishes it from capitalist production where all inputs, including labour, are supplied through the market.(8)

There is a continuum, then, from peasant subsistence through simple commodity production to capitalism. While peasants engage solely or primarily in subsistence, simple commodity producers and capitalists engage solely or primarily in commodity production. Using these distinctions as a guide, we will propose below that simple commodity production can become subjected to capitalist control without labour becoming a commodity.(9) First, though, we must consider Marx's concept of the subordination of labour in capitalist production.

In his analysis of capitalist production, Marx distinguished two processes whereby labour is subordinated to capital. The first, what he called the formal subordination of labour, is "the takeover of a mode of labour developed before the emergence of capitalist relations" in which "handicraftsmen who previously worked on

their own account, or as apprentices of a master, ...become labourers under the direct control of the capitalist." This entails the dispossession of workers from the means of production and the means of subsistence such that they are forced to exchange their labour power for money in the capitalist labour market in order to survive. This form of appropriation does not include control of the labour process, however. Through ownership of the means of production, capital is able to combine the work of labourers in order to increase productivity, but the technical basis of production remains handicraft. And, once production is centralised, the only way the capitalist may extract more surplus value, without transforming the labour process, is to increase the duration of labour (for Marx, lengthening the working day). Surplus value extracted in this fashion is called absolute surplus value. The second process, the real subordination of labour, occurs when capital extends its control over the labour process by dissolving handicraft production through the displacement of manual tools by machine tools. A social as well as a technical process, handicraft workers are stripped of their skills to the extent that they become mere extensions of tools, tending machines rather than applying knowledge to the production process. Real subordination opens a new terrain for the extraction of surplus value by capital. It becomes possible to increase value within a given unit of time by increasing

the intensity of labour. This is called relative surplus value.(10)

But how does this relate to farm households? Is it possible for capital to control production without exchanging money for labour power and without dispossessing the direct producers? In Marxist economic theory, a commodity contains both use-value (satisfying a specific need) and exchange value (a measure of exchangeable wealth). Since exchange value refers to potential exchangeability rather than the actual act of exchange, it is possible that the exchange value of a commodity will not be realised through monetised exchange. Labour power in farm households, for example, can be treated as a commodity without ever entering the sphere of real market transactions. This occurs when its value is transferred to other products sold in the market. Chevalier offers the following example of how this works in practice:

> Self-employed workers may buy their own labour-power from themselves and be able to evaluate its approximate worth (or exchange value) thus treating it as a commodified condition of production. This may be done by calculating the market value of those commodities which are necessary for personal consumption (some of which may be bought from their own reproduction) or the equivalent sum of money which goes into reproduction of their labour-power. The resulting amount may be part of an overall budget that must be minimally balanced if the worker's 'enterprise' is to survive.

The value of labour power is thus determined through mechanisms other than exchange, but for reasons that pertain to its exchangeability.(11)

Furthermore, it is possible that a farm household may own some means of production without having effective control over them. It is necessary to draw a distinction here between strict legal ownership and the ability to exchange the commodities thus produced at their value. In other words, effective dispossession may occur if capital is able to extract surplus value without taking actual legal control of the means of production. Mollard argues that, in the case of French farm households, surplus value is appropriated by capital (or, more specifically, capital in contact with agriculture: what he calls the agro-industrial complex) whenever producers enter the sphere of capitalist circulation. He identifies three mechanisms of appropriation: the rental or purchase of land; the purchase of production inputs; and the sale of agricultural products. Hence, although means of production are formally owned, a farmer's social position is equivalent to that of a worker rather than a capitalist: at best, the value realised is sufficient for the reproduction of labour power, but not for the retention of any surplus created through production.(12)

Once we assume the formal subordination of farm households through effective dispossession and the indirect transformation of labour into a commodity, can we locate a

process of real subordination? Real subordination and the extraction of relative surplus value are contingent upon capital's success in intensifying work effort and maintaining pre-existing levels of work performance during and following the introduction of new technologies (in order to reap the surplus created by the increased productivity). Within the general context of Mollard's mechanisms of appropriation, the goal of agro-industrial capital is to subordinate farm households so as to systematically extract the surplus. This occurs through the development of large scale and specialised production, innovations in chemical and mechanical technologies, and a division between mental and manual labour. Increases in productivity result, meaning a greater surplus is available to be appropriated by capital, and farm households must continually modernise their means of production to increase their productivity further and maintain their incomes. The continual appropriation of relative surplus value forces farm households to maintain and increase their work intensity, while becoming further integrated into capitalist exchange and production.(13)

The basic economic existence of all producers--workers, peasants, farmers and so forth--is governed by the pursuit of acceptable, historically determined standards of living. In the case of farmers, this is achieved through the household based production of commodities for the capitalist

market. They pursue use-values in order to reproduce their livelihood but, given their market participation, any and all use-values they might potentially consume are treated as objects containing measurable exchange value. By combining land, labour power and instruments of production, farmers employ ongoing strategies whereby they seek to achieve, maintain and possibly expand their incomes and enterprises. In this sense they seem to act like capitalists. Yet, whereas the capitalist is engaged in capital accumulation through the extraction of surplus value, the farmer is merely attempting to sustain himself within a production process effectively controlled by capital.(14) Since capital is able to appropriate the surplus from farmers, even the most successful strategies will produce only a modest expansion of their incomes and enterprises. Hence, any expansion that does take place is more akin to a worker's wage increase than a capitalist's enhanced profit. One side of the social struggle in agriculture is rooted here in the subordination of producers to capital.

II

But this takes us only half way in understanding the material basis of farm households. There are two sides to all production, namely the production of goods and the production of labour power. Whereas the theory outlined above illuminates the marshalling of productive forces and

the ordering of social relations in goods production, it is silent with respect to the same processes in the constitution of labour power. Yet, while some people (normally the male heads of households) are engaged in the production of agricultural commodities, other people (normally wives and female kin of the household heads) are engaged in the work of providing subsistence for those men and the other members of the household. Hence, the framework must be expanded to include an analysis of domestic labour in the farm household.

The participants in the domestic labour debate of the 1970s drew attention to this neglected aspect of the capitalist mode of production. In situating the source of working class women's oppression in the family, they related women's dependent status in the household to her reliance on the male wage and her role in reproducing labour power on a daily and generational basis. This framework, and especially Seccombe's expansion of its analytical scope to encompass a comparison of the reproduction of labour power in the capitalist, slave, and feudal modes of production, provides a departure point for theorising this aspect of household production.(15) Before discussing farm households, though, some concepts at the general level of class modes of production should be clarified.

Human labour power is one of the productive forces in any mode of production. By combining with the means of

production--raw materials and the instruments of labour--in definite relations of production, goods are produced. Practical knowledge and energy are the two components that constitute labour power. Of these, practical knowledge is the most important. Seccombe, paraphrasing G.A. Cohen, writes "[i]f a community were to have its basic tools destroyed, it is possible that it may, with a little good fortune in natural materials, recover. If its practical knowledge were lost, however, tools themselves would be useless, and the community would certainly be doomed." But labour power is never reducible to knowledge; rather, it always consists of the conscious direction of human energy to planned ends. Furthermore, this unique productive force must be reproduced on a daily and generational basis. It is replenished daily through the provision of food, clothing, and shelter, and it is replenished generationally through procreation and the socialisation of the young. At the heart of generational reproduction lies the biological reality that women, and not men, bear children and lactate. Although its significance varies historically, this sexual difference plays a central role in the overall organisation of labour power's reproduction in all class societies.(16)

In class societies, the total social product is divided between that which is necessary for the subsistence of direct producers (subsistence product) and the surplus which is appropriated by the exploiting class (surplus product).

The subsistence product is used to purchase the means of subsistence, and domestic labour (food preparation, housecleaning, childcare) is expended to produce labour power.(17) Domestic relations (the relations of labour power's production) are characteristically constituted in some variation of a family or kin based household unit. A household is a living space that is regularly inhabited by one or more members of a domestic group. A family is a kin related group living together and forming the core of a household. And kin refers to a network of genealogical identity defined by birth and extending beyond a co-resident family. Some form of a family household exists in all human societies to provide a mechanism for the regulation of the domestic life cycle. Fertility must be regulated, legitimate paternity must be established, a stable household must be maintained during the period of infant and childhood dependency, resources must be transmitted between generations in an orderly fashion, and care must be provided for the dependent elderly. As an institution, the family establishes a minimal social requirement for legitimate co-residency.(18)

But what accounts for the widespread subordination of women in the family household? This phenomenon arises out of the relationship between the biological role of women in production and the subordination of subsistence production to surplus production in class societies. Pregnancy and

lactation result in a period of reduced work capacity for a childbearing woman during which time she is unable to supply her own means of subsistence. Normally this problem is resolved through relations of kin and sexuality, with the biological father ordinarily taking on the responsibility. In the process, this individual acquires the specific social role of supporting the woman bearing those children for whom he shares biological responsibility. Now there is no biological rationale for this limited sexual division of labour to extend beyond the period of pregnancy and lactation.(19) Whether women are directly engaged in surplus production or solely involved in producing subsistence, however, childbearing interferes with the extraction of surplus product by the dominant class. But over the long term, childbearing is a systemic requirement if the labour force is to be replaced through generational reproduction. Hence a contradiction exists that needs to be resolved if the optimum amount of surplus product is to be extracted from the producing class.

This resolution, which entails minimising the amount of subsistence product granted to producers while ensuring that ongoing reproduction occurs, takes place in the family. Through a variable process of class struggle and negotiation, the dominant class grants more subsistence product to men than is necessary for their own reproduction, thereby creating the material basis for extended female

dependency. In turn, and with a certain degree of sexual struggle, women are increasingly given the major or sole responsibility for all facets of domestic labour, while men take the major or sole responsibility for providing the means of subsistence through participation in surplus production.

What emerges from this process is a family household arrangement in which the father/husband dominates the mother/wife and the resident children. A number of male privileges flow from this relationship. The househead has the right to socially represent the family group, the right to possess and dispose of family property, the right of sexual access to his spouse, custodial rights over children, and supervisory authority over family labour. The specific character of these rights vary historically across both production and household forms, but they are materially embedded in the subordination of subsistence production to surplus production in all class societies.(20)

How does this work at the level of the capitalist mode of production? Capitalism inherited a sexual division of labour from earlier class societies which has been exacerbated and strengthened by the capitalist social division of labour. Goods production was increasingly removed from households to workshops and factories prior to and during the industrial phase, rendering family households specialised units for the production of labour power that

were beyond the sphere of capitalist exchange. Hence, an added structural compulsion was created (the effect of which varied historically due to class and sexual struggle) for women to be relegated to domestic labour in households controlled by men.(21)

But why does the production of labour power remain in households, beyond the sphere of capitalist exchange, when most other areas of production are capitalist with all their productive forces, including labour power, in the form of commodities? Actually, capital, in the pursuit of greater surplus value, does attempt to transform domestic labour. But, in many ways, domestic labour is resistant to capitalist transformation. Indeed, domestic production shares many characteristics with those areas of agricultural production that have remained in a household form, notably lengthy production times, the sporadic application of labour, and, especially in the case of child care, a high intensity of labour. Not surprisingly, then, working class households and farm households have a similar relationship to the capitalist mode of production.(22)

As sellers of labour power, working class households compete with each other in the labour market as individual units. Seeking to secure the optimum value of their commodity, they must accept the dictates of the market and adjust their subsistence production in ways necessary to enhance their competitiveness. In this way, the market

operates in working class households to influence the form, duration, and intensity of domestic labour; in other words, they subordinate their production to the sphere of capitalist exchange. Producers are compelled to organise their productive forces in response to the perceived value of their product on the market. Market calculations are employed in order to minimise costs in combining the various means of production, thereby treating unexchanged factors of production as commodities. Domestic labour itself is treated as a commodity, and the domestic labour process falls under the indirect control of capital. The working class household, then, can be seen as a form of simple commodity production in which labour is organised independent of the commodity market (although really controlled by it), and all other production factors are integrated--with varying degrees of intensity--into capitalist exchange and production.(23)

But what of domestic labour in farm households? A similar though even more indirect process takes place. As in all other class based forms of production, the appropriation, distribution, and consumption of the means of subsistence is subordinated to the production of surplus. Furthermore, the effective subordination of the agricultural labour process leads to the effective subordination of the domestic labour process. Hence, the domestic labourer (woman) in the household unit engages in strategies to best

maximise and employ the means of subsistence. She is compelled to make calculations, alter the intensity or organisation of her labour, and generally manage the domestic sphere of the household in conformity with the market. The other side of the social struggle in agriculture is materially rooted here, in the subordination of the domestic labour process (women) to agricultural production (men) and to capital (the bourgeoisie).

III

The farm household, then, is a double sided production unit in which agricultural commodities and labour power are produced. Although the organisation of the two productions is non-capitalist, they are both compelled, through their subordination to capitalist production, to obey the laws of the market. The overriding imperative of surplus extraction establishes a hierarchy within the household itself. The subordination of subsistence to the production of surplus provides the material basis for the subordination of women to men. This can take a particularly oppressive form in the case of farm households, where the male position of household head of the two productions is strengthened by the effects of the capitalist social division of labour.

But how do we move from the labour process to ideology? The question of being and consciousness, or base and superstructure, is a source of ongoing difficulties, and

Marxists from Lukacs and Gramsci to Althusser and his critics have been concerned with it in one form or other. The putative debate between "(French) structuralism" and "(English) culturalism" in particular, which has been so important for recent historiography, is really about overcoming economic determinism in our analysis of ideology and consciousness. As Seccombe has aptly suggested, however, the problem of determinism is not so much one of an emphasis on the base to the exclusion of the superstructure, but a serious narrowing of our understanding of the base. It is necessary, that is, to recognise the importance of consciousness and knowledge at the centre of production before moving to a theory of ideology. In the case of capitalist and capitalist controlled production, this means appreciating the social nature of the real subordination of labour.(24)

Real subordination in capitalist production consists of two processes. The first is the application of technology, which creates the potential for enhanced productivity by embodying human skill in more predictable and reliable non-human form. Since workers do not own the means of production, this involves an appropriation of knowledge by producers from non-producers. The second is the intensification of work effort. The intensity of labour, as Lazonick suggests, is the essence of Marx's distinction between the capacity to work (labour power) and work

actually performed (labour). In order for productivity to increase with the introduction of new technology, workers must at least maintain their previous pace of work. Since benefits do not accrue to workers, there is no immediate incentive for them to do so. Managerial supervision is required to compel workers to accept new technology and work as close to their capacity as possible. Capital thus attempts to extend control over the labour process through the appropriation of knowledge and the supervision of work. Workers, meanwhile, attempt to retain control by setting their own work pace, controlling the introduction of new technology, or claiming a share in the productivity gains by demanding higher wages. The point of production, then, is a site of ongoing struggle in capitalism.(25)

In the two productions of the farm household the same processes are at work, but the conditions are more complex. Although the labour processes are effectively controlled by capital, the situation is different in two crucial ways: control is exercised by capital-in-general (or, more precisely, agro-industrial capital in general) rather than a specific firm, and formal, legal control of the means of production resides in the household unit (with the household head). Neither the possibility nor the necessity exists for direct control and transformation of the labour process. Nonetheless, indirect control must be exerted to ensure that work effort approximate work capacity, new technologies are

introduced, productivity gains associated with the introduction of new technologies accrue to capital, and the infrastructure of the labour process remains as much as possible under capital's control. The technical mechanisms of surplus extraction are located in the sphere of exchange (as expressed in the concept of the cost-price squeeze). But, given that control is indirect, the state plays a significant managerial role here. It guides the production process in general, which, broadly conceived, extends from the immediate point of production to those sites beyond the home and farm where productive labour is applied. Struggle in the agrarian labour process, then, is situated primarily in the realm of exchange and the state.

Now it is crucial that Marx's original conceptual distinction between being and consciousness, as well as the notion that social being determines social consciousness, be retained. The antagonism in production is more than a struggle over control of knowledge as a component of labour power. It is also a struggle over the production of knowledge itself, or the constitution of meaning. One's class and gender identities are anchored in this struggle, forming one's sense of place in the labour process, forming one's perception of changes in the labour process, and, ultimately, determining one's understanding of all social reality. The primary element in the distinction between being and consciousness is located in these two components

of human knowledge. On the one hand, knowledge is material, giving labour power its uniqueness as a productive force. On the other hand, knowledge is the region of ideology, which is not material in any sense, where meaning is produced. The two components should be kept analytically distinct, while recognising that in any given historical context they are very much interconnected. The problem, of course, is assessing the ways in which this interconnectedness works, and this requires a theory of ideology.

IV

Any historical materialist discussion of ideology must begin with Gramsci. In his attempt to transcend the determinist models of Second International Marxism in the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, Gramsci developed an epistemology that owed much to Hegel's version of totality and Croce's conception of the unity of subject and object.(26) In so doing, he rejected the rigid base/superstructure metaphor in favour of the notion of a single essence imbuing the social whole, and, more importantly, a vision of the social world in which reality is deemed to be indivisible from human consciousness and action. Scientific theories have no truth value independent of their circumstances in this view. Hence, their epistemological status is derived, not from their ability to

explain reality, but from their role in the formation of the world view of particular classes. The existence of a reality beyond immediate social practice is denied, and the formation of ideologies is related directly to class interest. According to Gramsci, every class position in production carries with it an implicit conception of the world, and the clash of these conceptions is an important area of class struggle. In order to secure its control, the dominant class must make its world view explicit. This ideological hegemony is imposed through a variety of institutions and is produced by intellectuals, who form a distinct social group. But this ideology must be flexible in that its task is to incorporate and defeat the alternative conceptions emanating from the experience of subordinate classes. In the case of the proletariat, an incipient socialist consciousness exists in the daily activity of workers, and the task of working class intellectuals and working class political parties is to make this consciousness explicit. Hence, both class domination and popular resistance have to be constantly organised at the ideological and political level.(27)

Althusser, in seeking to construct a scientific Marxism, rejected Gramsci's philosophy as Hegelian and humanist.(28) Indeed, he took issue with the concept of totality employed in both Second International and "historicist" Marxism, particularly the unity of subject and

object common to the epistemology of Lukacs, Gramsci, and many of their contemporaries (the historicists).(29) He identified and rejected an "expressive" totality in which the social whole possesses a core (economy) or essence that is then reflected as epiphenomena in the other elements of society. While retaining the concept of totality, he proposed a theory of multiplicity and difference in which a plurality of instances, none of which is reducible to another, characterise every social structure. Every social formation is constituted by a specific organisation of the social practices composing it (economic, political, ideological, theoretical) such that one may play a dominant role at a particular conjuncture, but the economy is always determinant in the last instance. Hence, ideological and political relations are not mere reflections of economic relations, nor are they indivisible from class relations, but follow their own dynamic in a "relatively autonomous" fashion. Furthermore, he rejected the notion that history is the manifestation of a subject, be it an Absolute Idea (as in Hegel) or the proletariat (as in historicist Marxism). Rather, he maintained that an historical reality exists independent of collective consciousness. That reality is composed of and determined by the objective, antagonistic structures known as modes of production, which are propelled by class struggle, and human beings are constituted as subjects through ideological practice, which

is an integral instance of the social formation. This differs from Gramsci's notion of hegemony in that, by rejecting the unity of subject and object, Althusser pointed to the epistemological space between being and consciousness.(30)

It is significant that one of the most fruitful applications of Gramsci's interpretation of popular consciousness and resistance has been in England.(31) There it met with an historiography of the working and popular classes that shared many of Gramsci's philosophical premises. This historiography, associated with names such as Hill, Thompson, Hobsbawm, Hilton, and Rude, took form in the Communist Party of Great Britain's Historians' Group during the 1940s and 1950s and emerged as a distinctive genre after '1956'. In light of later developments, the most significant text of the Historians' Group was Dona Torr's Tom Mann and His Times. Published in 1956, this book was a schematic outline of a people's history of the transition to capitalism in England, emphasising the history of popular democracy and the struggles of small producers as they lost control over their means of production. Taking the classical economic processes as given, Torr analysed the constitution of popular consciousness and the role of popular initiative in the form and process of capitalist development. Her book belonged to a popular-democratic tradition of history writing that flourished in the CPGB

between the 1920s and the 1950s, and was inspired by the nineteenth century Romantic-cum-Marxist critique of capitalism personified by William Morris. As such, it proved to be a valuable point of departure for the post-1956 historians who were then turning to the younger (and more Hegelian) Marx for a non-determinist historical materialism.(32)

The epistemology that characterises this confluence of the young Marx, Romanticism, and histories of popular consciousness retains an expressive conception of totality and the unity of subject and object. Rude, for example, makes explicit use of Gramsci in devising his theory of the fusion of "inherent" and "derived" elements in popular ideology. According to Rude, the popular classes possess an inherent "mother's milk" ideology based on direct experience, oral tradition, or folk memory, which fuses with a more structured system of ideas to become the popular ideology of a given time and place. In actual history, there is considerable overlap between these, with derived elements gradually becoming incorporated as inherent ones. The "Norman Yoke" or "moral economy", described by Christopher Hill and Edward Thompson respectively, are examples of this fusion in practice. Thompson himself would no doubt reject such a typology as an unwarranted abstraction. His approach is in fact the most radical in this genre. He refuses to draw a distinction between base

and superstructure or social being and consciousness. There is no reality independent of subjective experience in this view, and the fulcrum of class struggle and (therefore) historical change is the creation of a political class consciousness out of everyday experience.(33)

The richness of this approach should not be underestimated. Especially when combined with Raymond Williams' reworking of the concept of culture from a similar theoretical perspective, it has produced a magnificent historiography which both illuminates past struggles and reveals the ways in which popular classes have been, can be, and must be active agents in the creation of their own history. Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class, in particular, illustrates how the popular classes forged a political movement and a distinctive working class culture between 1798 and 1830 that are not reducible to the development of productive forces and, indeed, were as important as economic changes in the formation of the working class. We should not allow the attractiveness of the categories to blind us to the epistemological difficulties, however.(34) The refusal to allow any conceptual distance between being and consciousness presumes that there is a direct relationship between thought and reality. On the one hand, the notion of the working class as Subject is retained, composed of individual, autonomous subjects. On the other, experience and culture replace the

economy as the expressive essence of the totality. (Rude, seeking to understand the ideology of peasants as well as the working class, makes use of Gramsci's distinction between organic and traditional classes to highlight the division and diversity among the exploited. Yet, the ideologies produced are interpreted as expressive of a popular subject, or subjects, albeit more diverse and complex than the working class.) These difficulties are significant. The approach does not allow one to ask questions about the ideological constitution of historical subjects or the material determination of ideologies; that is to say, there is no way to analyse the intermediate forms in which social identities are shaped. To do so requires admitting the existence of conceptual distance between being and consciousness, subject and object, which this approach denies.(35)

This inevitably leads into discourse theory. The challenge posed to materialist epistemologies by post-Saussurian linguistics has been profound. It is no longer possible--as empirically trained historians are especially wont to do--to treat language as the neutral medium through which experience is expressed. Rather, we must recognise that language itself is constitutive of reality; we cannot read past language to an underlying source, but we must analyse how language itself forms reality.

Saussure's concept of language, which informs the analytical approaches of Lacan, Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault and others, can be a slippery and dangerous slope, however. Without getting hopelessly mired in the intricacies of linguistic theory, it should be noted that, in this approach, language is deemed to be constantly in flux, communication is necessarily ambiguous, and there is no reality beyond discourse. Since a given word in one's vocabulary does not have a definite reference point in an anterior reality, a new meaning is assigned to the word whenever it is used to construct a novel sentence. In turn, reality itself (which is constituted through language) is fragmentary and incoherent. Indeed, any attempt to impose order on this flux is an exercise in domination. In Foucault's work, discourse and its practices are forms of power/knowledge that inevitably organise and control. The history of sexuality is really the history of dominating discourses on sexuality. Deleuze, going further, suggests that language itself is an artificial imposition on the flux of the unconscious.(36)

Historical materialists and other realists should be wary of such approaches. All discourses, including Marxism, are deemed to be apparatuses of domination in this view. The political position that logically flows from such an analysis is an extreme and immobilising anarchism. Nevertheless, by retaining a materialist stance, yet

incorporating some of the post-Saussurian insights, it is possible to accord language and discourse a certain determining role.(37)

Gareth Stedman Jones' analysis of Chartist language is one example of how this might work in practice. Rejecting previous "social" analyses of Chartism, in which the political language of the movement was deemed to be expressive of an underlying social reality, he focuses on the language itself, interpreting its form rather than its putative content. "What is proposed," he writes,

> is an approach which attempts to identify and situate the place of language and form, and which resists the temptation to collapse questions posed by the form of Chartism into questions of its assumed substance. It is argued that, if the interpretation of language and politics is freed from a priori social inferences, it then becomes possible to establish a far closer and more precise relationship between ideology and activity than is conveyed in the standard picture of the movement.

The conclusion he reaches is that Chartist language was continuous with an older language of radicalism that predated the emergence of a working class. It was more than a vehicle for the expression of working class discontent, however, for it played a significant role in establishing the premises and parameters of Chartism. But the movement ultimately collapsed, Stedman Jones suggests, due to the failure of the Chartist leadership to persuade its constituency to interpret distress and discontent within the terms of the inherited language.(38)

If we accept that language should be analysed at some distance from social references and, indeed, that language plays a significant role in constituting society, how do we theorise its relation to other social practices? Foucault is useful here. His "archaeology of knowledge" is a theory of the development of forms of knowledge and the rules governing the emergence of particular discourses. In this theory, discourse refers to a linguistic unity or group of statements that constitutes or delimits a particular area of concern. The patterns regulating a discourse are discursive practices, in which the limits and social relations of legitimate discussion are established. Social power operates through knowledge, and discourse is the medium connecting knowledge and power. Foucault's project, based upon the belief that power is inherent in all social relationships, is the analysis of the social mechanisms through which power is practiced. The historian's (or "archaeologist's") role, in his view, is to deconstruct the myriad of social apparatuses and discourses through which knowledge is constructed in the exercise of power.(39)

Although Foucault directs us to the role of specific apparatuses in the production of knowledge, his concept of a multiplicity of micro-powers operating throughout society suggests that all power is of equal significance. While this perspective is useful in moving beyond class reductionism to analyse other oppressions, it does not allow

us to analyse a hierarchy of powers.(40) The power of a parent over a child is theoretically equivalent to the power of capital over a worker in this view. As Jeffrey Weeks has noted, the political ramifications of this are ominous: "...if power is everywhere it is difficult to understand how it can be resisted or broken out of."(41) But this merely means that Foucault cannot be relied upon as a general guide to historical analysis. Once we appreciate his limitations, aspects of his schema may be incorporated into an historical materialist account.

Feminists and others interested in sexuality have found Foucault and the structuralist tradition to be particularly suggestive. Weeks, for example, makes creative use of Foucault, Lacan and others in mapping the construction of modern sexual identities. He shows how discourses on sexuality, produced in social institutions and connected by political and economic processes, have determined the domain of the sexual in the twentieth century. Rather than this simply being a process of regulation and subjection, however, the sexually oppressed have used the dominant definitions to construct their own identity and build movements of resistance. He writes:

> The construction of categories defining what is appropriate sexual behavour..., or what constitutes the essential gender being...; or where we are placed along the continuum of sexual possibilities...; this endeavour is no neutral, scientific discovery of what was already there. Social institutions which embody these definitions...are constitutive of the sexual lives

> of individuals. Struggles around sexuality are, therefore, struggles over meanings--over what is appropriate or not appropriate--meanings which call on the resources of the body and the flux of desire, but are not dictated by them.(42)

In some cases, however, the dangers of a structuralist approach have outweighed its positive effects. Women writing in the English journal m/f, for example, have concluded that it is impossible to have knowledge of any phenomenon prior to its expression in discourse. Hence, there is no underlying social reality that conditions and unifies the struggles of women, only a series of discourses organised around specific sites of oppression (domesticity, work, psychology, sexuality), which have no unity. Women's resistance, therefore, can only be specific and discursive.(43)

m/f's idealist position forms part of the whole post-structuralist rejection of epistemological realism (including Marxism), but it also has specifically feminist origins. Marxist feminism's initial encounters with structuralism and other theories of identity formation were in reaction to the purportedly "sex blind" categories of Marxism. The problem is that they, like the many others who have turned to theories of ideology in rejecting Marxism's economism, assume (on the basis of Second International categories) a narrow productive base that cannot possibly provide a materialist account of women's subordination. Hence they conclude that either oppression takes place

solely at the ideological level or a separate "mode of reproduction" must be theorised.(44) In either case the result is a form of conceptual dualism in which class and sexual oppression are deemed autonomous. When the concept of mode of production is expanded to include the reproduction of labour power, however, women's oppression can be clearly understood in material and class terms. This does not render ideology epiphenomenal, of course, but it does suggest that the constitution of gender identity is determined by the domestic relations betweeen women and men in family households.

Michele Barrett and Mary Macintosh stress the relative autonomy of "familial" ideology in their account of how gender identity is formed in twentieth century industrial capitalist societies. In so doing, they challenge functionalist analyses, which posit particular family forms and gender relations as required by capitalism, and dualist analyses, which view women's oppression as being ideologically or biologically determined. In this ideology, a particular household form is deemed the most appropriate arrangement for the organisation of domestic life. This arrangement, drawn generally from the domestic organisation of class societies, and specifically from the historical experience of the industrial bourgeoisie, is the nuclear family of male head, dependent wife, and dependent children. The nuclear family becomes an ideal in familial ideology,

providing the general context in which masculinity and femininity are constituted. In turn, these identities affect the sexual division of labour within both the household and society, the state regulation of the family and sexuality, and the legitimate bounds of sexual morality, household arrangements, and gender behaviour. "The 'family'," Barrett writes,

> provides the nexus for the various themes--romantic love; feminine nurturance; maternalism, self-sacrifice; masculine protection and financial support--that characterise our conception of gender and sexuality. It is, however, an ideological nexus rather than any concrete family system which is involved here and there are many connections between these processes within and outside the locus of the family home.(45)

V

The primary components of a theory of ideology should now be visible. Ideology refers to the production and transformation of meaning, which occurs in the realm of ideas. Although it moves far beyond it, ideology begins and ends with the production process, but it is neither a reflection of a material base nor in any sense material. As Marxist feminists have argued, there are two sides to production: the production of goods and the production of labour power. In turn, two components of the ideological realm are connected directly to production: gender and class.(46) But how does the material relate to the ideal? To begin with, following Gramsci, ideology should be seen as

a contested social terrain, demanding constant organisation and intervention by both dominant and subordinate social groups. Furthermore, as culturalist historiography has shown, resistance to the forces of domination is constructed in popular ideology and politics by subordinate subjects who play an active, determining role in the historical process. But, taking account of Althusser's critique of Hegelian and Second International Marxism, the epistemological distance between subject and object must be recognised. There is no direct relation between social being and social identity; rather, as discourse theory suggests, identity is shaped through intermediate languages and discourses. It is here that ideologies are formed. But how are they formed?

Dominant ideologies subject people to their place in a mode or form of production and qualify them to take up and perform productive roles. At its most basic level, a dominant ideology renders the inherent antagonisms in production as functional difference: women and men, workers and employers, have different roles to perform. In post-manufactory capitalist societies, the state, particularly in its educative capacity, is the primary site for the organisation and construction of dominant ideologies.(47) From the formal process of schooling to the less formal issuance of administrative decisions or the conduct of studies, the state and state supported institutions play a significant role in the distillation and refraction of

knowledge. But these apparatuses are not simple reflections of the mode or form of production they seek to reproduce. Rather, the production of meaning follows its own particular form at some distance from material production. Specifically, there are two processes--one practical, the other theoretical--by which ideologies are constructed in institutions.(48)

Practical ideology operates in the realm of people's everyday experiences, addressing them as individuals and members of social collectivities. This is the process that Althusser describes as interpellation, whereby human subjectivity is constituted. Central to the concept of interpellation is the notion that ideologies are not received as something external by a fixed and unified subject. Rather, with the reception of an interpellation, the receiver is participating in an ongoing social process of constitution and reconstitution. It is here that we acquire our social identities, notably class and gender identities, and become <u>subjected</u> to a system or systems of representation. But in order to be effectively interpellative, practical ideology must be structured in such a way as to have resonance for those receiving it. It needs to connect with the experience of the receivers, ordering their world in a way that is meaningful. It plays on the contradictions in society, and openings and lapses in

various ideologies, to coax and shape identity in a particular direction.

Theoretical ideology is the conceptual terrain upon which objects of knowledge are defined: it provides the epistemological space in which practical ideology may operate. Abstraction occurs here, in that the ordinary language of practical ideology is organised in terms of a specific theoretical discourse at this level. First, a domain of knowledge is defined in relation to other discourses on the theoretical terrain. Second, a problematic--"the objective internal reference system of...[a theory's] particular themes, the system of questions commanding the answers given"--is established.(49) Third, organisational practices are generated to shield the discourse in question from other discourses. Fourth, restrictions are placed on who may speak and what may be discussed. And, fifth, analytical categories are constructed that are solely referential within the specific discourse itself or the discursive order of which it forms a part.(50) But, beyond this discursive jockeying, the operation of any dominant theoretical ideology is ultimately limited by practical ideology, or, more precisely, practical ideology's interaction with ideologies of resistance.

But how do ideologies of resistance--what we will call popular ideologies--develop? First, the production process is the material basis for the construction of popular

ideologies. The antagonisms inherent in production are viewed as inequality or exploitation in popular ideology, although their source or form may be interpreted as residing outside of production. Second, the constitution of a popular identity follows the same formative rules as does the constitution of a dominated identity. Subordinate individuals are addressed as exploited and as potential agents of resistance and social change. A well articulated popular ideology, such as Marxism, has as sophisticated a discursive structure as the most fully developed dominant ideology. This includes a theoretical ideology, a practical ideology, and, if it has any hope of success, an institutional apparatus--such as a party--in which analysis may be conducted, ideology may be generated, and the various levels may be linked. Less clearly articluated popular ideologies, such as populism, tend to exist more exclusively in the realm of practical ideology, drawing upon a range of dominant and popular theoretical ideologies for categories of analysis. Nevertheless, these popular ideologies can and do form coherent critiques, fruitful languages for the constitution of identities, and effective institutional structures.(51)

A popular ideology is, first and foremost, a linguistic unity, what Stedman Jones calls "a complex rhetoric binding together, in a systematic way, shared premises, analytical routines, strategic options and programmatic demands."(52)

The specific relationship between words and sentences in the language structures reality in a way which has resonance for the audience in question. It is thereby able to mobilise a constituency by constructing a personal and collective identity in opposition to dominant ideologies. But its coherent structure notwithstanding, all ideology exists in history. In the face of changing realities and the emergence of new constituencies, the malleability of language is tested. The popular ideology must continue to interpret reality in a meaningful way or lose its ability to create identities and mobilise people. New or different social groups may appropriate aspects of the ideology, giving it new intonations.(53) More ominously, the categories and inferences of the popular ideology may be incorporated into the dominant ideology, transforming the former's meaning in the process. And the categories of dominant ideology may, in effect, infiltrate the popular ideology, constructing a new unity in which the previously resistant loses its critical edge and becomes accommodationist.

---

1. In the strictest sense, reproduction refers to the renewal of the social and technical elements of production, and of the relations between them, from one round of production to another; more generally, it refers to the renewal over time of a mode of production or social formation in all of its economic, political, and ideological aspects. For discussions, see, for example, H. Friedmann, "Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations," Journal of Peasant Studies 7(2) (January,

1980), p. 162; M. Barrett, Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis (London, 1980), pp. 19-29; and T. Bottomore, ed., A Dictionary of Marxist Thought (London, 1983), pp. 417-419.

2. The extraction of surplus value is "the specific way exploitation takes place under capitalism...in which the surplus takes the form of profit, and exploitation results from the working class producing a net product which can be sold for more than they receive in wages. ...The amount of surplus value a worker produces is the difference between the value he or she produces and the value of his or her labour power." Bottomore, ed., A Dictionary, pp. 472-473.
3. In Althusser's writing articulation means "to join together" or "give expression to": it is used as an anatomical metaphor to indicate relations of linkage between two or more levels of various phenomena. See A. Foster-Carter, "The Modes of Production Controversy," New Left Review 107 (1978), pp. 53-54.
4. K. Marx, Capital, vol. III (Moscow, 1978), part VI; W. Denis, "Capital and Agriculture: A Review of Marxian Problematics," Studies in Political Economy, Number 7 (Winter, 1982), pp. 128-133; D. Goodman and M. Redclift, From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions (Oxford, 1981), chapter 1; for Lenin on American agriculture see V.I. Lenin, "Capitalism and Agriculture in the USA," Selected Works 12 (Moscow, 1943), pp. 190-282; for an application of Kautsky's analysis to North America see A.M. Simons, The American Farmer (New York, 1902). A recent study which illustrates the importance and persistence of household agriculture in the supposedly "purely capitalist" England of the nineteenth century is M. Reed, "The Peasantry of Nineteenth Century England: A Neglected Class?," History Workshop Journal 18 (Autumn, 1984). Two important studies of Western Canadian agrarianism are situated within this classical approach: John Conway's "'To Seek A Goodly Heritage': The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy," PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1979, which utilises Lenin's analysis of Russian populism to argue that the agrarian movement was a "petit bourgeois response to capitalist industrialization", and C.B. Macpherson's Democracy in Alberta: social credit and the party system (Toronto, 1962), which should be understood in the context of the author's main interest, the analysis of early modern bourgeois democratic theory in terms of a classical understanding of capitalist transition.
5. Foster-Carter, "The Modes of Production," p. 49; Goodman and Redclift, From Peasant to Proletarian, chapter 2; R. Brenner, "The Origins of Capitalist Development: A

Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism," New Left Review 104 (1977). The so-called "left-Innisian" position in Canadian political economy is generally cast in terms of dependency and/or unequal exchange; for applications to Western Canadian agriculture see D. Mitchell, The Politics of Food (Toronto, 1975) and R.T. Naylor, "The Ideological Foundations of Social Democracy and Social Credit," in Gary Teeple, ed., Capitalism and the National Question in Canada (Toronto, 1972).

6. P.P. Rey, Les Alliances de Classes (Paris, 1973), pp. 14-15: quoted in Foster-Carter, "Modes of Production," p. 56, pp. 50-54; J. Taylor, From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of the Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment (Atlantic Highlands, 1979); J. Chevalier, "There is Nothing Simple About Simple Commodity Production," Studies in Political Economy, Number 7 (Winter, 1982), pp. 102-103.
7. S.A. Mann and J.M. Dickinson, "Obstacles to the Development of a Capitalist Agriculture," Journal of Peasant Studies 5(4) (July, 1978); Mann and Dickinson, "The State and Agriculture," in H. Newby and F. Buttel, The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies (Montclair, N.J., 1980); H. Friedmann, "World Market, State and Family Farm: The Social Basis of Household Production in the Era of Wage Labour," Comparative Studies in Society and History 20(4) (October, 1978).
8. H. Friedmann, "Household Production and the National Economy"; Friedmann, "Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains," Journal of Peasant Studies 6(1) (October, 1978); see also M. Hedley, "Independent Commodity Production and the Dynamics of Tradition," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 13(4) (November, 1976); Hedley, "Reproduction and Evolving Patterns of Co-operation and Resource Transfer Among Domestic Producers," Canadian Journal of Anthropology 1(2) (Winter, 1980); Hedley, "Relations of Production of the `Family Farm': Canadian Prairies," Journal of Peasant Studies 9(1) (October, 1981).
9. Peasant production and simple commodity production are abstractions. An actually existing agricultural household will exist somewhere along the continuum from absolute subsistence to complete market participation (not including labour). Prairie agricultural households are and have been primarily at the market end of this continuum; therefore, the concept of simple commodity production best describes their social position. In the rest of the text we shall use the term "farm households" and "farmers" when referring to "simple commodity production" and "simple commodity producers".
10. Marx, Capital, volume I, pp. 1021, 645: quoted in W. Lazonick, "Class Relations and the Capitalist

Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of Marxian Economic Theory," unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1983, p. 21; G. Stedman Jones, "Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution," in Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982 (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 47-48.

11. J. Chevalier, "There is Nothing Simple," pp. 94-99.
12. J. Chevalier, "There is Nothing Simple," pp. 100-110; W. Denis, "Capital and Agriculture," pp. 136-146; A. Mollard, Les paysans exploites (Grenoble, 1977) is discussed by both Chevalier and Denis.
13. Chevalier, "There Is Nothing Simple," pp. 110-113; Denis, "Capital and Agriculture," pp. 141-146.
14. Chevalier, "There Is Nothing Simple," pp. 114-118.
15. For the domestic labour debate see W. Seccombe, "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism," New Left Review 83 (1974), and subsequent criticisms and rejoinder in the same journal; B. Fox, ed., Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism (Toronto, 1980); M. Barrett, Women's Oppression Today, pp. 172-186; L. Vogel, Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory (New Brunswick, N.J., 1983), Part Four.
16. W. Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power: A Comparative Study," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1983, pp. 33, 52, 69-77; G.A. Cohen, Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence (Princeton, 1978), p. 41.
17. Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," pp. 84-85.
18. Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," pp. 89-96.
19. There is no biological need for any sexual division of labour.
20. Vogel, Marxism and the Oppression of Women, pp. 144-150; Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," pp. 98-103; M. Godelier, "The Origins of Male Domination," New Left Review 127 (1981); a recent collection which explores these issues is S. Coontz and P. Henderson, eds., Women's Work, Men's Property: The Origins of Gender and Class (London, 1986).
21. One aspect of this class and sexual struggle was the establishment of the family wage in the regions of advanced capitalism during the nineteenth century. See M. Barrett and M. McIntosh, "The `Family Wage': Some Problems for Socialists and Feminists," Capital and Class Number 11 (1980); Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," pp. 429-439, 461-466; Seccombe, "Patriarchy stabilized: the construction of the male breadwinner norm in nineteenth century Britain," Social History 11(1) (January, 1986).
22. Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," chapter 6; Seccombe, "The Expanded Reproduction Cycle of Labour Power in Twentieth Century Capitalism," in Hidden in the

Household; E. Blumenfeld and S. Mann, "Domestic Labour and the Reproduction of Labour Power: Towards an Analysis of Women, the Family and Class," in Hidden in the Household; Vogel, Marxism and the Oppression of Women, chapter 11.

23. See M. Luxton, More Than A Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home (Toronto, 1980) for a discussion of the working class household in Flin Flon.

24. P. Anderson, Considerations on Western Marxism (London, 1976); P. Anderson, In the Tracks of Historical Materialism (London, 1983); for the "debate" at its height see E.P. Thompson, The Poverty of Theory (London, 1978) and P. Anderson, Arguments Within English Marxism (London, 1980); Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," pp. 60-63.

25. Lazonick, "Class Relations in the Capitalist Enterprise".

26. Totality refers to the determining domination of the whole over its constituent parts. "Social totality in Marxist theory is a structured and historically determined overall complex. It exists in and through those manifold mediations and transitions through which its specific parts or complexes...are linked to each other in a constantly shifting and changing, dynamic set of interrelations and reciprocal determinations." Bottomore, ed., A Dictionary, p. 480. Bendetto Croce was a leading idealist philosopher in early twentieth century Italy. C. Boggs, Gramsci's Marxism (London, 1976), pp. 21-22.

27. A. Gramsci, Selections From The Prison Notebooks; Boggs, Gramsci's Marxism; R. Miliband, Marxism and Politics (London, 1977), pp. 48-49, 57-62; Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (London, 1969), chapter 9; A. Callinicos, Marxism and Philosophy (Oxford, 1983), pp. 61-80, 150-153; Callinicos, Althusser's Marxism (London, 1976), pp. 16-29.

28. In rejecting humanism Althusser was denying "that the human essence is the subject of history and that it determines its direction according to a predestined drama of alienation and reconciliation." Callinicos, Althusser's Marxism, pp. 69-70.

29. In historicism a theory "possesses a claim to cognitive validity to the extent that it is appropriate to the historical needs of a particular class in a particular epoch." Callinicos, Althusser's Marxism, pp. 17-18.

30. L. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (London, 1971); Callinicos, Althusser's Marxism; Callinicos, Marxism and Philosophy, pp. 89-95; T. Benton, The Rise and Fall of Structural Marxism (London, 1984).

31. See, for example, S. Hall and T. Jefferson, eds., Resistance Through Rituals (London, 1976).
32. B. Schwarz, "`The people' in history: the Communist Party Historians' Group, 1946-56," in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Making Histories: Studies in history-writing and politics (London, 1982); R. Samuel, "British Marxist Historians I," New Left Review 120 (1980); R. Johnson, "Culture and the historians," and "Three problematics: elements of a theory of working class culture," in J. Clarke, C. Critcher and R. Johnson, eds., Working class Culture: studies in history and theory (London, 1979); D. Torr, Tom Mann and His Times (London, 1956).
33. G. Rude, Ideology and Popular Protest (New York, 1980); Rude, The Crowd in History (New York, 1964); E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (London, 1963); Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," Past and Present number 50 (1971); C. Hill, "The Norman Yoke," in J. Saville, ed., Democracy and the Labour Movement: Essays in Honour of Dona Torr (London, 1954.
34. Thompson, The Poverty of Theory; see also G. McLennan, "E.P. Thompson and the discipline of historical context," and "Philosophy and history: some issues in recent marxist theory," in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Making Histories.
35. The best example of the use of this approach in the analysis of rural North American popular politics is Lawrence Goodwyn's Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America (New York, 1978). This book could easily be retitled The Making of the American Farmer, as it owes much to Thompson (although the influence of C. Vann Woodward is also evident). It is rich in cultural analysis: the concept of movement culture; the identification of a sequential process of agrarian insurgency; culture and experience as determining forces in history. Yet, Goodwyn refuses to abstract. He denies the existence of a mode of production or social formation conceptually distinct from experience. Hence, his populists--the mid-roaders at least--are presented as pure subjects. They are the bearers of democracy, resisting the forces of corporate hegemony. See also Goodwyn's critique of James Green in "The `Co-operative Commonwealth' and Other Abstractions," Marxist Perspectives 10 (Summer, 1980) and Green's reply "Populism, Socialism and the Promise of Democracy," Radical History Review 24 (Fall, 1980). Although I agree with most of Green's criticisms of Goodwyn, his own analysis is quite orthodox, positing a linear and evolutionary transition to capitalism as the material context of "populism" and "socialism". A similar, though conservative, materialist epistemology guides the

American "new rural history". In this approach, modernisation theory, environmental determinism, and quantification are combined to assess how rural America adjusted to the development of urban, industrial society. See, for example, R.P. Swierenga, "Theoretical Perspectives on the New Rural History: From Environmentalism to Modernization," Agricultural History 56(1) (January, 1982). For critiques of the conservatism of the "new social history"--the elder sibling of "new rural history"--see T. Judt, "A Clown in Regal Purple: Social History and the Historians," History Workshop Journal 7 (Spring, 1979) and E. Fox-Genovese and E.D. Genovese, "The Political Crisis of Social History," Journal of Social History 10(2) (Winter, 1976).

36. A. Callinicos, Marxism and Philosophy, chapters 5 and 6; Callinicos, Is There A Future For Marxism? (London, 1982); M. Foucault, The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction (New York, 1980); J. Weeks, Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities (London, 1985), pp. 170-181 ; "Language and History," History Workshop Journal 10 (Autumn, 1980), pp. 1-5.

37. See P. Dews, "The 'Nouvelle Philosophie' and Foucault," Economy and Society 8(2) (May, 1979) and Dews, "The 'new philosophers' and the end of Leftism," Radical Philosophy number 24 (Spring, 1980) for analyses of the politics of structuralism. Callinicos suggests that post-Fregean language philosophy provides a more fruitful guide to a materialist account of discourse. In this tradition words have a stable meaning with reference to a co-existing reality, and it is the way in which words combine in novel sentences which accounts for linguistic creativity in a given discursive system. Unfortunately, I know of no historians who have adopted this line of enquiry, and I am too uncomfortable with the intricacies of the distinctions to pursue it myself. Hence I will follow the better travelled, yet more dangerous path of structuralism. Callinicos, Marxism and Philosophy, chapter 6.

38. G. Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," in Languages of Class, pp. 94-95; for a classical Marxist critique see J. Foster, "The Declassing of Language," New Left Review 150 (1985); for a sympathetic appreciation see G. Claeys, "Language, class and historical consciousness in nineteenth century England," Economy and Society 14(2) (1985); for an analysis of French popular politics that is similar, though more social, see M. Sonencsher, "The Sans-culottes of the Year II: rethinking the language of labour in revolutionary France," Social History 9(3) (October, 1984).

39. M. Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge (New York, 1972); Foucault, The History of Sexuality; J. Weeks, "Foucault for Historians," History Workshop Journal 14 (Autumn, 1982); D. Lecourt, "On Archaeology and Knowledge," in Marxism and Epistemology (London, 1975); A. Sheridan, Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth (London, 1980).
40. Reductionism refers to the reduction of ideological phenomena to their putative economic and social determinants.
41. J. Weeks, Sex, Politics and Society: the regulation of sexuality since 1800 (London, 1981), p. 8.
42. Weeks, Sexuality and Its Discontents, p. 178.
43. See, for example, R. Coward, "Rethinking Marxism," m/f number 2 (1978).
44. On Marxism's sex blind categories see, for example, H. Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," in L. Sargent, ed., Women and Revolution: A discussion of the unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism (Montreal, 1981); on mode of reproduction see R. McDonough and R. Harrison, "Patriarchy and Relations of Production," in A. Kuhn and A.M. Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism (London, 1978); on the autonomy of ideology see R. Coward and J. Ellis, Language and Materialism (London, 1977).
45. Barrett, Women's Oppression Today, p. 205; M. Barrett and M. Macintosh, The Anti-Social Family (London, 1982); for a discussion of masculinity from a similar perspective, see A. Tolson, The Limits of Masculinity (London, 1977).
46. Class and gender ideologies intersect with other ideologies (religious, ethnic, regional, national and so forth) in a given society, but the overall ideological ensemble is patterned by gender and class. In Althusserian terminology, gender and class are overdetermining or determinant in the last instance. G. Therborn, The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology (London, 1980), especially pp. 71-72. In the rest of the text, the term ideology shall mean class and gender ideology.
47. My understanding of the state and education is drawn primarily from the following: Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society, especially chapter 8; Miliband, Marxism and Politics, chapters 3 and 4; Gramsci, The Prison Notebooks; H. Entwistle, Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling For Radical Politics (London, 1979); G. Mardle, "Power, tradition and change: educational implications of the thought of Antonio Gramsci," in D. Gleeson, ed., Identity and Structure: issues in the sociology of education (Driffield, 1977); L. Panitch, The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power (Toronto, 1977); L. Althusser, "Ideology

and Ideological State Apparatuses"; Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, On Ideology (London, 1978); S. Hall, "Schooling, state and society," in R. Dale et.al., eds., Education and the State, Volume I: Schooling and the National Interest (Sussex, 1981); P. Bourdieu and J.C. Passeron, Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (London, 1977); P. Willis, Learning to Labour: how working class kids get working class jobs (Farnborough, 1977); M. Barrett, Women's Oppression Today, chapters 4 and 7; M. McIntosh, "The State and the Oppression of Women," in Kuhn and Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism; A.M. Wolpe, "Education and the Sexual Division of Labour," in Kuhn and Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism; Wolpe, "The Official Ideology of Education for Girls," in Dale et.al., eds., Education and the State, Volume II: Politics, Patriarchy and Practice (Sussex, 1981); R. Johnson, "Educational policy and social control in early-Victorian England," Past and Present 49 (1970); see T. Eagleton, Criticism and Ideology (London, 1976) for his notion of a literary mode of production.

48. On theoretical and practical ideology see L. Althusser, For Marx (London, 1965), p. 231; D. Lecourt, "On Archaelogy and Knowledge," pp. 208-213; S. Dentith, "Political economy, fiction and the language of practical ideology in nineteenth century England," Social History 8(2) (May, 1983).
49. Althusser, For Marx, p 67n.
50. See Therborn, The Ideology of Power, especially pp. 81-84
51. See, for example, E. Laclau, "Towards a Theory of Populism," in Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory (London, 1979) and Laclau, "Populist Rupture and Discourse," Screen Education 34 (Spring, 1980).
52. Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," p. 107.
53. On the appropriation and transformation of language see R. Gray, "The Deconstructing of the English Working Class," Social History 11(3) (October, 1986); for an example of how feminists appropriated the language of radicalism in early nineteenth century England see B. Taylor, Eve and the New Jerusalem (London, 1983), especially chapter IV.

CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF IDEOLOGIES, STATE STRUCTURES, AND THE AGRARIAN MOVEMENT IN MANITOBA

In any society, the particular shape that forms of production, institutions, and ideologies assume is determined by specific historical experiences. In late nineteenth and early twentieth century North America, industrial capitalism matured in concert with the expansion of family farming. Thus, societies were created that, while dominated and defined by capitalism, were not purely capitalist. More precisely, household wheat production grew within economies increasingly controlled by corporate capital, bureaucratic states emerged to assume responsibility for a range of reproductive tasks, and popular politics was transformed. In this chapter we survey these broader areas of Canadian and American history to establish a context for understanding the development of dominant and popular ideologies in Manitoba agriculture.

I

Between 1870 and 1930 a world market in wheat emerged and was consolidated, the geographic frontiers of global wheat production expanded, and farm households displaced both capitalist and peasant enterprises as the primary form of wheat production in all regions of the world market. This new world wheat market facilitated the emergence of farm households, but their expansion was dependent upon

individual and varied state initiatives. The interaction of the market with state policies affecting the movement of labour and capital provided the basis for the transformation of production. When a world price for wheat came into existence, it combined with the actions of national policy makers to undermine capitalist and peasant production in the face of the rise of farm households.(1)

The world market in wheat emerged between 1873 and 1896. Before 1873 there were various markets, notably a European market and an American market, which, while connected by trade, were separate structures. After 1873, however, improvements in ocean and land transportation allowed the emergence of a market in which a single world price set the maximum cost of production in every exporting nation. The European price fell and the American (Chicago) price rose until they converged in 1882. But both prices fell sharply after 1882 due to declining inland (railroad expansion) and ocean (steamship overproduction) shipping costs, the new European requirement for hard wheat, and, most importantly, a growth in the number of producers. This fall marked the beginning of a single world price. The price recovered between 1896 and World War I. After the war, however, there was a glut, followed by a period of high prices and, after 1925, a complete price collapse.(2) Whereas the fall of world prices before 1896 affected only European producers for the most part, the post-1925 crisis

affected all wheat growers as even farmers were unable to meet their modest costs of production.

Although fifty million people left Europe between the 1870s and the 1930s, this did not constitute the formation of an international labour market. Unlike the situation in wheat, where a world price emerged, migration resulted from wage differentials among labour markets, or differences in standards of living between areas that did not have labour markets, and these differences were not reduced during the period. Rather, European emigration was organised through states and corporations seeking to colonise new lands with farmers. The territorial expansions in the United States, Australia, Canada, and, to a lesser extent, Argentina utilised farm settlement to effectively incorporate new areas into existing state structures. Wheat farming required the least financing and organisation of any alternatives (other commodities; peasant, capitalist or other production) for incorporating new territory and governing it adequately. As farmers began to produce wheat for the market, the price fell. Any producers who were paying rent or wages, were tending too small a plot, or were unable to improve production techniques were put under pressure. Hence, peasant and capitalist producers became the victims of a world price that continued to fall as settlers worked themselves and their families as hard as possible in order to avoid proletarianisation. Those

peasants and agricultural workers who were forced off the land either pursued farming opportunities in the new lands, sought employment locally where wages were under a certain degree of upward pressure due to farm competition, or migrated to jobs in the new lands where wages were under even greater upward pressure from the farming alternative.

Nor was there an international market in capital during this period. Capital markets and rates of profit remained national phenomena. Capital did not move freely from one sector to another across state boundaries, but was induced by state guarantees that returns would be high and risks would be low. In 1913 England accounted for 40.9% of total foreign investments, with France and Germany controlling 20.4% and 13.2% respectively. The three countries held credits of $32.8 billion out of a world total of $44 billion. The bulk of French and German investments were in Europe, while half of English investments were within the Empire. Overall, the majority of investments were in the areas of new settlement where they had been attracted by local states for the building of expansionist infrastructure. Indeed, the largest portion of these latter investments were in the form of interest-bearing securities such as government and railroad bonds.

In the areas of recent European settlement, then, states used wheat farming to expand into new territories. Wheat acreage in the United States plains grew steadily

throughout the period. Argentine growth began in the 1890s and stabilised from 1905 onwards. 1905 also marked the beginning of significant acreage expansion in Canada and Australia, with Australian acreage declining during the post-war period and into the Depression while Canada maintained growth well into the Depression. The fact that acreage expanded despite price movements stemmed from state policies of expansion whereby people who would otherwise have sold their labour power were given the opportunity to farm. (In Argentina, where private capital played a comparatively larger role, acreage responded more to price.) This new class became an important force in the various societies of which it was a part. It was much larger than the food requirements of the individual countries justified, producing for a world market which it had helped create. Most importantly though, by the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century, each society contained a class that, while brought into existence by capitalist expansion, was neither bourgeois nor proletarian.

Friedmann's analysis illustrates that, contrary to many accounts, Canadian expansion was not unique; it was merely the largest in a global series of territorial incorporations into existing state and economic structures. But Canada's National Policy, which included the transfer of Rupert's Land, the pacification of the metis and native inhabitants, railway construction, settlement, and tariffs, was

noteworthy because of the scale of the project, and the speed and efficiency with which the preconditions of settlement were achieved. The absence of a settlement frontier between Upper Canada and the Western Interior, coupled with the beginning of wheat farming on the American plains in the 1860s and the existing commercial links between Red River and St. Paul, presented a major challenge for the newly created state. Ironically, given the threat from the south, previous American experience in railroad engineering and the large scale mobilisation of capital made Canadian expansion a viable undertaking. Nonetheless, incorporation of this new territory was a major accomplishment because the Canadian government had to overcome geographic obstacles, metis and native resistance, and the north-south movement of commerce. The project only succeeded through subsidies and land grants, the protective tariff, special freight rates, and an initial CPR monopoly. By 1885 an extensive infrastructure was in place, but it was only a shell of what was needed for a viable economy and society. Some settlement had begun, primarily along the woodlands at the edge of the prairies, but there was no intensive network of branch lines and town sites to attract migrants such as had accompanied the piecemeal expansion of settlement south of the border. The massive immigration that did fill the prairies in the early twentieth century (a five-fold increase in prairie population and a twelve-fold

increase in improved prairie land between 1901 and 1931), after the exhaustion of cheap American land, was composed of people induced by state and corporate coaxing, and largely displaced by global transformations in agriculture.(3)

The Canadian wheat market that developed in the context of this structure was marked by a series of contractions and expansions that generally reflected the changes at the world level. Prices declined from about $1.30 a bushel in 1882 to about $0.65 a bushel in 1896, while Canada's production increased from 32.3 million to 42.1 million bushels between the censuses of 1881 and 1891. With the boom that began in 1896, wheat prices rose to $0.75-$0.80 a bushel in 1907 and $1.20 a bushel in 1912. Production, which was 56 million bushels in 1901, expanded to 230 million in 1911. By 1913, however, with mortgage and other interest rates increasing as credit tightened in the London money markets, the price dropped to below a dollar a bushel, recovering slightly to a dollar the following year. And, reflecting a 25% drop in average yield per acre, production dropped substantially to 160 million bushels in 1914. With heightened wartime and post-war demand, price increased from $1.28 in 1915 to an incredible peak price of $3.15 per bushel in the summer of 1920. Furthermore, wheat acreage increased by 80%, and the value of wheat and flour exports doubled, between 1913 and 1919. Beginning in 1920, however, serious depression threatened as the price dropped to a low of $1.07 in 1924,

placing extreme pressure on those producers who had incurred debt in purchasing land and machinery to take advantage of wartime and post-war prices. Perhaps because of this pressure, production continued to increase as it moved from 300 million to 395 million bushels between 1921 and 1925. The last period of comparative prosperity, before serious depression did become a reality, began with a sharp price increase to $1.68 in 1925, followed by a slow decline to $1.20 in 1929. Although prices were falling in the later twenties, costs were low and crops were good, especially the record harvest of 567 million bushels in 1928 which increased Canada's share of the world market to 50%. The effects of drought began to be felt in 1929, however, as production fell to 305 million bushels, recovering to 420 million in 1930, but falling again to 321 million bushels in 1931. And price, finally, began its dramatic decline in 1930, dropping slowly to $1.00 during the year, dipping to $0.65 in 1931, and hitting bottom at $0.25 per bushel in 1932.(4)

These prices--terminal or "spot" prices at the Lakehead--were not, of course, the prices a prairie producer actually received for his grain. The spread between these prices and the "street" or "track" prices at the local elevator or siding was determined by an elaborate marketing structure variously presided over by capitalist, state, and co-operative intermediaries in the late nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries. At the Lakehead, grain was mixed, cleaned, loaded, and, after 1912, federally inspected at terminals owned by railway companies, grain companies, farmer owned co-operatives, and the federal government. The product moved by rail from country elevator through Winnipeg, where it was inspected (after 1886), to the Lakehead, with freight charges paid by the farmer at government regulated rates after 1897. At the local shipping point, normally a country elevator, the producer either sold his grain outright to a buyer, commissioned the selling, or stored the grain for later sale. Whichever option he chose, and it was usually the first one, he entered into a commercial relationship with one of a number of elevator owners (or terminal owners if he had enough grain to load a car) who, for the most part, were grain and milling companies prior to 1910. By 1930, however, almost 40% of all country elevators were producer owned or controlled, with all transactions regulated by the Canada Grain Act (1912). The central institution in the grain trade was the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, formed in 1887. Comprised of elevator companies, cash grain commission merchants and brokers, millers and maltsters, shippers, and exporters, the exchange set the various street, track and spot prices through both cash and (after 1904) futures markets. With the exception of the years 1917 to 1920, during which time exchange trading was suspended in order to

halt an upward price movement and to ensure "stable" supplies to Britain and France, the open market system was freely operative until 1935.(5)

As the grain trade became established and the wheat economy expanded, farmers faced an increasingly corporate organised industrial structure protected by tariff barriers and, after the initial homestead acquisition and preemption period, a fully capitalist market in land. Production inputs and items of personal consumption, ranging from land and lumber for dwellings, barns, and granaries through seed and machinery for seed bed preparation, seeding, haying, summerfallowing, and threshing to household furnishings, clothing, off-farm foodstuffs, fencing materials, and hand tools, had to be purchased in the market. With the flurry of mergers around 1910, which included fifty-eight amalgamations involving two hundred and seventy-five firms in all areas of industrial activity from food and cotton processing to agricultural implements and iron and steel, the foundation for the price system of corporate capitalism was established. At the level of the farm economy itself, the total market value of land, buildings, implements, and livestock increased from $231 million in 1901 to $2.7 billion in 1931, peaking at $3.2 billion in 1921. Land (approximately 60% of the total) increased in total value from $129 million to $1.7 billion, or, on a per farm basis, from $3343 in 1901 to $8026 in 1921 and $5955 in 1931. The

actual price of land in the twenties, meanwhile, ranged generally between $10.00 and $30.00 an acre, depending upon quality, location and the price of wheat. Total building and implement values increased from $46.2 million to $796.5 million in the thirty year period. Per farm values increased from $850 in 1901 to $3100 in 1921, falling back to $2800 by 1931. Finally, the total value of livestock increased very modestly from $54.3 million to $195 million in 1931, with per farm value increasing from $982 to $1864 between 1901 and 1916, but actually declining below the 1901 level by $300 in 1931.(6)

From the initial settlement years, but especially after the expansion beginning in the nineties, credit in one form or other was crucial to the operation of farm households. Land companies, trust companies, mortgage firms, and private investors financed land transfers and purchases during the period. Interest rates ranged from 6% in periods when central Canadian and overseas capital was readily available to 15% to 20% in periods of contraction. Furthermore, western rates tended to be higher than eastern rates, and urban rates were generally lower than rural ones. According to the Saskatchewan Agricultural Credit Commission, over 80% of Saskatchewan farms were mortgaged in 1913, with an average mortgage indebtedness of $1500 per farm or $5.00 an acre (when wheat production was returning $20 to $25 an acre per annum). In 1931, when the census began collecting

information on farm mortgages, the data revealed that 35%-40% of all farms were mortgaged, with an average mortgage per farm of $3100 (about the price of a representative quarter section in the late twenties when average farm size was two quarters). The financing of other instruments of production and consumption, including seasonal operations, was normally done through machinery manufacturers, implement dealers, wholesale houses, and local retailers. These entities, in turn, were financed by commercial banks. Through a combination of banker induced statutory limits on securities (neither farm real estate nor grain could be accepted as collateral) and a desire to invest in the safer, more liquid commercial and industrial fields, direct bank loans to farmers were rare. Where they did exist they were limited to three or four month terms, which were generally too short for either operating loans (since they fell due just before harvest) or machinery purchases (which required a number of years to pay off). Since it was unsecured, the credit farmers did receive through manufacturers and retailers was undoubtedly more expensive than mortgage money. Farm surveys from the late twenties suggest that non-mortgage debt accounted for about 25%-30% of a farmers total debt load. State intervention, although it was sorely needed during this period simply to create a farm credit system, was minimal and, from the perspective of producers, ineffectual. The Dominion government amended the Bank Act

in 1913 and 1915 to allow grain to be accepted as security, but banks were loath to significantly expand their involvement in the western farm economy. Provincially, war induced ventures such as Manitoba's Rural Credit Societies were dependent on loans from the chartered banks who, after a few years of participation, demanded higher rates of interest and thereby scuttled the plan. By the end of the twenties, prairie farmers had a total debt load of over $800 million, owed to a variety of institutions, and a ratio of debt to equity ranging anywhere from 3% on large farms to 110% on small operations.(7)

II

Canada experienced its Industrial Revolution and, consequently, its full transition to capitalist relations of production in the four decades after 1850. In the early nineteenth century primitive accumulation had been fostered through proto-industrialisation around peasant production in the countryside and incipient manufacturing connected to merchant capital and the entrepot trade in the towns. In the 1850s canal building began to give way to railway construction for the transport of staple products from the continental interior. With this impetus, coupled with a greater agrarian emphasis on market production, a home market emerged for both producer and consumer goods. On the basis of a labour market composed of skilled workers from

Britain and the United States, and unskilled labourers from Ireland and the farms of Quebec and Ontario, both master artisans and former merchant capitalists expanded into large scale industrial production. After the loss of the American market in the 1860s, central Canadian capitalists with links to Britain presided over the creation of a national economic and political entity that, it was envisioned, would be based upon industrial development protected by tariff serving an expanding agricultural population. Although the strategy was not successful as a national development policy until the end of the century, the 1880s witnessed respectable growth in the manufacture of producer and consumer goods. This growth helped expand the domestic market which, in turn, induced heightened competition and price declines. Capital, however, was limited in its ability to reduce costs since its control over the labour process was circumscribed. Although production was increasingly centralised in this period, control of the pace and rhythm of work remained with the workers through their retention of artisanal methods. To be sure, a degree of division of labour took place in some industries, but generally workers continued to possess total knowledge of the production process.(8)

The second Industrial Revolution, which transformed the metropolitan regions of global capitalism and spawned a new wave of imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was based in Canada upon wheat exports,

new chemical and electrical processes, and mining operations for minerals associated with the new processes. New industries employing these processes, such as autos, chemicals and electrical goods, developed rapidly during the period. These industries were largely controlled by the branch plants of giant American firms, which joined the new Canadian corporations, formed by indigenous mergers in areas such as agricultural implements and steel, in dominating the Canadian economy. The firms that succeeded in the merger movements of both the United States and Canada did so by cutting costs through the creation of internal economies. At one level, the simple application of large scale technology produced these savings. More crucially, though, successful corporations were able to increase their economies of throughput; that is, they were able to maximise their output per unit of time. But this innovation was an organisational rather than a technical accomplishment. The flow of productive inputs and the distribution of production to increasingly extensive markets required co-ordination if economies were to be achieved. Hence a managerial structure was developed to control and co-ordinate factor markets, output markets, and the production process.

Of course, the most significant production factor that needed to be controlled was labour. Economies of throughput required the standardisation and intensification of work processes. The new technologies embodied human skills in

machines, and the professional engineers who designed and understood them became the new controllers of the production process. A new type of worker--the "semi-skilled" machine operative--was required to operate the new machine technology. These workers needed less skill and knowledge than the old craft workers who had controlled the pace of work and the resolution of production problems, but more skill than nineteenth century labourers who sold little more than their physical capabilities. The newly devised personnel departments sought reliable, attentive and loyal employees who would obey management orders and not disrupt production. Managers, following F.W. Taylor's direction but not necessarily his precise method, devised various forms of hierarchial management systems to appropriate shop floor knowledge, make work more time and less task oriented, and generally speed up production. Although workers resisted these incursions in various ways, their ability to challenge the intensification of labour was limited by the expanding supply of immigrant labour which accompanied the expansion of wheat production.(9)

For domestic workers, the capitalist transformation of goods production after 1850 had an indirect though equally profound effect. The simple removal of goods production from the household during early industrialisation intensified the sexual division of labour by confining women more strictly to the domestic sphere. Some domestic

processes, like textile manufacturing and shoemaking, were removed to the factory but, for the most part, women continued to produce goods and services for the home. Foodstuffs, clothing, medicines, meals, laundry, and health care were produced and prepared in the home using traditional methods. During industrialisation's second phase, however, the domestic labour process began to be transformed. Between 1890 and 1930 mass production and mass distribution brought new products and services, notably gas, electricity, running water, prepared foods, ready made clothes, and factory made furniture and utensils, to many homes. Standardised, uniform goods began to replace the production and maintenance work which filled women's days in the nineteenth century. The drudgery of women's work was beginning to disappear to some extent, but so was control of the work process. Through the medium of the new technologies, the foundation was laid for the control of women by industrial capital through product design and advertising, while the increased productivity of domestic labour had an isolating effect since the labour of one person was generally sufficient to reproduce a nuclear household. Moreover, while the amount of work required to maintain the family at nineteenth century standards declined in the twentieth, the new emphasis on consumption, social anxieties around childhood and adolescence, and, beginning in the twenties, the individualisation of transportation

through the automobile were expanding responsibilities and producing a domestic form of speed-up.(10)

III

Since there were two significant processes of capitalist development in Canada during the period 1870-1930, it follows that an important consideration for Canadian historiography is, or should be, the way in which the one related to the other. Unfortunately, for the classically inspired working class historians and political economists of industrialisation, the issue does not exist.(11) Household agricultural production is only relevant in their schema in terms of primitive accumulation and the creation and maintenance of a home market; hence the expansion of wheat production is important merely in terms of the impetus it provided Canada's "second Industrial Revolution". It must be conceded, of course, that this stance was at least partially adopted in response to the extreme position advanced by the staple-cum-dependency tradition, which claimed that the Canadian social formation was dominated by commercial capital in the National Policy period. Paul Phillips, in his refreshing intervention in this debate, argues that, in fact, both industrial capital (in a wage relation with labour) and commercial capital (in an exchange relation with farmers and industrial capital) played an integral part in the country's formative years.

He suggests that an adequate understanding of the period must make sense of a range of conflicts and alliances "between industrial capital and labour, ...between commercial capital and the independent commodity producer; between independent commodity producers and labour; and between industrial and commercial capital." As important as this resolution may be for the current state of Canadian political economy, however, it remains unsatisfying as a guide to the problem at hand. While Phillips has the bourgeoisie "speaking with one voice", he continues to draw an analytical distinction between industrial and commercial capital, with commercial capital being the class fraction which relates to farm households. Moreover, the relation is viewed as being simply one of unequal exchange, whereby commercial capital (railways, grain companies and financial institutions) developed mechanisms of monopoly control in the price system in order to appropriate part or all of the economic rent and agricultural surplus from farmers.(12)

Articulationist studies of American capitalist expansion in the nineteenth century suggest that the relation between agriculture and industrialisation in North America was more complex than either a classical or dependency approach is able to reveal. According to Charles Post, household agricultural production was primarily market oriented and, therefore, dependent on commodity circulation by the 1840s. This subordination of farming to capitalist

exchange set in motion a process of increasing labour productivity and technical innovation in agriculture (the introduction of the seed drill, mechanical reaper and the steel plough, for example). Furthermore, the westward expansion of household agricultural production in tandem with industrial capitalism meant that the "vanguard" sector of American industrialisation (in contrast with the classical English pattern), both before and after the Civil War, was the "agro-industrial complex" producing farm machinery, tools and supplies, and processing agricultural raw materials. "These branches of production," Post writes, "were characterised by both technical innovation in their labour process and either constituted or stimulated transformations in key branches of Department I [the department of social production producing objects and instruments of production]."(13) And, Michel Aglietta adds, farm households were fully integrated into capitalist production by the end of the 1873-97 depression:

> This integration created a permanent tendency for labour productivity to rise in agriculture, and induced a major expansion in the output of agricultural equipment. There developed a strong tendency for farm prices to fall, settling at the minimum level required to provide sufficient money to maintain a farming family, plus the valorization of the capital lent by marketing firms and banks. The downturn in agricultural prices was in turn decisive in bringing about a fall in wages. It not only favoured accumulation in the department producing means of production; competition in agriculture also permitted the development of a powerful foodstuffs industry.(14)

By the beginning of the twentieth century, in other words, American agricultural production was effectively under the control of capital through mechanisation, the use of credit, the supply of inputs, and the development and concentration of upstream infrastructure (entrepot and processing firms). The intensification of accumulation in the twentieth century (the extraction of relative surplus value), meanwhile, affected farmers by continually revolutionising the instruments of production, maintaining and deepening their participation in the capitalist market, and, along with working class households, transforming the domestic labour process.

We would suggest, then, that in both the United States and Canada farm households were transformed in tandem with capitalist production. Beginning in the 1840s and 1850s, but greatly accelerating with western expansion and the launching of intensive capital accumulation marked by new technologies and corporate concentration, farmers became subordinated to capital-in-general through the operation of credit and price in factor, goods and money markets. Equally important, and following the experience of working class households, farm households were further subordinated to capitalist production and exchange through the revolution in personal consumption. Combined, these two processes determined the material conditions of farming in the twentieth century.

IV

Coincident with the extension of capitalist relations and the transition to industrial capitalism in nineteenth century North America, institutional and bureaucratic states emerged to gradually appropriate responsibility for various aspects of social and ideological reproduction from voluntary and familial agents. From early to mid-century formal and specialised organisations with reformist purposes were created for the treatment of crime, poverty, ignorance, disease, mental illness, and juvenile delinquency. Mental hospitals, school systems, reformatories, and penitentiaries characteristically evolved through a two stage process from private corporations controlled by wealthy citizens and staffed by generalists to publicly controlled bodies based upon expert and specialised administration. By the end of the century incipient bureaucratic state structures were in place in North America which, while small by late twentieth standards, were qualitatively different from the customary and informal methods of dealing with social and personal problems which existed prior to 1800.

The most significant element in this new apparatus was the development of state supported primary and secondary education. As the revisionist historiography of the past fifteen years has shown, by the 1880s bourgeois and middle class elements in Ontario and other industrialising areas of North America had fashioned public, and ultimately

compulsory, school systems out of the private and haphazard educational practices they inherited from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Faced with the perceived problems of crime and poverty, ethnic diversity through immigration, promoting "useful knowledge", unruly plebian/working class and idle bourgeois youth, and training a proletariat in the rhythms of factory work, education was seen as a means of encouraging and regulating the social changes associated with the development of capitalism. Not surprisingly, given the interaction between their size and purposes, these systems came to be structured and governed as large scale bureaucracies. Educationalists and their supporters, faced with complex administrative problems on the one hand and the nepotism and uncertainties of the political process on the other, drew upon the capitalist model of work organisation to rationalise, co-ordinate, and make their schools function as effectively as possible. Like the factory, these systems were hierarchical and differentiated, combining an extensive division of labour with an authoritarian command structure. At the bottom were the legions of teachers, increasingly women at the primary level as the century progressed, who used only approved instructional materials in their classroom work and were trained in the appropriate pedagogies at Normal Schools. Immediately above the teachers, at the board level, were principals and superintendents who managed the local system

and maintained contact with the elected board officials. At the state and provincial level, finally, departmental officials produced and dispensed curricular and administrative policy, while teams of inspectors ensured that central decisions were implemented and followed locally.(15)

One effect of state funding and the bureaucratisation of education was the creation of conditions for the professionalisation of teaching and, hence, the creation of a contradiction in the social identity of teachers. While bureaucracy undoubtedly involved a loss of control over the work process and a heightened exploitation of teachers as workers, it was accompanied by the establishment of specialist training, entrance requirements, and an occupational association marking teachers as professionals. As a group, therefore, they seemed to straddle the boundary between proletarian and professional existence. This development was, in fact, part of a larger change in the latter half of the nineteenth century as the term "professional" came to be applied to a larger group of vocations than the traditional trio of doctors, lawyers, and clergy. Rooted in, and based upon, the bourgeois values of achievement, ability, and equality of opportunity, professionalism was a type of status acquired through the mastery of a specific area of knowledge. It was, at its core, an individualist philosophy focusing on personal

development and enhancement through the pursuit of a career. Beginning in this period, various areas of knowledge were "professionalised" in North America when, characteristically, their leaders established educational qualifications requiring academic training, formed associations to shield the elect from the non-elect, started journals, fashioned specialist vocabularies, and, in the case of academic professions, initiated the career oriented production of endless publications. The central institution in the "culture of professionalism" was the modern university. Higher education in the later nineteenth century was in the early stages of a transition from colleges dispensing religious and ethical instruction for the elite to large institutions reproducing the whole range of social and technical knowledge for use in a bourgeois society. Indeed the university was becoming a microcosm of that society, characterised as it was by "careerism, competition, the standardization of rules and the organization of hierarchies, [and] the obsession with growth and expansion."(16)

The professionalisation of social knowledge, and its cloistering in universities, represented a demarcation of legitimate enquiry in the name of objectivity. As the histories of the American Social Science Association and the new professional organisations like the American Economics Association clearly reveal, an older tradition of general

and reformist investigation gave way to specialised disciplines engaged in purportedly neutral, scientific research and teaching that was not tied in any way to a particular political or social project. What professionalism and objectivity meant in this context was a severing of any intellectual links with social forces--notably working class and farm movements--that challenged, however mildly, the ascendancy of capital and its values. American academics such as Richard Ely and Edward Ross quickly learned that their careers depended upon accepting and championing the dominant view of the social world. By the turn of the century it was clear to all aspiring American intellectuals that an academic career in social science meant that certain questions could not be asked and certain connections could not be made. Professional social science was slower to develop in Canada, but a similar though less dramatic pattern prevailed. In organisations such as the Civic Improvement League, established in 1915, social scientists worked with other academics, traditional professionals, and businessmen in investigating social conditions. But the formation of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA) in 1913 hinted at a break with this general and reformist approach. It was not until the twenties, however, with an expansion of social science education in the country's universities and the reorganisation of the CPSA in 1929, that a professional

orientation was firmly secured. By the thirties, social scientists had established their authority as expert advisers to a liberal state. Although some intellectuals--such as those in the League for Social Reconstruction--aligned themselves with subordinate social groups, the limits of legitimate academic activism did not extend leftward beyond liberalism. When Frank Underhill tested those limits at the University of Toronto, for example, he was strongly rebuked by capital and the state.(17)

In engineering and the natural sciences the link between the university, capital, and science and technology was secured through the birth of the corporate capitalist form and the application of new technologies to the production process. The expansion of engineering education and the emergence of the professional engineer, in particular, proceeded in concert with the growth of national firms and, most importantly, the real subordination of labour in production. Engineers, as was noted earlier, filled many of the managerial posts in the corporate bureaucracies, and they were trained in the new universities.(18)

State funding and organisation of agricultural education accompanied the expansion of public schooling and the transformation of higher education. Privately organised agricultural societies flourished in early nineteenth century North America as the primary method for the

dissemination of agricultural knowledge, giving way to government directed agricultural colleges and farmers' and women's institutes in the latter part of the century. North American higher education in agriculture effectively dates from the formation of Michigan Agricultural College in 1855. But it was not until after the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, which provided federal funding through land grants for agricultural and mechanical training, that a system of American agricultural colleges began to be established. The pattern that evolved was for funds to be applied either to private colleges (Rutgers in New Jersey) or, more commonly, state universities (Wisconsin) or state agricultural colleges (Iowa, North Dakota). In Canada, Ontario Agricultural College was established in 1880 as a publicly funded and, at least initially, unaffiliated institution. Although college growth was slow in the early years, systematic investigation in the agricultural sciences was established in the late nineteenth century, especially after the creation of a system of experimental stations in both countries in 1886. In the period after 1890, and especially after the turn of the century, state funded agricultural colleges expanded and flourished across the continent, following the model of the new universities with which they were often aligned. Intellectuals working within the institutions became increasingly professional, while administrators--most often members of the Association of

American Agricultural Colleges and Experimental Stations--increasingly applied business models to college organisation.(19)

Farmers' institutes emerged in the late 1870s and early 1880s to supplement the efforts of agricultural societies in disseminating agricultural knowledge to farmers. Institutes expanded throughout North America during the 1880s and 1890s under the direction of agricultural colleges or boards/departments of agriculture. In these bodies both professional staff and working farmers conducted lecture programmes in rural communities. With the expansion of colleges after the turn of the century, and the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in the United States and the Agricultural Instruction Act in Canada during 1914, systematic, fully staffed government extension services overtook farmers' institutes and agricultural societies as the primary forms of outreach and adult education. In both countries the groundwork for state sponsored extension was laid by agro-industrial capital. The North Dakota example was representative. Railroad companies promoted agricultural improvements by providing funds for experimental stations and sponsoring "Better Farming Trains" to tour the state. Through its extension department, International Harvester established a three hundred acre experimental farm at Grand Forks which passed to state control in 1914. And, in 1910, Minneapolis and St. Paul

business interests--implement manufacturers, bankers, railway owners, processors, and lumber dealers--formed a "Better Farming Association" through which county agents were employed and boys camps were organised. This apparatus eventually passed to the state extension service, and the Better Farming Association provided a model for the state's Farm Bureau which developed later. By the 1920s, in states and provinces throughout North America, wide ranging extension services employing county agents, home demonstration agents and specialists in various topics were offering instruction and service to farm women and men.(20)

V

Working class and agrarian critiques of capital and the state in the nineteenth century were part of a tradition of popular analysis that dated from the eighteenth century. The source of this tradition--at least in its plebian and democratic form--was the English and American radicalism that emerged in the 1770s, becoming coherent in the 1790s following the revolutionary successes in America, Ireland and France. As Stedman Jones has shown, radicalism--with its focus on political oppression and corruption--remained the determining mode of popular thought in England until at least the mid-nineteenth century. The misuse of political power was the cause of economic misery in this analysis. Similarly, early nineteenth century North American popular

politics was guided by a radical ideology of anti-monopoly, equal rights, and a labour theory of value. The Working Men's parties and working class locofocoism of the Jacksonian era employed a political analysis directed against the monopoly power of the monied interests. Furthermore, agrarian critiques of the Family Compact in Upper Canada were cast in terms of the deleterious effects of political corruption on the producing classes. The succession of popular movements that crossed the historical stage in the latter half of the nineteenth century stretched the radical, anti-monopolist categories in an attempt to comprehend the reality of industrial capitalism. The National Labor Union in the 1860s, the Grange and Greenbackism in the 1870s, and the Single Tax and Nationalism in the 1880s all denounced political and economic oppression in similar terms, sharing a vision of society in which the toilers--workers and farmers--were exploited through the swindles and chicanery of the rich, particularly the "parasites'" control of the state.(21)

The impressive agrarian and working class mobilisations at the end of the nineteenth century were the last, and the most important, movements to employ radicalism in a coherent way. Eschewing a distinctively economic analysis of production relations, the Knights of Labor in the 1880s reacted to their loss of control over the pace and rhythm of work, and their increasingly subordinate place in their

communities, by invoking the radical tradition in their demand for the abolition of the wage system. And North American agrarians in the Farmers' Alliance, the People's Party and the Patrons of Industry shared with the Knights an understanding of capitalist development that made sense of their common experience of exploitation. These movements began with a notion of equal rights and opposition to special privilege that fuelled their producerism, anti-monopolism and co-operative vision. According to Knights and agrarians, monopoly power, through its manipulation of the state, operated in the fields of railroads and communications, the tariff, the land, and money and banking, and a producer directed government would bring coercive monopolies under popular control. Equally important, co-operation was the crucial corollary to state intervention in the radical project. In the agrarian vision the co-operative commonwealth could be established and sustained through producer and consumer organisations. For Knights, the extent to which they opposed strikes was in fact an expression of their rejection of a conflict-ridden system foisted upon producers by non-producers. At the heart of late nineteenth century radicalism, however, stood the three elements in the concept of producerism: labour was the source of all value; the wealth which labour created belonged to labour alone; and farmers and workers shared

common cause in their struggle against non-producers entrenched in the corporations and the state.(22)

In both the working class and agrarian movements, radicalism gave way to divergent ideological strains during the twentieth century. Between 1895 and 1919 an evolutionary and reformist wing developed in Canadian working class politics based upon the independent labour candidacies of the 1880s and rooted in craft unionism. Known to historians as labourism, and represented by such figures as A.W. Puttee of Winnipeg, it involved supporting candidates who endorsed policies that trade unionists demanded or who were simply from the ranks of the working class themselves. A programme centred in the Trades and Labor Congress, and finding partisan expression in local Labor parties, included free compulsory education, the eight hour day, a minimum wage, extension of the franchise, and public ownership of utilities among its proposals. With a commitment to the politics of the ballot box as a supplement to trade union struggle over wages and working conditions, labourism laid the ideological foundations for the working class element in the social democracy of the CCF. Meanwhile, two revolutionary perspectives developed to the left of labourism during the same period. On the one hand, workers applied an explicitly Marxist analysis to their experience in political parties such as the Socialist Party of Canada (SPC) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP),

concluding that the overthrow of capitalism through the capture of the bourgeois state was both necessary and inevitable. In syndicalist organisations such as the Industrial Workers of the World, on the other hand, political strategies focusing on the state were rejected in favour of strike action and struggle at the point of production as the key to capital's demise. After the defeat of 1919 many revolutionaries, particularly from the SPC and SDP, moved into the newly formed Communist Party.(23)

A somewhat different and comparatively conservative configuration developed in the North American farm movements. Between the demise of Populism and the organisation of the American Farm Bureau Federation in the United States, and between the decline of Patronism and the formation of the Progressive Party in Canada, a clearly pro-bourgeois perspective was forged in North American agrarianism. In both countries, as rural social science erected boundaries delineating the various regions of social life and radicalism was less able to offer a convincing challenge, the economic and political became discrete areas of endeavour defined from above. Across the continent farm organisations turned their attention to the business of marketing with, for example, the incorporation of the Equity Co-operative Exchange of St. Paul in 1911 and the launching of the Grain Growers' Grain Company of Winnipeg in 1907. Although capital perceived these challenges as a threat, and

farmers used radical language to justify them, the marketing agencies nevertheless represented an adjustment to the apparently permanent reality of the capitalist economy. Politically, the elements which came together as the American Farm Bureau in 1919, out of a network mobilised by the newly created county agent system, championed farmer co-operation with capital in the interests of making the economy work more efficiently for "all business" (farm and otherwise). In Canada the group around United Grain Growers, and in the mainstream of the Progressive Party, sought an alliance with capital's reform wing in order to secure fair treatment for the agricultural sector in a political economy increasingly dominated by industry and finance. By the 1920s this tendency effectively controlled farm politics and economics across North America, but not without having had to confront a significant challenge from the left.(24)

While this conservative ideology was being constructed in the first three decades of the century, proto-socialist and socialist agrarian movements were sustaining, deepening, and transforming the oppositional potential of radicalism. Indeed in many areas, such as the American southwest, parts of the American midwest, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, this critical perspective was firmly entrenched on the political terrain. In the southwest the Socialist Party was able to create a substantial following among poorer farmers,

sharecroppers, tenants and agricultural workers by building upon the Alliance and Populist inheritance and sharpening the producerist critique of monopoly to stress capitalist exploitation. The party also won significant support in the midwest. It had a particularly strong following in North Dakota, but here the educational foundation laid by party activists was appropriated by the Nonpartisan League which, by reverting to a more explicitly radical language, was able to form a proto-socialist movement within the shell of the Democratic Party and elect a progressive government in the state. Although the government was shortlived--defeated by a coalition of regional capital, urban middle class elements, and the state Farm Bureau--it was the most significant socialist success in the early twentieth century United States. Furthermore, by keeping the tradition alive, it ensured substantial support for the Communist Party among midwestern farmers in the 20s and 30s. Left agrarianism in Canada, meanwhile, emerged as an identifiable entity in the 1920s out of the progressive wing of the farm movement. In the Ontario and prairie movements a radical critique had been kept alive while the mainstream moved into alignment with capital. After the war this critique became increasingly socialist, gaining organisational expression in the Farmers' Union of Canada during the campaign for compulsory pools. By the late twenties and early thirties the Farmers' Union had spawned two socialist perspectives on

Canadian agriculture. On the one hand, the Communist Party, through the Farmers' Unity League, was applying a Marxist analysis that, despite creative attempts by some to adapt historical materialism to the realities of rural North America, was rigid and doctrinaire. On the other hand, the CCF was evolving a more flexible approach which eventually succumbed to the accommodationist dynamics of social democracy.(25)

VI

The independent woman's movement that emerged in the last three decades of the nineteenth century in North America created organisational and ideological space for women separate from both dominant and subordinate male institutions. A distinctive gender identity was formed in the period which, while never completely transcending the boundaries of class, cannot be understood by simply referring to the putative class location of the women involved. Urban women, asserting their right to work outside the home, created autonomous clubs and societies in which to share experiences and lay the foundation for expanding their opportunities in the public sphere. With an underlying commitment to a woman's right to engage in extra-domestic, "productive" labour, clubs such as the Toronto Women's Literary Society were theoretically open to all women although, practically speaking, they tended to be the

preserve of individuals from middle class backgrounds. In ventures such as the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in the United States, however, important efforts were made to span the class divide. Among rural women, meanwhile, an autonomous sisterhood was constructed through the temperance crusade. After its founding in 1874, the Women's Christian Temperance Union became the vehicle through which women mobilised their power in hopes of changing an immoral masculine world. The most militant supporters, who were concentrated in the countryside, viewed the ban on drink as the centrepiece of a larger reform project that extended to the suffrage, labour and agrarian movements. Indeed there was significant continuity between the woman's movement generally and the radical movements of the period. In groups ranging from Bellamyite Nationalist Clubs to the Knights of Labor and Populism, feminists combined an image of woman as productive worker and social purifier with the radical philosophy of producerism and anti-monopolism to produce a powerful critique of the male capitalist order. In various speeches and tracts from the period a social transformation was envisaged in which women constructed pan-class sisterhood, and then used their collective power to defeat corrupted monopoly and build the co-operative commonwealth of producers. In this way radicalism was fused with the feminist critique, while the liberating potential of the woman's movement was firmly

grounded in the radical analysis of politics and society.(26)

For the most part, however, the Canadian woman's movement went in an opposite direction. The image of the "new woman" was a contradictory one that had both a progressive and a conservative edge. Women were questioning their privatised sexual subordination and demanding equal status in the public sphere, but the challenge was cast in terms of motherly duties and social housekeeping. Suffrage, which became the primary focus for women activists by the early twentieth century, changed from its initial association with progressive reform in the Canadian Women's Suffrage Association to a predominantly conservative cause by the time the first successes were recorded during World War I. The movement became controlled by professionalising women (and men) at a time when, as was noted earlier, the limits of legitimate professional activity were becoming circumscribed. Professional women, drawing upon both elements in the new womanhood, constructed a place for themselves as experts in those areas, such as teaching, nursing, and social work, for which they were believed to be best suited. The suffrage movement, under their tutelage, became constrained within a limited reform agenda defined by, and connected to, their professional work. Their reform initiatives and suffrage aspirations were legitimised, in turn, with reference to women's maternal responsibilities in

the public sphere. Whereas some women linked the purifying and moral crusade of feminism to the radical language of popular movements, then, others used it as a vehicle to enter and bolster the ideology of professionalism.(27)

Canadian working class organisations remained largely aloof from the suffrage movement during the early twentieth century. Labourite women and men supported enfranchisement, but as part of their larger, electorally focused reform project. From this perspective, female suffrage was a means of substantially increasing the prospects of electing working class representatives, and thereby enhancing the possibility of having the labour programme implemented. And in labourite groups such as the Women's Labour League, which advocated union organisation among working women, suffrage was promoted as a means of achieving equal pay for equal work and as a useful organising tool in raising political consciousness. Generally speaking, then, labour women viewed their experience in class rather than gender terms, and were sceptical of suffragist aspirations to speak for all women. They preferred to work in their own class organisations in pursuit of primarily class objectives that did not challenge prevailing gender identities other than to affirm a woman's rights to fair wages and working conditions if, and when, she found herself in paid employment.

Similarly, gender was less important than class to socialist women for whom the struggle against capitalism was

the fundamental issue. In the Socialist Party of Canada, with its aversion to any and all "reformist" tendencies which drew working class attention away from the class struggle, the necessity and desirability of even minimal organisational or ideological autonomy for women was denied. The more flexible Social Democratic Party allowed space for the formation of women's groups and the discussion of reforms of particular interest to women, but a gender analysis never emerged to complement class analysis. In fact throughout the socialist movement, and in common with working class politics as a whole, the "woman question" was cast in terms which assumed the primacy of domestic roles and female subordination within the family. Women might fight for socialism alongside men, and a socialist future might promise women an end to wage exploitation, but it also contained a domestic vision--which most socialist women embraced--of an idealised working class family saved from capitalist erosion.(28)

In Canadian agrarian organisations, too, the suffrage movement was perceived as a distant force which did not address the class realities of farm women. Like the labourites, the prairie grain grower associations were early supporters of women's enfranchisement. There was, however, little formal contact between the farm movement and suffrage societies. The Saskatchewan Women's Grain Growers' Association (formed in 1913) played an early leadership

role in the movement for suffrage in the province, but the momentum soon shifted to middle class professionals in the cities and towns who gained control of the Saskatchewan Provincial Equal Franchise Board. In fact, two provincial farm women's sections were not formed until after the real battles for the vote had been fought. The United Farm Women of Ontario and the Manitoba Women's Grain Growers' Association came into existence in a political atmosphere in which women were able to fully participate in elections, and these groups felt that a significant part of their work consisted of educating women to use the ballot effectively. For all farm movement women in the early twentieth century effective use of the ballot meant, first and foremost, supporting the agrarian reform agenda. Echoing the sentiments of labour and socialist women, class was more important to them than gender. They did feel that women had special concerns and sensibilities, but they believed more strongly that they and their men were engaged in a common struggle which overrode any apparent inter-class bonds of sisterhood. While the organisation of women's groups in farm organisations cannot be understood without reference to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century autonomous woman's movement, then, female agrarianism owes more to the history of popular insurgency than it does to feminism.(29)

This broader historical context suggests that capitalist expansion, the development of a bureaucratic state, and the experience of social movements in Manitoba should be understood as part of one piece. It is especially important, it seems, to analyse the political economy of agriculture and rural social movements as integrally linked to industrialisation and urban organisations. Capitalist production came to dominate farm households in this period even as household production expanded; furthermore, the state structures which accompanied capitalist development were adapted for the subordination of farm households and farm people. Our detailed investigation of aspects of this process begins in the next chapter with an institutional survey of the educational state structure in Manitoba agriculture between 1890 and 1925.

---

1. This analysis of the global context of the wheat economy is drawn from H. Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production in the Era of the World Market, 1873-1935: A Global Analysis of Production and Exchange," PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.
2. While the Chicago price recovered somewhat in 1929, the British import price fell continuously from 1925 to 1934. Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production," p. 85.
3. Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production," chapter V; V.C. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy (Toronto, 1957), chapters 3, 4 and 5; G.A. Friesen, The Canadian Prairies: A History (Toronto, 1984), chapter 8.
4. Nineteenth century prices are basis Montreal; all others are Number 1 Northern, cash basis Lakehead. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy; W.T. Easterbrook and H.G.J. Aitken, Canadian Economic History (Toronto, 1956), chapter 20; J. Mavor, "Agricultural Development in the North-West of Canada, 1905-1909," Report of the

79th Meeting of the Royal Academy for the Advancement of Science (London, 1910), p. 223; G. Britnell, The Wheat Economy (Toronto, 1939), p. 50; Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1886 (Ottawa, 1887), p. 164; Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1896 (Ottawa, 1897), p. 189; Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1901 (Ottawa, 1902), p. 89.

5. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy, parts 2 and 3; D.A. MacGibbon, The Canadian Grain Trade (Toronto, 1932), part II.
6. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy, chapter 5; R.T. Naylor, History of Canadian Business, Volume II, (Toronto, 1975), chapter 14; R.W. Murchie, Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier (Toronto, 1936), chapter 6.
7. W.T. Easterbrook, Farm Credit in Canada (Toronto, 1938), part I; Naylor, History of Canadian Business, Volume I, pp. 104-107, 199-209; W.A. Mackintosh, Economic Problems of the Prairie Provinces (Toronto, 1935), chapter 12; Murchie, Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier, pp. 76-83; T.D. Regehr, "Bankers and Farmers in Western Canada, 1900-1939," in J.E. Foster, ed., The Developing West: Essays in Honor of Lewis H. Thomas (Edmonton, 1983).
8. H.C. Pentland, Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1850 (Toronto, 1981), chapter V; G. Kealey, Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892 (Toronto, 1980), parts I and II; B. Palmer, Working Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980 (Toronto, 1983), chapters 1, 2 and 3; G. Kealey and B. Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900 (Cambridge, 1982), chapter 1. These and the following paragraphs on industrial capitalism comprise a synthesis of the consensus within working class historiography on Canadian capitalist development. Although I have drawn on a number of sources, I have generally followed the outlines in G. Kealey, "The Structure of Canadian Working Class History," in W.J.C. Cherwinski and G. Kealey, eds., Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working Class History (St. John's, 1985) and C. Heron and R. Storey, "On the Job in Canada," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada (Montreal, 1986). The guiding text for both of these articles is apparently D. Gordon, R. Edwards and M. Reich, Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The historical transformation of labor in the United States (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), an historical survey of American capital accumulation that is theoretically similar to M. Aglietta's A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience (London, 1979), but,

significantly, it does not include Aglietta's articulationist premises (see Gordon, et. al. pp. 224-225n and p. 226n).

9. Naylor, The History of Canadian Business, Volume II; A. Chandler, The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business (Cambridge, Mass., 1977); W. Lazonick, "Class Relations and the Capitalist Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of Marxian Economic Theory," unpublished paper, Harvard University (March, 1983), pp. 30-47; G. Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History (New York, 1976), chapter 1; C. Heron and R. Storey, "Work and Struggle in the Canadian Steel Industry, 1900-1950," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job.
10. S. Strasser, Never Done: A History of American Housework (New York, 1982), prologue and passim.; R. Schwartz Cowan, More Work For Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave (New York, 1983), chapter 4; V. Strong Boag, "Keeping House in God's Country: Canadian Women at Work in the Home," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job.
11. Note, for example, the absence of any serious mention of farming in the essay collections Canada's Age of Industry, 1849-1896 and The Consolidation of Capitalism, 1896-1929, which form part of the series Readings in Canadian Social History edited by Gregory Kealey and Michael Cross.
12. P. Phillips, "Staples, Surplus and Exchange: The Commercial-Industrial Question in the National Policy Period," in D. Cameron, ed., Explorations in Canadian Economic History: Essays in Honour of Irene M. Spry (Ottawa, 1985), pp. 32-33, 39, 40; see also P. Phillips, "Manitoba in the Agrarian Period, 1870-1940," unpublished paper, University of Manitoba, and P. Phillips, "The Hinterland Perspective: The Political Economy of Vernon Fowke," Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory 2(2) (Spring, 1978).
13. C. Post, "The American Road to Capitalism," New Left Review 133 (1982), p. 48.
14. M. Aglietta, A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience (London, 1979), pp. 78-79.
15. S. Houston, "The Impetus to Reform: Urban Crime, Poverty, and Ignorance in Ontario, 1850-1875," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1974; A. Prentice, The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada (Toronto, 1977); M.B. Katz, M. Doucet and M. Stern, The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), chapter 9; B. Curtis, "Preconditions of the Canadian State: Educational Reform and the Construction of a Public in Upper Canada, 1837-1846," Studies in Political Economy 10 (Spring, 1983); B.

Curtis, "Schoolbooks and the Myth of Curricular Republicanism: The State and Curriculum in Canada West, 1820-1850," Histoire Sociale/Social History 16(31) (November, 1983); B. Curtis, "'Littery Merrit', 'Useful Knowledge', and the Organization of Township Libraries in Canada West, 1840-1860," Ontario History 78(4) (December, 1986); M. Danylewycz, B. Light, and A. Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching: A Nineteenth Century Ontario and Quebec Case Study," Histoire Sociale/Social History 16(30) (May, 1983); R. Gidney and D.A. Lawr, "Community vs. Bureaucracy?: The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," Journal of Social History 13(3) (1980).

16. B. Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America (New York, 1976), p. 288; M. Danylewycz and A. Prentice, "Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Central Canada," Labour/Le Travail 17 (Spring, 1986); D. Owram, The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1986), chapters 3 and 5; J. Pitsula, "The Emergence of Social Work in Toronto," Journal of Canadian Studies 14(1) (Spring, 1979); V. Strong-Boag, "Intruders in the Nursery: Childcare Professionals Reshape the Years One to Five," in J. Parr, ed., Childhood and Family in Canadian History (Toronto, 1982); L. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1965); P. Axelrod, Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics, and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980 (Toronto, 1982), chapter 1; S.E.D. Shortt, The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian intellectuals and their convictions in an age of transition, 1890-1930 (Toronto, 1976), chapter 8; A.B. McKillop, "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto," in McKillop, Contours of Canadian Thought (Toronto, 1987).
17. M. Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington, 1975); T. Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana, 1977); Owram, The Government Generation, pp. 52-68, 121-125; R.D. Francis, Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur (Toronto, 1986), chapters 9 and 10; C. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History (Toronto, 1976), pp. 79-84.
18. D. Noble, America By Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism (New York, 1977).
19. E.D. Eddy, Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education (New York, 1957); A.C.

True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925 (Washington, 1929); W.C. Hunter, Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College (Fargo, 1961); Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," chapter III; J.F. Snell, Macdonald College of McGill University: A History from 1904 to 1955 (Montreal, 1963); A.S. Morton, Saskatchewan: The Making of a University (Toronto, 1959), chapter IX; M. Hayden, Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982 (Vancouver, 1983); W.H. Johns, A History of the University of Alberta, 1908-1969 (Edmonton, 1981); D. Jones, "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929," PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978, pp. 45-46; M. Rossiter, "The Organization of the Agricultural Sciences," in A. Oleson and J. Voss, eds., The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920 (Baltimore, 1979). Six new Canadian colleges, including the privately funded Macdonald College at McGill University, were formed between 1905 and 1915.

20. R. Scott, Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914 (Urbana, 1970), especially chapter VI; D.A. Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education, 1870-1910," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972, pp. 32-45, 50-60.

21. G. Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," in Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982 (Cambridge, 1983); P. Hollis, The Pauper Press: A Study in Working Class Radicalism of the 1830s (Oxford, 1970); E. Pessen, Most Uncommon Jacksonians: The Radical Leaders of the Early Labor Movement (Albany, 1967), chapter 10; A. Dawley, Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn (Cambridge, Mass., 1976), especially chapters 2 and 8; S. Ryerson, Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873 (Toronto, 1975), pp. 85-133; D. Montgomery, Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1867-1872 (New York, 1967); G. Grob, Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement, 1865-1900 (Chicago, 1961), chapter II; C. Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins," in American Radicalism, 1865-1901 (Chicago, 1946); R. Hann, Farmers Confront Industrialism: Some Historical Perspectives on Ontario Agrarian Movements (Toronto, 1975); L.A. Wood, A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924 (Toronto, 1924; reprinted 1975), part I.

22. On the Knights of Labor, see Grob, Workers and Utopia, chapter III; M. Dubofsky, Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920 (New York, 1975), pp. 54-61; Kealey and Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be; L. Fink,

Workingmen's Democracy: The Knights of Labor and American Politics (Chicago, 1983), chapter 1; R. Hann, "Brainworkers and the Knights of Labor: E.E. Sheppard, Phillips Thompson, and the Toronto News, 1883-1887," in G. Kealey and P. Warrian, eds., Essays in Canadian Working Class History (Toronto, 1976). The Knights, while they may have represented the North American working class fully "made" as culturalist historiography suggests, employed a language which predated proletarianisation and, more importantly, extended beyond the world of the waged worker.
On agrarianism, see B. Palmer, Man Over Money: The Southern Populist Critique of American Capitalism (Chapel Hill, 1980); L. Goodwyn, Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America (New York, 1976); C. Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901"; N. Pollack, ed., The Populist Mind (New York, 1967); Pollack, The Populist Response to Industrial America (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); R. Cook, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s," CHA Reports (1984); S.E.D. Shortt, "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: the Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896," in D. Swainson, ed., Oliver Mowat's Ontario (Toronto, 1972).

23. Palmer, Working Class Experience, chapter 4; C. Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," Labour/Le Travail 13 (Spring, 1984); G. Friesen, "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement," Labour/Le Travailleur 1 (1976); A.R. McCormack, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919 (Toronto, 1977); N. Penner, The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis (Toronto, 1977), chapter 3.

24. T. Saloutos and J. Hicks, Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939 (Madison, 1951); G. Fite, American Farmers: The New Minority (Bloomington, 1981); W.L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada (Toronto, 1950); H.S. Patton, Grain Growers' Co-operation in Western Canada (Cambridge, Mass., 1928); I. Macpherson, Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1979), pp. 9-16, 77-80; J. Thompson with A. Seager, Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord (Toronto, 1985), pp. 28-37; D. Laycock, "Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies, 1910-1945," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1985, chapter II; G. Panting, "A Study of the United Farmers' of Manitoba to 1928: An Agricultural Association During a Period of Transition," MA thesis, University of Manitoba, 1954.

25. J. Green, Grassroots Socialism: Radical Movements in the Southwest, 1895-1943 (Baton Rouge, 1978); G. Burbank, When Farmers Voted Red (Greenwood, 1976); R. Morlan,

Political Prairie Fire (Minneapolis, 1955); J.K. Putman, "The Socialist Party of North Dakota, 1902-1918," M.A. Thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956; L.K. Dyson, Red Harvest: The Communist Party and American Farmers (Lincoln, 1982); D.S. Spafford, "The Left-Wing, 1921-1931," in N. Ward and D.S. Spafford, eds., Politics in Saskatchewan (Toronto, 1968); Spafford, "The Origin of the Farmers' Union of Canada," in D. Swainson, ed., Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces (Toronto, 1970); D. Monod, "Rethinking Prairie Communism," Histoire Sociale/Social History 18(35) (May, 1985); Macpherson, Each for All, pp. 68-77; Thompson and Seager, Canada 1922-1939, pp. 229-235; S.M. Lipset, Agrarian Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan: A Study in Political Sociology (Berkeley, 1950; reprint 1971); Laycock, "Populism and Democratic Thought," chapters III and IV. This analysis runs counter to the tradition which sees Western Canadian agrarianism as a populist "expression" of petit bourgeois experience. See, for example, P. Sinclair, "Class Structure and Populist Protest: The Case of Western Canada," Canadian Journal of Sociology 1 (1975-76); J. Conway, "Populism in the United States, Russia, and Canada: Explaining the Roots of Canada's Third Parties," Canadian Journal of Political Science 11(1) (1978); Conway, "The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy: Some Reconsiderations," Journal of Canadian Studies 14 (Fall, 1979); and J. Richards and L. Pratt, Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West (Toronto, 1979), pp. 20-38. Laycock, meanwhile, seeks to avoid the problem of class reductionism by abandoning materialism to embrace discourse theory. He isolates four systems of populist thought which seem to operate at their own distinct level, unencumbered by interactions with other discursive systems or material determinations.

26. M.J. Buhle, Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920 (Urbana, 1981), pp. 53-90; W. Mitchison, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study of Nineteenth Century Feminism," in L. Kealey, ed., A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s (Toronto, 1979), pp. 151-167; N. Sheehan, "The WCTU and Educational Strategies on the Canadian Prairies," in Sheehan, J.D. Wilson and D. Jones, eds., Schools in the West: Essays in Canadian Educational History (Calgary, 1986); G. Decarie, "Something Old, Something New...: Aspects of Prohibitionism in Ontario in the 1890s," in D. Swainson, ed., Oliver Mowat's Ontario (Toronto, 1972), pp. 167-171; Kealey and Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be, pp. 105-107, 356.

27. C. Bacchi, Liberation Deferred?: The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918 (Toronto, 1983);

W. Roberts, "`Rocking the Cradle for the World': The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto 1877-1914," in Kealey, ed., A Not Unreasonable Claim; R. Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism," in C.Berger and R.Cook, eds., The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton (Toronto, 1976); D. Gorham, "Flora McDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist," in Kealey, ed., A Not Unreasonable Claim.

28. Bacchi, Liberation Deferred?, pp. 118-123; L. Kealey, "Canadian Socialism and the Woman Question, 1900-1914," Labour/Le Travail 13 (Spring, 1984); A. Klein and W. Roberts, "Besieged Innocence: The `Problem' and Problems of Working Women--Toronto, 1896-1914," in J. Acton, P. Goldsmith and B. Shepard, eds., Women at Work, 1850-1930 (Toronto, 1974).

29. Bacchi, Liberation Deferred?, pp. 123-132; M. Kechnie, "The United Farm Women of Ontario: Developing a Political Consciousness," Ontario History 78(4) (December, 1985); J. Menzies, "Votes for Saskatchewan Women," in N. Ward, ed., Politics in Saskatchewan; S. Mahood, "The Women's Suffrage Movement in Canada and Saskatchewan," in J. Acton et. al., eds., Women Unite! An Anthology of the Canadian Women's Movement (Toronto, 1972); V. Strong-Boag, "Pulling in Double Harness or Hauling a Double Load: Women, Work and Feminism on the Canadian Prairie," Journal of Canadian Studies 21(3) (Fall, 1986). For the relationship between suffrage and the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota see G. Beito, "`I am a Farmer's Wife, not a Farmerette': Letters to the Nonpartisan Leader, 1917-1920," Plainswoman: An Anthology of Rural Women, March, 1981-April, 1983 (Grand Forks, 1983); for Populism and suffrage see J.S. Blocker, "The Politics of Reform: Populists, Prohibition, and Woman Suffrage, 1891-1892," Historian 34(4) (1972).

CHAPTER THREE: AN INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF DOMINANT AGRARIAN IDEOLOGY, 1890-1925

The educational state structure that developed in Manitoba agriculture before 1925 was part of the broader North American process. This chapter surveys that development. It consists of a general overview of the infrastructure of agricultural education in Manitoba, an institutional history of the Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) administration and faculty, a more specific account of the emergence of the three relevant disciplines in the college, a brief history of rural adult education, and a survey of departmental and college programmes designed for rural children and youth.

I

At Confederation the control and direction of agriculture was divided between the dominion and provincial governments. Before 1867 all aspects of agriculture had fallen under the jurisdiction of the various British North American provinces. Each of the provinces had developed central boards to supervise agricultural societies and administer annual grants-in-aid. The Canadas, however, had also formed a bureau of agriculture in 1852 which, in 1862, became a separate department of agriculture. Although the statutory purpose of the department was to create a closer connection between agricultural activities and the

legislature, its main function became the promotion of immigration and colonisation. In this the department proved to be a model for the post-Confederation Dominion Department of Agriculture.

In the division of powers at 1867 the Dominion Department of Agriculture, as part of a central state apparatus designed to promote commercial activity, was given responsibility for agriculture and immigration. Purely local affairs were left to the provincial governments. In practice this meant that the Dominion was engaged in the promotion of "agricultural commerce and finance, ...[and] opportunities for the profitable servicing of a rapidly expanding agricultural frontier."(1) Although the British North America Act gave the provinces the power to promote immigration and settlement within their own jurisdictions, in effect their activity was increasingly confined to the supervision of boards and societies and the promotion of agricultural improvement through various forms of agricultural education.

The artificiality of the distinction between commercial and local activity, as expressed in the division of powers, was reflected in various federal government interventions in the area of agricultural improvement and education. The first of these was the experimental farm system, launched in the context of the North-West's failure to attract immigrants and stimulate national economic activity. A

House of Commons select committee was appointed in 1884 to enquire into the encouragement and development of agriculture in Canada. Convinced that wasteful farming methods were hindrances to agricultural progress, the committee recommended the establishment of a Bureau of Information and a system of experimental farms. Although various forms of experimental, model, demonstration, and school farms had been proposed by committees throughout the nineteenth century without result, the government was prepared to establish some type of system in the 1880s in order to stimulate western development. In 1886 An Act Respecting Experimental Farm Stations was presented to Parliament to facilitate the establishment of a central experimental farm in Ottawa and four branch farms (including one in Brandon) that would conduct agricultural experiments and make the results of experimentation available through publications. With this significant gesture, then, the Dominion government first intervened in the area of agricultural research and education.(2)

Over the next twenty-five years the Dominion's educational activities were confined to experimental farm work, conducting dairy schools, and establishing model creameries. In the second decade of the twentieth century, however, the central government made a major financial contribution to agricultural education. The immediate political impetus to action was the conjuncture of two

social forces. The farm movement, although defeated on the issue of reciprocity, was sufficiently powerful in 1911 to extract two campaign promises from Prime Minister R.L. Borden which he subsequently fulfilled: action on grain marketing (Canada Grain Act, 1912) and assistance to the provinces for agricultural education. More importantly, though, capital's increasing demand for state intervention in technical education, coupled with demands from various social groups for rural improvement through education had, in 1910, resulted in the appointment of the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education. As a result of its recommendations, Borden's government introduced the Agricultural Aid Act (1912) and the Agricultural Instruction Act (1913). The former act provided $500,000 and the latter one $10 million over ten years for the provinces to use in the improvement of rural economic, social and educational conditions. These funds, of which Manitoba received approximately $850,000, formed the financial basis for the rapid expansion of rural education between 1913 and 1923.(3)

Prior to Manitoba's entry into Confederation in 1870 there were scattered attempts to promote agricultural knowledge at Red River. Hay Field Farm was established near Fort Douglas in 1817 as a site for agricultural experiments, while the Hudson's Bay Company initiated experimental farms at the settlement in 1830 and again in 1838. Agricultural fairs were held in the settlement as early as 1832. It was

not until Manitoba was granted provincial status within Canada, however, that a more systematic promotion of agricultural improvement and knowledge was undertaken. Following the example of Ontario, the government passed legislation in 1872 establishing a Provincial Agricultural and Industrial Society and enabling the formation of local agricultural societies. Societies were charged with the responsibilty of encouraging agriculture through the importation of improved seed and livestock, awarding prizes for crop and livestock improvement, and generally pursuing excellence in agricultural work. The structure of agricultural societies remained essentially unchanged between 1872 and 1900, while their practical function during the period was almost exclusively the sponsorship of agricultural fairs.(4)

Farmers' institutes, which proved to be more important than agricultural societies in the development of agricultural education, were introduced to Manitoba in 1890. Under the terms of the Farmers' Institute Act of that year, twenty-five persons could petition the Minister of Agriculture requesting the formation of a farmers' institute, which entitled the institute to a provincial grant of fifty cents per member, access to municipal grants, and the use of provincially funded speakers. Local institutes undertook to hold meetings and hear and discuss lectures on agricultural topics. Farmers' institutes

existed as separate entities until 1900 when they were integrated with agricultural societies. After 1900 institutes operated solely under the auspices of local agricultural societies, although provision was made for the formation of institutes in areas where agricultural societies were not organised.(5)

In the early years of the new century the domain of agricultural knowledge in Manitoba was transformed by the establishment of Manitoba Agricultural College. In 1904 the Manitoba Agricultural College Act was passed creating the college and allocating one-hundred thousand dollars for construction. From 1904 until 1924 the agricultural college functioned essentially as an institution separate from the university. Between 1905 and 1912 MAC was affiliated with the university to the extent that degrees were granted by the university and the University Council appointed members to the MAC Board of Directors. In 1912, however, MAC completely severed its ties with the university. The college operated as a separate degree granting institution until 1916 when it re-affiliated with the university under essentially the same terms as the pre-1912 arrangement. From 1916 to 1924 MAC continued what was basically a nominal connection with the university: it was a creature of the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of Education, with its own president and its own advisory board. In 1924, however, as a result of economic conditions

and the recommendations of the Murray Commission, MAC ceased to exist as a separate entity. It was incorporated into the University of Manitoba in that year as the Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics, although it did retain its own advisory council.(6)

Building upon the agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, MAC and the Agricultural Instruction Act became the institutional and financial infrastructure for the construction of a rural extension service in the second decade of the century. Between 1910 and 1913 the MAC administration and staff established the parameters of future work by initiating activities for women, men, and youth. In 1910 the organisation of Home Economics Societies was begun under the authority of the Home Economics Societies Act. A year later the college and the railways instituted Better Farming Trains to take scientific agriculture to the countryside. And, in 1913, the college and the Department of Education introduced Boys' and Girls' Clubs to Manitoba and to Canada. In the decade after 1913, as a direct result of the Dominion grants, the extension service grew from a part-time activity of the MAC faculty to a branch of the Department of Agriculture with a director, assistant director and staff.(7)

II

MAC was the central institution in this educational state structure. The main constituent disciplines of theoretical ideology were situated there, with agricultural economics, home economics, and rural sociology all emerging as distinct areas of enquiry and study in the college's first decade. The components of practical ideology were organised at MAC as well, and the extension service was either managed through the college or was closely connected with it. Finally, it was the professional school in which not only agricultural and home economics intellectuals were trained, but also the farm women and men who would serve as role models and social leaders in individual rural communities.

Throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Ontario settlers in Manitoba who sought agricultural guidance and advice had been content to rely upon the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph. Increasingly in the 1890s, however, as it became apparent that Ontario agriculture was not the same as Manitoba agriculture, local agitation developed for a similar institution there. Hence, in 1901, the Roblin government appointed a commission to enquire into the question of agricultural education in the province. The seven man commission was empowered to investigate the advisability of forming an agricultural college, its probable cost, and the best methods of

operating such an institution. The commissioners studied agricultural education in Britain, Europe, and other parts of North America, with excursions to Guelph, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan. This process yielded a series of recommendations affecting every level of the educational system. With respect to post-secondary education, the commission recommended the establishment of an agricultural college to offer instruction in agriculture and domestic science. Indeed, the commissioners felt that it was important that domestic science and agricultural instruction be linked. Men would be trained in the practical subjects of agriculture, including the production and distribution of wealth, while women would receive training in the various aspects of domestic science, enabling them to take their rightful place as helpmates for farm men.(8)

Upon submission of the report the Roblin government passed legislation and voted funds for the construction of MAC. On 28 May, 1904 the Board of Directors met for the first time. That meeting and the five others held that year were largely concerned with problems of construction. It was not until the following year that the board turned its attention to questions of staffing and curriculum. In the spring of 1905 the first appointments were made with W.J. Black as principal and professor of animal husbandry and W.J. Carson as professor of dairying. During 1906 five more

appointments were made.(9) Although a couple of short courses in dairying were held during 1905-06, MAC formally opened on 6 November 1906 with an enrolment of eighty-two in the two year diploma course. By the following academic year, 1907-08, MAC was firmly established as a teaching institution with a total attendance of 220 and a teaching staff consisting of the principal, six professors, four lecturers, demonstrators in cheese and buttermaking, an instructor in mechanics, a matron, a farm foreman, a stenographer, a bursar, an assistant engineer, a carpenter, a gardener, and a number of labourers.(10)

Throughout MAC's life the Board of Directors operated as an advisory body to the Minister of Agriculture. Although no independent authority was vested in the board, it did have a significant role to play in college governance. Following the initial activity of construction and establishing a faculty, the board settled into the regular matters of maintaining the physical plant, maintaining and policing the staff, adopting and approving programmes and courses, and conducting relations with other agricultural and educational organisations in the province. In the mundane matters of routine college administration, which accounted for the bulk of their work, the board's advice was accepted and they effectively ran the college. On other issues, however, such as staffing and the site change, the board felt ignored from time to time. In 1910,

for example, the board requested a meeting with the minister in order to clarify its duties, passing a motion expressing "disappointment and regret that they were in no way consulted by the government as to the change of site of the agricultural college and that no intimation even of the purchase of a new site had been made to them."(11) Similarly, a lengthy discussion took place in a 1919 board meeting regarding the powers of the board to make appointments and fix salaries. According to the minutes of the meeting, "much dissatisfaction was expressed by individual members of the board with the action of the Department of Agriculture in repeatedly vetoing the board's appointments and ignoring its recommendations."(12) Boards under various governments, then, felt a certain amount of frustration in dealing with the Minister of Agriculture.

The board was constituted as a mixture of government appointees and representatives from other bodies. The first board contained four government appointees (including Premier Roblin as an ex-officio member), two representatives from the university Board of Governors, and four "practical farmers" elected by the agricultural societies.(13) In 1912, when the college gained its autonomy, the MAC board suggested that the two representatives previously appointed by the university now be appointed by the agricultural societies. The government rejected this advice, however, and the 1913-14 board contained six government appointees

(including J.A.M. Aikins who had previously been appointed by the university board) and four agricultural society representatives.(14) With the election of the reformist Liberal government in 1915 the board went through another change. The 1915 board retained its six government appointees (although the faces were different), but the farmer members were changed from representatives of the agricultural societies to representatives of the grain growers and livestock associations. Moreover, for the first time the board of ten people contained two female members.(15) This structure remained virtually intact until 1924 when the Board of Directors was transformed into a Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics Advisory Council. By this time the board-cum-council included five government members (of whom one was the only woman member) and one representative each from the livestock association, the agricultural societies, the MAC alumni association, and the United Farmers. In the transition from board to council, however, the body's power was seriously curtailed, although its mere existence in the university was something of a concession. The council's advice was given to the university's Board of Governors rather than the Minister of Agriculture (who ceased to have responsibility for agricultural education in any event), and it appears its effective authority was limited to the field of rural extension.(16)

The daily administration of the college was conducted by the president, and the informal line of authority and communication was between the president and the Minister of Agriculture. MAC had five presidents during its existence: W.J. Black, 1905-1915; J.B. Reynolds, 1915-1920; John Bracken, 1920-1922; C.H. Lee (acting president), 1922-1924; and W.H. McKillican who, in 1924, was the last president of MAC and the first Dean of Agriculture and Home Economics.

W.J. Black was a graduate of OAC who came to the presidency from The Farmers' Advocate. An ambitious man, he was no doubt responsible for MAC's transformation into an independent institution in 1913. His initial appointment was due to his Conservative party connections, and this inevitably led to his dismissal by the Liberals in 1915.(17) J.B. Reynold's appointment as Black's replacement represented something of a transition in the way the MAC presidency was perceived and the way MAC presidents were appointed. Reynolds and his three successors were all career agricultural scientists or agricultural academics. Reynolds was on the faculty of OAC prior to coming to MAC, and returned to the presidency there in 1920; Bracken was employed as a Dominion government crop scientist and the Saskatchewan government director of Farmers' Institutes before his MAC appointment; C.H. Lee had been on the MAC faculty as professor of botany and bacteriology since 1909; and W.C. McKillican came from the superintendency of the

Brandon Experimental Farm. Although Black employed the language of scientific agriculture, and was connected with the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Farmers' Institutes, he represented an older voluntarist approach to agricultural knowledge: not only was he politically partisan, but he was formed as an educator more by practical farming and agricultural journalism than by academic training. Reynolds and his successors, meanwhile, were committed agricultural scientists who trained, worked, and made their careers in the new educational institutions.(18)

The various boards and presidents were faced with the recurring problem of MAC's relationship with the University of Manitoba. In the history of North American agricultural colleges there was a strong tradition of independence from other post-secondary institutions. Colleges such as OAC, Iowa Agricultural College, and North Dakota Agricultural College had become strong schools without affiliating with a university. Interested commentators and people associated with MAC looked to these examples when arguing for an independent agricultural college. Two interrelated arguments were proffered. First, it was felt that the university represented an urban influence which would be unhealthy for young farm women and men. Second, there was a desire to establish a specialised and technical curriculum, and it was felt this would be jeopardised by association

with the university's more classical curriculum.(19) MAC, of course, achieved complete autonomy in 1912 and maintained that status for four years. Reaffiliation in 1916, however, marked the beginning of MAC's journey to faculty status in the University of Manitoba. As noted above, independence in 1912-16 had as much to do with Black's careerism and his politics as it had to do with the ideology of autonomy. Hence, with a new government and a new college president, the question of affiliation was raised again. Reynolds made the case for affiliation in his first report, arguing that MAC graduates wanted the increased prestige of a university degree and that affiliation would assist the university by bringing it into association with technical instruction in agriculture. He had one reservation, however. It was important to him that the Board of Directors not lose any control over the course of studies or the conditions of admission to the college. The final arrangement allowed the board to retain its control, while giving MAC representation on the University Council.(20) Economic imperatives caused the eventual amalgamation in 1924. In these new circumstances the advisory council was indeed purely advisory, with the university's Board of Governors being the final authority. The council's function was essentially one of keeping the urban based university board sensitive to the needs of farm people.(21)

Between 1905 and 1924 the MAC teaching staff grew from three men (including the principal) to about forty women and men. During that twenty year period approximately 138 people taught in the college for various lengths of time. Although there was something of an expansion in hiring in the middle years, with as many as 14 being hired in 1915, the annual rate of hiring was fairly constant throughout the period, averaging about 7. To the extent that the period from, say, 1913 to 1918 or 1919 represented something of a buoyant labour market for agricultural and home economic academics, there are three probable causes for the phenomenon. First, the impact of the war on MAC was such that positions (often temporary ones) became vacant as male faculty joined the military. Second, monies available through the federal Agricultural Instruction Act allowed the college to hire additional faculty to serve as extension lecturers. Third, the sustained growth of the home economics division really dates from 1913, although the programme commenced in 1910 when three academic staff were hired. Of the 138 faculty who were employed at the college, something is known about the background of 85 of them. Using information culled from new staff announcements published in Managra (the MAC student publication), the geographic origin, educational background, previous employment, and initial academic rank at MAC of these people can be determined in varying degrees.(22)

The information on geographic origin suggests that, especially in the early years (1905-1910), MAC relied heavily on Ontario and the United States for its academic staff and, after 1910, Manitoba supplied a surprisingly high proportion of the male teaching staff.(23) The home economics division (all female) relied most heavily on Ontario and the United States, with two-thirds of the faculty coming from those areas (5 of 14 from the former and 4 of 14 from the latter). Only 2 (of 14) Manitoba women were hired in the whole period. The remaining three women came from Ireland, Nova Scotia, and Saskatchewan. In the case of the agriculture division, nearly 40% of the forty-five men came from Ontario, while 16% were from the United States. What is more remarkable about agriculture, though, is that one-third of the total staff were Manitobans or, to put it in more dramatic terms, 50% of the thirty men hired between 1911 (when the first two Manitobans were hired) and 1923 were either born or raised in Manitoba. The remaining faculty came from Scotland (3), England (2), and Quebec (1).(24)

The educational background of the MAC faculty is significant for three reasons: it confirms the pattern suggested by geographic origin; it shows that the majority of those hired were themselves agricultural college graduates; and it reveals that only a small percentage of the staff had graduate training.(25) On the first point,

27% of those hired were MAC graduates, 22% were trained in American institutions, and 46% were graduates of Ontario colleges and universities. Of the Ontario graduates, almost two-third had been students at Guelph (OAC and Macdonald Institute), one-third of the American graduates (one-half of the male American graduates) were from the Iowa State College of Agriculture at Ames, and all but one of the Manitoba graduates were MAC alumni. On the second point, three-quarters of the faculty were themselves graduates of home economics or agricultural colleges. This is hardly surprising since, especially in the case of agriculture, the required training was almost solely available in the specialist, technical colleges. As well, MAC faculty and administration tended to idealise OAC and Iowa State, attempting to model their college on these older institutions. What is perhaps more revealing on this point is the glaring imbalance in Manitoba itself. Twenty MAC graduates were hired as compared to only one Manitoba College graduate, who happened to have a first degree from the University of Edinburgh (R.W. Murchie). A graduate of Brandon College who went on to Macdonald Institute, and a Wesley College alumnus who did graduate work at Harvard, also managed to find employment at MAC. Something of the rural antipathy towards the University of Manitoba is no doubt reflected in these data. On the final point, more than 80% of MAC faculty had only one degree when they were

first hired or (in the case of some of the engineering faculty) no degree at all. Those who did second degrees or certificates tended to be from a teaching background, while those who did graduate work were mostly in veterinary science or more purely academic subjects such as chemistry or English. Those teaching the new agricultural and home economics subjects (including rural sociology and agricultural economics) began their careers having only received the general degree.

The information on previous work experience indicates that a large proportion of the MAC faculty had previous teaching experience, while very few of the men had actually operated a farm.(26) 40% of the faculty had taught at some level of the educational system, with the largest number of these having previous university or college experience. The next largest group consisted of recent graduates (20%) whose first employment was at MAC: half of these were MAC graduates, a number appear to have been sessional appointments, and most, but not all of them, were appointed as lecturers or instructors. Women and men with experience in government departments (district representatives, experimental farms, etc.) were next, accounting for 18%. The men who taught agricultural engineering and farm mechanics, meanwhile, were hired more on the basis of practical experience than academic merit. Hence, five of the eight engineering faculty hired between 1905 and 1913

had experience in factory production. Of the remaining faculty, one had solely farming experience, while two others had farming experience as well as some other previous employment, two had backgrounds in agricultural journalism, two had served in the armed services during the war, and two had experience in farm management or agro-industry. Most of the people who found themselves teaching at MAC, then, were either career educators or career agriculturalists. A surprisingly small number had farm operation experience, experience in agro-industry, or a background in agricultural journalism.

The collective experience of MAC faculty indicates an increasing consciousness of their own identity and a growing sense that they possessed certain rights within the institution. Especially in the 1920s, an era of post-war inflation and fiscal conservatism, issues of salary and college governance became important points of contention with the administration.

In 1909, the earliest year for which a complete salary scale exists, the salary range was as follows: Principal, $2500; Professors, $2000-$2250; Lecturers, $1000-$1500; and support staff salaries ranging from $840.00 for the farm foreman and the gardener to $300.00 for the librarian.(27) This structure remained more or less intact for a number of years. The Board of Directors announced in 1912 that the salaries for department heads had been raised to $2400.00

per year and that it was their wish to have professors' salaries "raised to $3000 per annum in the very near future."(28) As it turned out, the "very near future" was 1916 for, in that year, a permanent salary structure was put in place for male and female staff. The schedule for men was $2600-$3000 for professors, $2100-$2500 for associate professors, $1600-$2000 for lecturers, and $1000-$1500 for assistants, with annual increases after one year of service. The women's schedule was $1700-$2400 for department heads, and $900-$1600 for assistants, with annual increases of $100 from the minimum to the maximum.(29)

By 1919, however, the president was reporting to the government that, in the face of a drop in enrolment from 360 to 200 over four years, the college was having difficulty maintaining its staff and justifying its existence. Notwithstanding the fact that labour costs had increased in all departments from 30% to 50% of the total budget, and the staff were receiving their annual increases according to the 1916 schedule, staff salaries were not keeping pace with the cost of living. Hence it was necessary to offer salaries above the schedule to new faculty.(30) It was in this context that the faculty made their first organised representation to the Board of Directors in the form of a petition presented in October, 1919. They presented their case as follows:

> There is at present a great deal of unrest and dissatisfaction among the members of the

> Agricultural College staff which is detrimental to the best interests of the College. We feel that this is largely due to the unsatisfactory salary schedules which have not been revised since 1916, although the cost of living has gone up approximately 100%. It is conceded that the salaries of those engaged in the teaching profession in general are inadequate having regard to years of training required, the value of the service rendered and particularly having regard to the present high cost of living. In addition we find that the salaries paid at the Agricultural College are low in comparison with the salaries in the teaching profession in general, and in particular when compared with other institutions in the West doing similar work. Members of our staff have left the institution for the above reason and others are contemplating doing so. We have felt, however, that it is our duty to endeavour to remedy the situation rather than either abandon the teaching profession or take positions in other institutions.(31)

This was not the trade unionist rhetoric of the General Strike, of course. Within the deferential contours of educational discourse, however, it must be seen as a language of rights, identity and challenge. For the faculty to suggest, for example, that the situation must either be remedied or they would be forced to leave the college, and perhaps the profession, was to challenge the administration with the only legitimate sense of collective identity available to them. The resolution was accompanied by a proposed new schedule, including comparative data from other institutions. The faculty requested the following salary range: instructors (male), $1800-$2400; instructors (female), $1500-$1800; lecturers (male), $2000-$2600; lecturers (female), $1800-$2100; associate professors (male), $2700-$3000; associate professors (female), $2100-

$2600; professors (male), $3000-$3600; and directors (female), $2600-$3000.

The board was actually quite forthcoming in its response to the faculty. Although a motion was passed at the October, 1919 meeting affirming that the faculty request had to be considered in the context of the financial conditions of the college, a new schedule was adopted early in 1920 which, while not meeting the faculty requests, did include substantial increases under the circumstances. Under the new schedule the ranges were instructor (male), $1500-$2000; instructor/librarian (female), $1200-$1500; lecturer (male), $2000-$2400; lecturer (female), $1500-$1800; associate professor (male), $2400-$2800; associate professor (female), $1800-$2400; professor (male), $2800-$3500; and director (female), $2200-$2800.(32)

The MAC faculty's first, and only, attempt at collective bargaining was a relative success in that they were able to initiate a general pay increase in the college. By 1922, however, the board instituted a pay freeze, allowing only a limited number of salary increases. When MAC became the Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics in 1925, college salaries were generally lower than those in the rest of the university. A report from President Maclean and Dean McKillican recommended an equalisation of salaries, but Premier Bracken was not prepared to increase the budget.(33)

III

It was within this general structure that ideologies were constituted within the college, but the specific structures that developed in the relevant disciplines should be understood in the context of the broader North American pattern. Home economics, agricultural economics, and rural sociology emerged in the late nineteenth century and were maturing as areas of specialisation in North American scholarship during the second decade of the new century. At about the same time, in the years following 1910, they were also becoming established at MAC, with distinctive disciplines, boundaries, courses, and programmes of research.

Mount Holyoke Seminary instituted a form of domestic education in 1837, but it was really the land grant colleges that established American home economics instruction after the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. Indeed the subject flourished in these agricultural and mechanical colleges rather than the Ivy League women's colleges where it was viewed as being too narrowly focused for the education of cultured women. By the 1890s, and concurrent with professionalising initiatives in other areas of knowledge, home economics was becoming organised as a discipline. The most significant aspect of this endeavour was the series of Lake Placid conferences which began in 1899 and culminated in 1908 with the formation of the American Home Economics

Association (AHEA). During this decade home economists established their claim to have their domain considered a legitimate area of expertise. The first conference abandoned the name "household arts" in favour of home economics, hoping that a linguistic identification with economics might be a first step in easing the way into college and university curricula. And a conference committee later recommended a number of strategies for entering various curricular areas: household management in economics; family studies in sociology; nutrition and the chemistry of foods in natural science; and family history and the history of the home in history. At the tenth conference, besides formally establishing the AHEA, resolutions were adopted to broaden the organisation and establish the paraphernalia of professionalism. Delegates decided to publish a journal, form state organisations, establish a dues structure, and encourage secondary and primary teachers to join the association.(34)

Home economics instruction commenced at MAC shortly after the organisation of the AHEA. In the summer of 1910 twenty-one women took the first course offered by the newly formed Department of Household Science. It was the fall of 1911, however, before a regular two-year course of study was implemented for which students received a diploma. In 1914 the diploma programme was supplemented by a special course for teachers and a professional course for diploma graduates

seeking employment in institutions. One year later a three-year course, for which the diploma was a prerequisite, was added to provide degree level training which, in 1920, became a separate five-year programme.(35)

Between 1911 and 1919, and chiefly as a result of the introduction of the degree programme in 1915, the home economics curriculum grew from ten to approximately forty courses offering instruction in the social, medical, and natural sciences. The original ten included "Nursing" and "Physiology and Hygiene" so women could properly care for family members, "Millinery" and "Sewing and Dressmaking" to provide garment making skills, a range of courses (Home Sanitation, Laundry, Home Furnishing, Household Handicraft and Cookery) teaching the scientific basis and fundamental skills of home maintenance, "English" to add a touch of gentility to what was basically a vocational education, and "Household Management". After 1915 courses such as cookery were expanded to include "Cooking", "Foods" and "Dietetics", partially transforming a simple food preparation course into embryonic food science courses. Furthermore, "House Planning", "Bacteriology" and "Arithmetic" were added to supplement the work in other courses. And instruction in "Horticulture", "Dairy Husbandry" and "Poultry" was begun in order to train farm women for productive roles (in market terms). In the degree programme, courses were organised into household science and household arts departments, and

some purely scientific courses (taught by the agricultural faculty) were added. Household management, foods, the history of home life, and book reviews were incorporated into household science, while household arts included dressmaking, millinery, costume design, textiles, home planning, and embroidery. Degree students also took other courses ranging from chemistry to music.(36)

With the overall reorganisation of the MAC curriculum in 1919-1920, there was a realignment of home economics courses towards more precise disciplinary boundaries. Gone were the old categories of household arts and household science, replaced by nine course groupings having the appearance of departments without, as yet, possessing departmental apparatus. Hence, in 1919 home economics students encountered a curricular structure that included cookery, foods and nutrition, clothing, housing, textiles, physiology and hygiene, household management, pedagogy, and institutional management. In the 1920s the curriculum became more streamlined as the number of regular courses dropped from forty-two to forty, and the number of general areas shrank from nine to seven.(37)

Unlike the MAC presidency, which underwent a transition to professionalism in the teens, the home economics division had a professional orientation from its inception in 1910. A.B. Juniper, the first director, was attracted to MAC from the deanship of household science at Macdonald College

(McGill), and later went on to the principalship of a domestic science college in England. Her successor was E. Charlton-Salisbury, trained at Rochester Polytechnic and formerly employed at Women's Union Domestic Science College in Buffalo, New York. And, from 1915 to 1925, there were three more directors, all with good academic backgrounds. These were E.M. Eadie (from Mount Allison and University of Toronto), Mary Kelso (trained at OAC), and Mary Hiltz (a Columbia University graduate). More significantly, though, MAC faculty (especially Juniper) were instrumental in the formation of the Manitoba Home Economics Association in 1911. All three MAC home economists were present, along with four other women, at the inaugural meeting in January of that year. The aims of the association included contact with the AHEA (MHEA members regularly attended AHEA conventions, although formal affiliation did not take place until 1915), provincial agitation for a home economics experimental station, and general liaison between the women of Manitoba and the manufacturers of household products. Membership was limited to women actually employed in the profession, although associate memberships were available and the formation of a "Housewives League" was discussed in 1912 as a kind of housekeeper's auxiliary. Association activities, beyond regular meetings, consisted mainly of trips to commercial establishments in the food sector. During 1911 and 1912 members visited Milton Bakery, Crescent

Creamery, Paulin Chambers, and the restaurant at Eaton's.(38)

The discipline of agricultural economics took form in North America between the 1890s and the 1920s. Two distinct groups--agronomists studying farm management in agricultural colleges and economists analysing the broader agricultural economy in universities--were involved in its creation. Farm management emerged out of the general agricultural courses, taught in nineteenth century agricultural colleges, that treated the whole range of agricultural practice as a single area of study. As other specialisations such as field husbandry and animal husbandry developed, courses in "agriculture" and "agronomy" were narrowed to topics of farm organisation and the business of farming. By the turn of the century agronomists were borrowing economists' techniques in order to study management practices on individual farms. In 1902, for example, the Minnesota Agricultural Experimental Station, under the direction of Andrew Boss, began a series of cost of production studies whereby farmers, working with specialists, kept detailed records of actual farm costs. At about the same time, George Warren of Cornell initiated survey methods, involving personal interviews with farmers to ascertain their incomes and expenses. In 1913 Warren published Farm Management as a college text which systematised the work that he, Boss, and others had been doing over the previous ten to fifteen

years.(39) Moreover, in 1910 these and other agronomists, who were all concentrating on farm management, formed the American Farm Management Association as an expression of their disciplinary and professional aspirations. During the same period academic economists such as Henry Taylor and Thomas Nixon Carver were focusing on what they called "rural economics" or "farm economics", attempting to establish a space for agriculture within economic discourse.(40) They tried to form a Farm Economics section in the American Economic Association, but when this proposal was rejected by the AEA they established the National Association of Farm Economists in 1910. Through joint research projects and friendly overtures over the following decade a common space was created between the two groups and, in 1919, the American Farm Management Association and the National Association of Farm Economists merged to form the American Farm Economics Association. Agricultural economics, as a unified discipline, may be dated from this merger.(41)

Agricultural economics was taught in various forms at MAC between 1907 and 1919. In 1919, however, the courses were brought together in a rural economics department which, in 1926, merged with rural sociology. Prior to 1916 there was no distinct farm management course. Rather, farm management was covered in agronomy or, more often, as part of field husbandry. Rural economics was first taught in 1910-1911, and continued until 1916 when it was incorporated

with farm management for most levels of instruction. Between 1916 and 1919, courses varied among farm management, agricultural economics, and rural economics. Then, in 1919, the general curricular reogranisation produced a distinct department containing courses in farm business and accounting, farm management, economics, agricultural economics, and agricultural legislation. This structure remained relatively unchanged until 1925 when two marketing courses, two courses on farm movements and co-operation, and a course each on the economic geography of agriculture, finance, and statistics were added. Then, the following year, the Department of Economics and Sociology was born.(42)

The emergence of agricultural economics as a discipline at MAC was reflected in the increasing specialisation of the faculty who taught the subject between 1907 and 1926. Agronomy in 1907-1908, and rural economics between 1908 and 1910, were taught by Principal W.J. Black. Black, although trained at OAC, was a former agricultural journalist with no specialist training in agricultural economics. Similarly, the field husbandry instructors who taught farm managemnent in the early years were natural scientists rather than economists. The 1914 appointment of George White as MAC's first professor of farm management reflected both a move towards specialisation and the retention of older attitudes to farm management instruction. White spent six months of

the year at MAC and the other six months on his one thousand acre farm near LaSalle where, according to President Reynolds, he acquired "the practical experience and the scientific data specially necessary in farm management instruction". Indeed Reynolds noted three components in White's suitability for his job at MAC: his training at OAC; his business experience with the Grain Growers' Grain Company (GGGC); and his work as a practical farmer. When he died in 1916 his work was divided, not among fellow faculty members, but between C.B. Piper of the Empire Elevator Company and Thomas Crerar of the GGGC. White's eventual replacement, however, was Alva Benton, a trained agricultural economist. Benton, appointed in 1918, completed a doctorate in farm credit for the University of Wisconsin in 1921. He, in turn, was supplemented and eventually replaced by H.C. Grant, the first person to receive graduate training in agricultural economics in Manitoba.(43)

Like agricultural economics, rural sociology emerged as a disciplinary domain in the 1890s. In 1892 and 1896, amid economic depression and agrarian insurgency, the American Economics Association held sessions on "The Farmers' Movement" and "The Agricultural Question" in which social scientists such as Richard Ely, John Commons and Franklin Giddings participated. And, in 1893, Reverend Josiah Strong published a book calling attention to the exodus of people

from the country to the city. It was during the following decade, however, that the notion of a "rural problem" developed to focus and define rural sociology. Kenyon Butterfield (at the University of Michigan) and John Gillette (at the University of North Dakota) began teaching "rural sociology" early in the decade, while the Protestant Interchurch World Movement conducted surveys of thousands of rural churches during those same years. Most importantly, though, significant state initiatives were undertaken around the end of the decade which contributed to the growing legitimacy of rural sociology. In the United States Roosevelt appointed the Country Life Commission to enquire into the "problem" of country life, while in Canada both the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education and the Commission of Conservation focused attention on this newly found problem.(44)

Following closely upon the release of the Country Life Commission report, the American Sociological Association chose "Rural Life" as the theme of its 1912 convention and, during those meetings, the Rural Sociological Society was formed to provide rural sociologists with an institutional identity. By the time of the publication of John Gillette's synthetic Constructive Rural Sociology and John McDougall's Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks in 1913, then, rural sociology had become firmly established as an area of research and analysis.(45) And paralleling agricultural

economics, the characteristic area of study was the individual community and the characteristic methodology was the rural survey. In the most energetic research project of the teen years, the Interchurch World Movement undertook a survey of rural life in the United States which covered 2400 counties and involved 8000 people working as researchers.(46)

The first MAC rural sociology courses were offered in the immediate context of the Presbyterian Church's community surveys of Turtle Mountain and Swan River in 1913. In 1914 and 1915 an extra-curricular "rural problems" class met at the college on Thursday evenings, discussing such topics as the country church, the country school, and boys and girls clubs. This class entered the curriculum as "Rural Sociology" in 1916, absorbing the "General History" course which had been taught from 1913. Henceforth, rural sociology courses for both diploma and degree students, using Gillette's Constructive Rural Sociology and G.W. Fiske's Challenge of the Country as texts, became permanent fixtures in the college. In 1919 a range of history courses re-entered the curriculum, including "History of Agriculture" and "Canadian History and Civics". Then, in 1921, the history/civics and rural sociology offerings were combined to create a Department of Rural Sociology and Civics. By this time rural sociology included courses in rural leadership, sociology, rural sociology, and methods of

rural survey work. In 1926, when rural sociology was absorbed by agricultural economics, the department also included courses in statistics and industrial history.(47)

Sociological research and instruction at MAC was dominated by R.W. Murchie. A native of Scotland, Murchie was trained there and at Wesley College before joining the MAC faculty in 1915. Immediately prior to his appointment he worked on the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys. Over the following fifteen years Murchie taught virtually all of the rural sociology courses, engaged in various research projects, and completed a University of Minnesota doctorate. With the assistance of the newly appointed district representatives, he surveyed rural home conditions in Killarney, Portage and "the Ruthenian districts" in 1916. He also conducted rural leadership courses during this period, especially for ministers and ministers' wives. In the twenties Murchie was increasingly called upon to do work for the UFM government. From a study of the social and economic conditions of closed school districts for the Murray Commission in 1923, through the Unused Lands Survey of 1924 (which became his doctoral dissertation), to his 1927 chairmanship of the committee enquiring into seasonal unemployment, Murchie was the most important social scientist working for Bracken during this period. Although he left Manitoba in 1930 to succeed C.C. Zimmerman as professor of rural sociology at the University of Minnesota,

Murchie's major contribution to Canadian social science was his senior authorship of Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier (1936) for the Canadian Frontiers of Settlement Series.(48)

IV

Rural adult education in Manitoba underwent an important transition in the early twentieth century. Between 1890 and 1925 the infrastructure expanded from a few semi-autonomous and local agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, catering to a male elite, to a centralised apparatus built around MAC, ostensibly serving all farm women and men. Prior to 1907 the field was defined by the agricultural societies and farmers' institutes. After that an extension service was established, becoming firmly entrenched during the decade of funding under the Agricultural Instruction Act.

Manitoba institutes were co-ordinated by the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute (MCFI) until 1897 when the Department of Agriculture assumed direct control over the work. The MCFI, consisting of delegates from local institutes, met annually in convention throughout the nineties. These meetings consisted of two sorts of activities. First, papers were presented by speakers ranging from OAC people to Manitoba educators and Manitoba farmers. Second, delegates engaged in nonpartisan

discussion of various public policy questions (partisan discussion was forbidden). The 1894 convention, for example, passed resolutions urging the teaching of agriculture in schools, the appointment of a royal commission on freight rates, and tariff reform. The officers and directors of the Central, from various parts of the province, met a number of times during the year. The president for many years was James Elder of Virden, followed by A.P. Stevenson of Morden (who was later instrumental in having the Morden experimental farm established), and the honorary president in the 1890s was S.A. Bedford of the Brandon Experimental Farm.(49)

Local institutes were held during the winter months, with two speakers normally attending each meeting. Afternoons were devoted to the presentation and discussion of papers, while evenings were reserved for socialising. In 1896 the nine institute lecturers delivered a total of ninety-six lectures to institutes throughout the province. Not all institute meetings involved a visiting lecturer, however. The ideal, in fact, was to develop local discussion and debate around questions of agricultural improvement. In 1895, for example, the Melita institute produced a paper, discussion, and successful resolution characterising agricultural societies as elitist, and proposing that society monies be diverted to the establishment of creameries and cheese factories.(50)

The institutes were only a slight improvement over the agricultural societies, however. Institute secretaries claimed that those presenting papers tended to be a small group of older farmers and that they had a difficult time attracting younger farmers to the meetings. The general pattern seemed to be that the older men attended the afternoon sessions while the younger men did chores. The young men then came out for the evening social event.(51) And male exclusiveness was a problem. A farm woman suggested in 1897 that women should attend the regular meetings as well as the social events, since they were engaged in many productive activities on the farm.(52)

As a result of criticism directed at both the institutes and agricultural societies, the two educational methods were amalgamated in 1900. At the local level, institute work continued essentially as it had before, but under the control of agricultural society directors rather than institute secretaries. Provincially, however, the amalgamation marked the beginning of a transition from nineteenth century voluntarism to the state direction of the later extension service. In the early years of the decade the farm press was urging the provincial government to follow Ontario's lead and appoint a superintendent of institute work. The 1905 appointment of W.J. Black as Deputy Minister of Agriculture, with a mandate to develop

agricultural education, suggests the advice was being heeded.(53)

Black immediately took responsibility for agricultural societies and farmers' institutes. After MAC opened (with Black as president), these activities became integrated into the work of the college. With faculty members to act as judges, the societies expanded their role beyond the sponsorship of fall and summer fairs. Winter seed fairs were added, as were standing grain crop and good farming competitions. Plowing matches, which had been held sporadically prior to Black's appointment, became a regular feature of many society programmes. Institutes were made more systematic and regular with a pool of faculty to draw upon as speakers. Short courses were initiated both in the country and at the college campus, which eventually replaced the institute meeting and lecture as the forum for discussions of agricultural improvement.(54)

Institutes for women began in 1910 with the organisation of the first home economics societies. With the commencement of household science instruction in the college, Black instructed A.B. Juniper and M. Kennedy to tour the province establishing societies. Between 15 November and 13 December of 1910 these two women visited fifteen towns, holding meetings under the auspices of the local agricultural society, in which they were able to organise fourteen new groups. There were, in fact, two

local women's organisations already in existence prior to this initiative. At Valley River, near Dauphin, a "Ladies Mutual Benefit Society" had been formed in 1910. This group, which met at the same time as the local (exclusively male) Grain Growers' Association, discussed the problems of homemaking (papers were presented on "Housecleaning" and "The Dish Cloth and Its Care" at the first meeting). Women in Morris, meanwhile, organised a "Women's Institute" in August of 1910, and were subsequently issued the first home economics society charter by MAC. Delegates from these two groups joined representatives from the newly formed societies at the first provincial Household Science Association convention early in the following year.(55)

Although Black was submitting a report entitled "Department of Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work" to the minister during MAC's earliest years, it was not until 1911 that an extension branch was actually formed with the appointment of E. Ward Jones as Black's assistant. Jones assumed control of extension work as of that date. One of his first responsibilities was to organise the "Better Farming Trains" that toured the province during the summers of 1911 to 1914. A special dairy train ran in June of 1910, based upon a similar programme in North Dakota. One year later the concept was generalised to include all aspects of college instruction. Jointly sponsored by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and

MAC, these trains ran for about one month each summer, making as many stops as possible. In 1912, for example, two trains (one CN, one CP) were equipped with refrigerator, livestock, baggage, field crops, dairy, home economics, sleeping, and dairy cars. They travelled the province on the respective company lines, visiting one hundred and forty six stations and reaching approximately 35000 people through lectures and demonstrations.(56)

In 1913 Jones was joined by Hattie Gowsell, appointed as a home economics extension worker. A year later rural extension entered a new phase with the commencement of Dominion funding. S.T. Newton was appointed superintendent of extension services in 1915, continuing in that role until 1921. During his tenure the Extension Service became a separate branch of the Department of Agriculture (1917-1923). By the time the Dominion grant was withdrawn in 1923, the then director (N.C. MacKay) had a staff of over thirty full and part-time lecturers and demonstrators. With no new funds forthcoming, the staff was cut to six and the office was moved back to MAC.(57) Between 1915 and 1923, however, a number of important structures and services were established.

Probably the most significant initiative undertaken in this period was the appointment of district representatives and home demonstration agents. The district representative programme was begun in 1915. Seven recent MAC agriculture

graduates, with practical farming experience, were assigned to various points in the province. As local extension workers, these men were expected to judge at fairs, conduct short courses and extension schools, organise Boys' and Girls' Clubs, and generally serve as agricultural resource people. They were often instrumental in organising farmers into local agricultural improvement associations. T.A. Johnson, district representative at Deloraine from 1919 to 1923, for example, helped organise the Southwest Manitoba Co-operative Poultry Association, the Manitoba Sweet Clover Growers' Association (thereby introducing sweet clover to southwestern Manitoba), a regional farm bureau bringing local businessmen and farmers together, and agricultural Chautauquas. He, and other district representatives, were also closely involved in the formation of rural credit societies, which the Norris government was promoting.(58)

Home demonstration agents were not introduced until some time later. Esther Thompson, a MAC student, was hired for the summer of 1917 and 1918 to work in the Whitemouth district east of Winnipeg. Under the direction of Robert Murchie, she did "community work" in the schools and homes of the district, teaching millinery, personal hygiene, cooking, and manual training. This proved to be a short term experiment for the extension branch, however. Although there were monies available, and there was a desire to establish home demonstration agents, the department found it

difficult to recruit qualified personnel. S.T. Newton wrote in his 1921 report that "there is a great scarcity of young women having the required training [for home demonstration agents], which is five years in the home economics department at an agricultural college, as well as three or four years of acceptable prior experience." Consequently agents were just becoming established when funding was curtailed. The first permanent appointment, in fact, was not made until March 1923 when T. Thordason, a MAC graduate, was assigned to the Roland/Miami area. Both the home demonstration agent and district representative programmes were abandoned in 1924 when Dominion funds were no longer forthcoming.(59)

And, finally, an extensive media programme was established through the Extension Service and the Publications Branch of the department. The Publications Branch was formed in 1913, primarily to co-ordinate the printing and publishing of immigration material, crop bulletins, and the proceedings of provincially chartered agricultural associations. After 1913 this work was extended to the production and distribution of bulletins and circulars, written by MAC faculty, on a range of agricultural problems. Within the Extension Service a number of media initiatives were undertaken between 1915 and 1923. A library service allowed organisations either to participate in a circulating library system or establish

their own library with financial and technical assistance from the department. Individuals could also borrow books and other material through this system. Between 1921 and 1924 an extension newsletter was published containing information from the various branches of the Department of Agriculture. And, beginning about 1919 or 1920, lantern slides, and then motion pictures, were produced on various topics and particular aspects of the department's activities. These films and slides, with titles ranging from "Dairy Cattle" to "Our Ruthenian Citizens", were available for viewing by rural and agricultural groups.(60)

V

Educational institutions for rural Manitoba children and youth were also transformed in the early twentieth century. Throughout North America nature study, school gardening, school district consolidation, and vocational courses in agriculture and home economics were changing rural schooling. With publications such as The Nature Study Idea (1903) and The Outlook of Nature (1905), for example, L.H. Bailey of Cornell University included schools in the American country life movement's analysis of rural society. In the Commission on Country Life, which Bailey chaired, the rural school was identified as an institution both in need of reform and crucial to the revitalisation of rural life. Similar Canadian anxieties about rural education were best

typified by the activities of James Robertson and William Macdonald. Robertson, a Dominion Department of Agriculture bureaucrat, and Macdonald, a bourgeois Montreal philanthropist, joined forces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to promote educational reform. Between 1890 and 1905 Macdonald contributed $14 million to educational projects in Canada. Most of this went to McGill University (and Macdonald College was born), but $1 million of it was used in the public schools of Canada. Macdonald and Robertson's most important project in the area of public schooling was the establishment of four "object lesson" consolidated schools (in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Ontario) for the practical application of reform programmes. Robertson subsequently chaired the Royal Commission on Technical Education and Industrial Training which, in the area of elementary and secondary rural schooling, recommended consolidation, more school gardening, and more agricultural and home economics training. This activity was accompanied by an outpouring of literature on rural education. Albert H. Leake's The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education (1915), for example, was a synthetic assessment of the topic in Canada and the United States, and was published in the same series as Gillette's Constructive Rural Sociology.(61)

Rural education for Manitoba children and youth can really be dated from the introduction of nature study to the

province's schools in the mid-1890s. At a meeting of the Advisory Board of Education on 30 May 1894 a report on the teaching of agriculture in schools was presented. It recommended that nature study be taught in the middle and upper levels of instruction, accompanied by comparable training in the province's normal schools. The recommendations were adopted, and put into practice the following year. Ideally, nature study was to entail the observation of common plants and flowers and, in the upper grades, systematic training in plant structure. According to rural school inspectors, however, the subject was often neglected or, if covered, was limited to stories about animals or flowers rather than actual observation. A. McIntyre reported in 1899, for example, that many teachers in his inspectoral division viewed nature study as a pleasant pastime for children rather than an integral component of a new approach to pedagogy. They had failed, he concluded, to grasp the serious nature of the work. Although inspectors lamented the failure of teachers to integrate nature study into the curriculum, for years it remained a peripheral subject with little meaning for students.(62)

By the middle of the following decade school gardening and consolidation were displacing nature study as the central media for rural education. As early as 1904 at least one rural teacher was practising school gardening at

his school by cultivating the school firebreak. Over the next half dozen years or so school gardening, because of its practical orientation, supplanted nature study in the school curriculum. At about the time that school gardening was being introduced, Manitoba's first school consolidation took place at Virden, in 1905. Although there were no Macdonald-Robertson "object lesson" schools in any of the western provinces, consolidation proved to be quite successful in Manitoba. Indeed, Manitoba educators were inspired as much by consolidation experiments in North Dakota, where similar conditions existed, as they were by Macdonald and Robertson. Prompted by concerns about conditions in the hundreds of one-room country schools in the province, the movement gained momentum after 1905, and especially after 1909 when Charles Newcombe was appointed the special inspector in charge of consolidation. By 1921, 110 consolidated school districts had been formed in Manitoba.(63)

With school gardening well established in elementary education by 1910, attention shifted to the secondary level. A Department of Education study in 1907, the royal commission report on the university in 1909, and an internal MAC committee study in 1911 all recommended some form of secondary agricultural instruction. While the Department of Education suggested that agriculture courses become part of the regular high school curriculum, the commission and the

MAC committee preferred the concept of a separate agricultural high school, equivalent to an urban vocational or technical high school. The latter approach was favoured, at least initially. By the end of the 1912-1913 school year five secondary schools of agriculture had been established, running from November to May and catering mainly to young men aged 14 to 22 who had not been in school for a number of years. In 1915, however, some secondary schools did offer agriculture as part of the regular curriculum, and the Department of Education bureaucrats were urging others to follow their example. There was some expansion over the next decade but, by 1924-1925 most agricultural training for youth had been transferred to the Boys' and Girls' Clubs.(64)

Home economics instruction had a limited place in Manitoba's rural schools. It is true that, within the new education movement, home economics was viewed as the feminine component of vocational training, but in Manitoba its influence was only felt in city and town schools. There was no domestic equivalent of nature study or school gardening: indeed, these activities were designed as much for rural girls as for rural boys. Home economics was taught at the secondary level in towns such as Selkirk, Virden, and Dauphin after 1915 or so though, and this no doubt affected some young farm women. For the most part however, Boys' and Girls' Clubs were the most important

media for training rural young people in domestic science.(65)

Although nature study was made a component of Normal School instruction in 1895, systematic teacher training in agriculture was not undertaken until after the formation of MAC. Beginning in 1909-1910, and continuing in subsequent academic years, Normal School students took a one month course at the agricultural college as part of their training. In 1913 the agricultural component was supplemented by instruction in home economics. Furthermore, after the introduction of agricultural high schools in 1915, MAC agriculture graduates were in demand to staff them. MAC did not control the whole terrain of rural teacher training, however. Robert Fletcher, Deputy Minister of Education, reported in his 1913 report that a new Normal School had been opened in Brandon, designed to give special attention to the "rural school problem". "Its geographical location, its ample grounds, and the equipment generally," Fletcher wrote, "will aid greatly in dealing with that problem."(66)

As significant as these interventions in the public school system were, by the twenties Boys' and Girls' Clubs had become the most important agricultural and home economics programmes for young people. Boys' and Girls' Clubs originated at various points in the United States in the opening years of the century. Two rural school superintendents, Albert Graham in Ohio and O.J. Kerr in

Illinois, are credited with forming the first two clubs, quite independently of each other, in 1902. Over the next few years state extension services incorporated club work into their programmes. And, by 1906, thousands of American boys and girls were engaged in agricultural and domestic competitions.(67)

The first Manitoba (and Canadian) Boys' and Girls' Clubs were formed in 1913. Two events marked the launching of the club movement in the province. First, the Winnipeg Exhibition Association organised a Farm Boys Club for the 1913 Canadian Industrial Exhibition. One hundred farm boys were guests of the association during the exhibition. The purpose of their visit to Winnipeg, which was supervised by MAC faculty, was "to receive a practical demonstration of the benefits derived by the use of modern farm equipment."(68) Second, the Extension Service initiated a potato and fodder corn growing contest and a poultry raising contest in the spring of 1913, making grants available to individuals and groups to organise the contests in their communities. Eight local clubs (with a total membership of 460) were formed that year, and they each held a fall fair for the exhibition and judging of the produce. More clubs were formed the following year, and by 1919 30,000 boys and girls were involved in the movement in Manitoba.(69)

Although organised through the Department of Agriculture, Boys' and Girls' Clubs were closely connected

with the Department of Education. The typical club was organised by a local businessman (quite often a banker) at the instigation of a school inspector or a district representative. Other business people, teachers, and farmers were then recruited as sponsors and leaders. The local organisation was expected to provide half the funds for organisational costs and prizes, with the Extension Service supplying the rest. Both MAC faculty and the extension staff were available as judges for the club fairs, which were organised on the basis of Department of Education inspectoral divisions. With the expansion of the Extension Service after 1917, staff were hired to specialise in the direction of club work. Three MAC graduates were appointed in 1919. H.E. Wood became co-ordinator of Boys' and Girls' Club work, while Elizabeth Whitwell and Margaret Speechly took responsibility for team demonstration work and junior home economics. Although the cessation of funding under the Agricultural Instruction Act had a certain detrimental effect on club work, the connection with the Department of Education did allow it to survive. Cash grants to clubs were discontinued, Whitwell and Speechly were laid off, and responsibility for club direction passed to the Department of Education's recently formed Technical Education Branch (a creature of the Dominion government's Technical Education Act of 1919).(70)

In the early years club programmes consisted simply of the competitive display of produce at club fairs, with cash prizes allotted to the winners. Over the years, the contests grew from the corn, potatoes, and chickens of 1913 to include, by 1917, twelve categories ranging from "Noxious Weeds" and "Essay Writing" to "Cookery" and "Garment Making". By the later teens, however, the concept of team demonstration competitions was expanding and changing the focus of club activity. In 1917 two Winnipeg milling companies offered special prizes in breadmaking competitions. This prompted the formation of teams at the local club level demonstrating a variety of domestic and agricultural techniques. Then, in 1920, Eaton's, Lake of the Woods Milling Company, and Western Canada Milling Company began sponsoring provincial team demonstration competitions. Local teams were chosen to compete in Winnipeg against other teams. The local production competitions continued during this period, although they too were undergoing a transition. As a result of both the emergence of team demonstrations and the withdrawal of staff support by the Extension Service, specialised clubs led by local volunteers were organised at the local level. In an ironic departure from the growth of professionalism, local people with a specific expertise (in farm mechanics, sewing or gardening, for example) became leaders of these specialised clubs.(71)

During this period, but especially in the decade from 1913 to 1923, an educational state structure was established in Manitoba agriculture. The agricultural societies and farmers' institutes of the nineteenth century were supplemented and systematised with the organisation of the government extension service in the first decade of the twentieth century. More importantly, though, the Manitoba Agricultural College was the centrepiece of this structure, as it trained young farm men and women in home economics and agriculture and served as a vital source of agricultural and domestic information. It was in this state structure, that is, that a dominant ideology for rural people was constructed and conveyed. As theorised in chapter one, ideologies consist of a theoretical and a practical component. The first step in analysing the system of meaning being constructed and conveyed is to assess the internal dynamics of the various discourses on the terrain of theoretical ideology. This is the purpose of the next chapter.

---

1. V.C. Fowke, Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern (Toronto, 1978), p. 156; D. Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972, chapter II; Statutes of Canada, 31 Vic., ch. 53, 1868; Canada Agriculture: The First One Hundred Years (Ottawa, 1967), part I; T.H. Anstey, One Hundred Harvests: Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, 1886-1986 (Ottawa, 1986), chapter 1.

2. Fowke, Canadian Agricultural Policy, chapter 9; Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," chapter II; Statutes of Canada, 49 Vic., ch. 57, 1886.
3. Fowke, Canadian Agricultural Policy, pp. 246-247; Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," pp. 73-74; N. Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society, 1880-1920 (Toronto, 1976), pp. 188, 198-199; R. Stamp, "Vocational Objectives in Canadian Education: An Historical Overview," in S. Ostry, ed., Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies (Ottawa, 1972), pp. 247-252; D. Jones, "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929," PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978, pp. 2-4; V.C. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy (Toronto, 1957), pp. 162-164; R.C Brown and R. Cook, Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed (Toronto, 1974), pp. 195-196.
4. J. Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture in Manitoba, 1870-1970 (Winnipeg, 1970), pp. 41-46, 66; Statutes of Manitoba (SM), 35 Vic., ch. 15, 1872.
5. SM, 53 Vic., ch. 35, 1890; SM, 63-64 Vic., ch. 2, 1900.
6. W.L. Morton, One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952 (Toronto, 1957), pp. 57-60, 85-88, 117-118, 132-137; Ellis, The Ministry of Education, pp. 181-186; SM, 3 Ed. 6, ch. 1, 1904; SM, 2 Geo. V, ch. 1, 1912; SM, 6 Geo. V, ch. 1, 1916; SM, 14 Geo. V, ch. 71, 1924.
7. Ellis, The Ministry of Education, pp. 196-198.
8. "Report of the Agricultural College Commission," Manitoba Sessional Papers (MSP) Number 17 (1903).
9. W.J. Rutherford in agriculture, F. Torrance in veterinary science, F.W. Broderick in horticulture and forestry, G.A. Sproule in English and mathematics, and A.R. Greig in engineering and mechanics. "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," MSP Number 14 (1905), pp. 410-411; MSP Number 16 (1906).
10. MSP Number 18 (1907), pp. 519-520; MSP Number 11 (1908), pp. 516-517; MSP Number 8 (1909), pp. 605-606.
11. University of Manitoba (UM) Archives, Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) Papers, "Board of Directors," 11 October, 1910.
12. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 19 February 1919.
13. "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," MSP Number 14 (1905).
14. "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," MSP Number 19 (1914).
15. "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," MSP Number 14 (1916).
16. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 20 September 1918; MAC Papers, "Advisory Council," 11 November 1924.

17. MAC Gazette 6(5) (March, 1913) and 7(1) (October, 1913). See the letter from Rebecca Dayton, President, Home Economics Societies, to Valentine Winkler in which Black is described as patronising and overbearing towards women in his role as Director of Home Economics Societies. Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), Valentine Winkler Papers, Box 1, 16 September 1915.
18. A.J. Madill, History of Agricultural Education in Ontario (Toronto, 1937), pp. 172-173; J. Kendle, John Bracken: A Political Biography (Toronto, 1979), chapter 2; Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture, pp. 188, 633; UM Archives, MAC Papers "Staff Minutes," 24 November 1911; MAC Papers "Board of Directors," 29 September 1915, 1 June 1920; on other North American agricultural colleges see Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," chapter III; W.C. Hunter, Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College (Fargo, 1961); S. Murray, "James Power: The Second President of North Dakota Agricultural College," North Dakota Quarterly 42 (Autumn, 1974); E.D. Eddy, Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education (New York, 1957).
19. The Farmers' Advocate 10 May 1905, p. 687; UM Archives, MAC Papers "Staff Minutes," 11 February 1911; MAC Papers "Board of Directors," 22 December 1909, 15 February 1911.
20. "MAC President's Report, 1915," MSP Number 14 (1916).
21. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 24 January 1924, 28 March 1924; MAC Papers, "Advisory Council," 11 November 1924, 21 January 1925, 11 November 1925.
22. Managra and MAC Gazette, 1905-1924. The amount of information available on each individual varies. We know the geographic origin and initial academic rank of 59 (43%), the educational background of 74 (54%), and the previous employment of 71 (51%) of the faculty members.
23. As we noted in footnote 22, we know the geographic origin of only 59, or 43%, of the MAC faculty.
24. Unfortunately, most of the information on geographic origin is no more specific than province or state. Of the 17 Ontarians for whom more specific information is available, only 6 of them were raised on a farm while 11 were from cities. Similarly, of the 12 Manitobans for whom specific information is available, 8 were from towns and only 4 came from farms.
25. As we noted in footnote 22, we have educational information on 74, or 54%, of the MAC faculty.
26. As we noted in footnote 22, we have previous employment information on 71, or 51%, of MAC faculty.
27. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 16 February 1909.

28. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 11 January 1912.
29. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 22 March 1916.
30. "MAC Report for 1919: The President," MSP (1920), p.3.
31. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 8 October 1919.
32. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 13 January 1920. All sixty-one people employed in MAC in 1919-1920 received a pay raise under the new schedule. For example, the president's salary went from $4000 to $4500; his secretary's salary went from $1020 to $1140; a professor in field husbandry, $3000 to $3300; an assistant professor in animal husbandry, $1900 to $2400; a lecturer in dairying, $1800 to $2000; a demonstrator in biology, $900 to $1200; the director of home economics, $2000 to $2300; a professor in home economics, $1800 to $1900; a lecturer in home economics, $1600 to $1700; an instructor in home economics, $1200 to $1400; and the telephone operator, $780 to $960.
33. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Advisory Council," 11 November 1925.
34. S. Strasser, Never Done: A History of American Housework (New York, 1982), pp. 202-204; E.S. Wrigley, "It Might Have Been Euthenics: The Lake Placid Conferences and the Home Economics Movement," American Quarterly 26 (March, 1974), pp. 79-96; W.D. Jenkins, "Housewifery and Motherhood: The Question of Role Change in the Progressive Era," in M. Kelley, ed., Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History (Boston, 1979), pp. 146-148; E.C. Rowles, Home Economics in Canada: The Early History of Six College Programmes (Saskatoon, 1966), chapters I and II.
35. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1911-1912, 1914-1915, 1915-1916, 1920-1921; for an overview of home economics education in Manitoba see J.G. Wilson, A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966 (Winnipeg, 1969); see also E.C. Rowles, Home Economics in Canada for the experience at other Canadian colleges
36. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1911-1912, "Outline of Courses: Household Science"; MAC Calendar, 1915-1916, pp. 86-96; "MAC Report: Report of Household Science Department, Report of Household Art Department," MSP Number 11 (1917).
37. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-1920, pp. 47-56; MAC Calendar, 1925-1926, pp. 60-65.
38. Staff announcements in Managra 1910, 1912, 1915, 1918, 1922; Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture, p. 634; PAM, Manitoba Women's Institute (MWI) Papers, Box 13, "Early Institute History" File, Letter from A.B. Juniper to Esther Thompson, 5 February, 1925; UM Archives, MAC

Papers, "Board of Directors," 13 January, 1920; UM Archives, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, Box 4, "MAC Report to Education Commission, Teaching Staff" and "Home Economics Report" in "MAC Annual Report," 1926-1927; PAM, Manitoba Home Economics Association Papers, Box 1, "Minute Books," 11 March 1911, 13 May 1911, April 1912, 18 May 1912, 9 October 1915; Wilson, A History of Home Economics, p. 178.

39. G.F. Warren, Farm Management (Cornell, 1911)
40. T.N. Carver, Principles of Rural Economics (Boston, 1911); H.C. Taylor, An Introduction to the Study of Agricultural Economics (Madison, 1905).
41. H.C. Taylor and A.D. Taylor, The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932 (Ames, 1952); G.F. Warren, "The Origin and Development of Farm Economics in the United States," Journal of Farm Economics XIV (January, 1932); H.C. McDean, "Professionalism in the Rural Social Sciences, 1896-1919," Agricultural History 58(3) (1984); C.L. Holmes, "Farm Management," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences 1930-1935, VI, pp. 111-114; E.G. Nourse, "Agricultural Economics," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences 1930-1935, I, pp. 534-536. Agricultural economics was part of a continental history during this period. At the University of Manitoba political economy was taught as early as 1882 and, in 1909, A.B. Clark was appointed the first university professor of political economy. When the Canadian Political Science Association was formed in 1913 political economy, encompassing all of social science and characterised by an historical approach, became institutionally established as an area of enquiry. It was not until the 1930s and 1940s, however, with the influence of Keynesianism and neo-classicism, that Canadian economics emerged as a distinct discipline. C.D.W. Goodwin, Canadian Economic Thought: The Political Economy of a Developing Nation, 1814-1914 (Durham, N.C., 1961); D. Owram, The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1986).
42. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1907-1925.
43. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, 1908-1910; "MAC Annual Report, 1916," MSP Number 11 (1917), p. 634; Comprehensive Dissertation Index 33, 1861-1972 (Ann Arbor, 1973), p. 336; MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 2 April 1918.
44. Commission on Country Life, Report of the Commission on Country Life (New York, 1911); Canada. Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education. Report (1913-1914); Canada. Commission of Conservation. Reports (1911-1917).

45. J. Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology (New York, 1913); J. MacDougall, Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks (Toronto, 1913).
46. This discussion of rural sociology is based upon L. Nelson, Rural Sociology: Its Origin and Growth in the United States (Minneapolis, 1969); Nelson, "The Rise of Rural Sociology: The Pre-Purnell Period," Rural Sociology 30(4) (December, 1965); Nelson, "Constructing Rural Sociology," Rural Sociology 9 (September, 1944); E. deS. Brunner, The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States (New York, 1957); O. Duncan, "Rural Sociology Coming of Age," Rural Sociology 19(1) (March, 1954). Rural sociology in Manitoba during this period was, like agricultural economics, part of a continental history. Canadian sociology did not emerge as a distinct discipline until much later. Although sociology courses were taught in various Canadian universities as early as 1915 and McGill established a sociology department between 1923 and 1925, social analysis in Canada was generally viewed as being the purview of political economy. At the University of Toronto, for example, sociology remained within the department of political economy until 1963. H. Hiller, Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology (Toronto, 1982) and M. Shore, The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origin of Social Research in Canada (Toronto, 1987).
47. MAC Gazette 9(3) (January, 1916), p. 32; UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1913-1925.
48. MAC Gazette (November, 1915); "Report of Rural Sociology and Rural Economics, Manitoba Agricultural College," MSP Number 11 (1917), p. 705; UM Archives, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, Box 3, "Rural Sociology File: Department of Economics and Sociology Special Report on Research, 21 September 1927"; Comprehensive Dissertation Index, 36, 1861-1972 (Ann Arbor, 1973), p. 213; R. Murchie, Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier (Toronto, 1936); Nelson, Rural Sociology, p. 70 (incidentally, Nelson succeeded Murchie at Minnesota following the latter's death in 1937). Murchie's career suggests that he had a North American rather than a Canadian orientation.
49. The Farmers' Advocate (TFA) 20 July 1893, p. 263; 5 August 1984, p 301; 5 August 1895, p. 301; 20 November 1896, p. 450; 5 August 1896, p. 300; 5 April 1897, p. 148; MSP Number 26 (1895).
50. TFA 20 October 1894, p. 410; 5 March 1895, p. 89; 5 April 1895, p. 139; 5 December 1895, p. 465; MSP Number 20 (1897); MSP Number 11 (1900).
51. TFA 5 November 1897, p. 478; 5 January 1900, p. 14; MSP Number 11 (1900).

52. TFA 5 January 1894, p. 3.
53. TFA 20 November 1900, p. 638; 5 February 1902, p. 79; 1 March 1905, p. 298; MSP Number 10 (1902).
54. "The Renaissance of Manitoba Farmers' Institutes is Approaching," TFA 1 March 1905, p. 298; UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Department of Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work," MAC Calendar, 1908-1909; "Department of College Extension Work," MAC Calendar, 1909-1910; Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture, pp. 200-201.
55. PAM, MWI Papers, Box 13, "Early Institute History File"; MWI Papers, Box 14, "Particulars Re. Formation of Women's Institutes in Manitoba: Meeting Undertaken by Household Science, MAC 1910"; MSP Number 2 (1911), pp. 167-168;"Household Science Convention," MAC Gazette 1(7) (March, 1911), p. 67; Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff, 1913-70 (Winnipeg, 1974), p. 22.
56. MSP Number 23 (1911), p. 169; UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes, 1 December 1911, 4 May 1912"; MSP Number 8 (1912), pp. 170-171; MAC Papers, "Faculty Minutes," 9 April 1914; MAC Papers, "College Extension," MAC Calendar, 1913-1914.
57. Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture, pp. 225-226.
58. Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff, pp. 10-11, 16-19; "The Appointment of Field Representatives," MAC Gazette 8(1) (November, 1914); "The District Representative," MAC Gazette 9(1) (November, 1915), pp. 8-11; "What the Agricultural Representatives Are Doing," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 1(2) (December, 1920); MSP Number 11 (1917), pp. 719-720; Manitoba Department of Agriculture (MDA), Annual Reports 1921-22, 1922-23, 1923-24; Ellis, The Ministry of Agriculture, pp. 224-225.
59. UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 14 December 1916, 5 April 1917, 26 November 1917, 2 April 1918; Esther Thompson, "Community Work," Managra 10(2) (December, 1917), p. 18; MDA, Annual Report (1921); "Annual Report of Manitoba Women's Institutes, 1923," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 3(7) (July-August, 1923), p. 6; Wilson, Home Economics Education, pp. 175-176.
60. "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, Bulletin, Number 8 (1916); MDA, Annual Report 1921, pp. 79-80, 101-105; "Report of the Publications Branch," MSP Number 14 (1916); "Report of the Agricultural Publications Branch," MDA, Annual Report (1919).
61. L. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York, 1961), pp. 75-85; Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society, chapter 12; Lawr, "The Development of

Agricultural Education," p. 212; L.H. Bailey, The Nature Study Idea (New York, 1903); Bailey, The Outlook of Nature (New York, 1905); A.H. Leake, The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education (New York, 1915); J.C. Miller, Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision (New York, 1913); E.P. Cubberly, Rural Life and Education (Boston, 1914); H.W. Foght, The American Rural School (New York, 1910).

62. "Teaching Agriculture," TFA 20 June 1894, p. 246; TFA 5 January 1895, p. 2; various inspector's reports between 1896 and 1905, for example, Manitoba Department of Education (MDE), Annual Report (1899), pp 42-43; Annual Report (1902), p. 523; Annual Report (1903), pp 581, 585, 587, 595; Annual Report (1904), pp. 43-45; Annual Report (1905), p. 33.

63. MDE, Annual Report (1905), p. 49; Annual Report (1908), p. 475; Annual Report (1909), pp. 54, 58, 94, 98, 109-110; Annual Report (1910), pp. 53-54, 69-71, 121-122; Annual Report (1913), p.116; "Consolidation of Schools," MDE, Annual Report 1909, pp. 121-128; K. Wilson, "The Development of Education in Manitoba," PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967, p. 316; Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society, p. 195.

64. MDE, Annual Report (1908), pp. 489-499; Annual Report (1914), pp. 59, 148; Annual Report (1916), p. 197; Annual Report (1923-24), pp. 81-83; "Report of the Royal Commission to Enquire Into and Report Upon the University," MSP Number 9 (1910), p. 483; UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes," 1 December 1911; K.W. Gordon, "Agricultural Education in Manitoba High Schools," MAC Gazette 7(4) (January, 1914), p. 224.

65. MDE, Annual Report (1920-21), p. 148; M. Speechly, "Science Puts on an Apron," Grain Growers' Guide 14 February 1923, p. 185; Wilson, A History of Home Economics Education, chapter VII. See Wilson, chapter II; R. Stamp, "Teaching Girls Their `God Given Place in Life': The Introduction of Home Economics in the Schools," Atlantis 2(2) Part I (Spring, 1977); and T. Crowley, "Madonnas before Magdalenes: Adelaide Hoodless and the Making of the Canadian Gibson Girl," Canadian Historical Review 67(4) (December, 1986) for eastern Canadian background on home economics education.

66. MDE, Annual Report (1913), p. 13; UM Archives, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 17 Februrary 1909; MAC Papers, "Course in Agriculture for Teachers" in MAC Calendar, 1909-1910, p. 56, "Teachers' Short Course" in MAC Calendar, 1912-1913, p. 92, "Normal Teachers' Course," in MAC Calendar, 1925-1926.

67. F. Reck, The 4-H Story: A History of 4-H Club Work (Ames, 1951), chapter 2; Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 79.

68. PAM, 4-H Papers, Box 4, "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," 5 June 1913 manuscript.
69. PAM, 4-H Papers, Box 4, "Letter to G. Ross, Reeve of Roland Municipality from E.W. Jones, Extension Secretary, MAC," 23 April, 1913 and "Handbook of Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs, 1918-1919"; E.W. Jones, "Extension Section," MAC Gazette 7(2) (November, 1913), p. 90.
70. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," MDE, Annual Report (1920-1921); "Boys' and Girls' Clubs" and "Report of the Director of Technical Education of Manitoba," MDE, Annual Report (1923-1924); "MAC Report: Extension Service," MSP Number 11 (1917), pp. 716-717.
71. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs" in MDE , Annual Report (1921), p. 137; Annual Report (1917), p. 248; Annual Report (1922-1923), p. 119; Annual Report (1924-1925), pp. 25-26. On the origin of the demonstration method in agricultural education, see Scott, Reluctant Farmer, chapters VIII and IX.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE THEORETICAL CONSTITUTION OF DOMINANT AGRARIAN IDEOLOGY

The theoretical terrain of North American agrarian ideology was formulated and inhabited by subdisciplines or offshoots of broader areas of social knowledge. Categories drawn from parent disciplines were adapted to interpret family farming and rural society. Bourgeois economics spawned agricultural economics, while home economics combined early marginal utility theory with scientific management. Rural sociology developed as a subdiscipline of post-Spencerian sociology. Rural education, meanwhile, was a hybrid of "new education" and rural sociology. Together, these four emergent areas of enquiry determined dominant understanding of social reality in early twentieth century rural Manitoba.

I

Agricultural economics was constituted as a distinct area of study at that point in the history of American economics when the marginal utility theory of John Bates Clark and others was resolving the conflict between classical economists and "new school" political economists. Richard Ely, who taught economics to agricultural economists at Wisconsin and whose texts were used at the Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC), was a leading proponent of new political economy. Thomas Nixon Carver, who was influenced

by J.B. Clark, was the author of one of the first texts in agricultural economics and, later in his career, contributed to a modification of marginalism. Texts produced by Ely, Carver and Henry Taylor, a University of Wisconsiin agricultural economist taught by Ely, defined the theoretical domain of agricultural economics as it was understood and taught in Manitoba between 1908 and 1925.

While a discussion of the meaning and significance of the emergence of marginalism in the context of the ostensibly conflicting visions of classical and historical economics is beyond the scope of this analysis, it is important to note the fundamental points of agreement among these approaches, and the characteristics which distinguished them. These three forms of economic enquiry were variants of bourgeois economics and, as such, accepted certain characteristics of a capitalist economy as given: commodity production; private property; a distinction between labour and capital; and, central to the whole enterprise, the market. "New school" political economists challenged the extreme abstraction of the market in the classical schema by undertaking historical and statistical studies of "real" (i.e. historical) economies, arguing in the process there was a role for the state (and thereby economists as advisers to the state) in regulating the market in the interests of a smoothly reproducing capitalism. Marginalists, meanwhile, had a different view

of the market's operation than either the classical economists or the new political economists. For them, both the factors of production market and the final goods market were interrelated and unified by consumer preference: the free consumer market of individual utility maximisers determined the realm of the economic. This emphasis on consumption distinguished marginalists from both classical and new-school economists who, employing Ricardian models, differentiated between input and output markets. For the latter, extra-market forces in the form of social classes limited market determination on the factor, or input, side. Marginalism, then, extended the determining power of the market, shifting focus from production to consumption, from supply to demand, and, most importantly, from relations between classes of people to relations between people and goods. In the process a new law of value was defined, based upon subjective consumer preference, to displace the labour theory of value.(1)

Richard Ely's Elementary Principles of Economics, first published in 1904 and used as an economics text at MAC, was informed by marginalism while retaining a residual historical perspective. Theory was central to Elementary Principles, but Ely prefaced the theoretical with an historical account intended to illustrate the historical basis of contemporary conditions and institutions. He argued that fundamental ideas and institutions such as

private property, the right to establish business enterprises, and personal freedom, considered by some to be virtually natural phenomena, needed to be understood as historical creations. The purpose of economics for Ely was "to study analytically the process by which he [man] gets his living to-day, remembering that the process depends on certain fundamental conditions, and that these conditions have their roots far in the past."(2)

The analysis began with consumption, which, governed by diminishing utility, marginal utility and demand, furnished the motive for production. A utility was anything which satisfied human want, marginal utility was the utility of the last good acquired or consumed before shifting consumption to some other good or commodity, and the law of diminishing utility stated that decreasing a stock of goods meant decreasing the utility per unit of the stock. Demand governed this process in that consumer choices were determined by the amount of the surplus of utility over cost; that is to say, individual consumers in the market attempted to maximise their utilities relative to price. It was market demand, then, that caused people to produce, and production was nothing more nor less than the creation of utilities through the application of mental and physical power to the physical universe.(3)

This application of power was called labour. Labour constituted one of the factors of production, while land

(the physical universe) and capital (those intermediate products of the combination of land and labour which were used for further production) were the two other factors. Land and labour were primary and original factors of production, while capital was secondary or derived. Capital accumulation resulted from production over and above what was necessary in the present, postponement of consumption, and saving surplus product to employ in future production. The application of capital resulted in a more efficient combination of land and labour.(4)

Consumption guided production through utility preference, then, and production was sustained by the application of labour to land through the medium of capital. But it was the mechanism of exchange which was at the heart of Ely's economic theory: it was exchange which constituted the market, bringing supply into contact with demand, and it was exchange which constituted value. The term "value" had two meanings: subjective value and objective (or exchange) value. The former referred to the economic importance of a commodity unit to the one valuing it; the latter was a value ratio determined by comparing various subjective values with one another. In practice, exchange took place (and exchange values were established) in the market, which was simply the meeting of two or more minds entertaining different subjective values. Price was exchange value expressed in terms of money. It was fixed at the equilibrium between the

subjective valuations of buyers and sellers. What was called market value was the price in any market at a given time, while normal value was an ideal towards which market values tended, standing at the point where marginal cost (the cost of production of the marginal producer) equalled marginal utility.(5)

Value and price, then, were constituted in a freely competitive market, governed by consumer demand for commodities. Income, meanwhile, was distributed among the three factors of production, and the entrepreneur who brought them together, according to both marginalist and non-marginalist processes.(6) Following Ricardo, Ely stated that rent (the return to land) was determined differentially "by the extent to which the given natural agent or the given use of the agent surpasses in productiveness the poorest natural agent of the same sort or the least profitable use of such a natural agent that society requires to meet its demands for the product."(7) In other words, rent was the difference in productivity between the most marginal land in production and a given piece of land, assuming the most efficient production possible in the particular circumstance. Interest--the reward for the use of capital--was determined by the relation between the supply of capital and the demand for it. The demand for capital depended upon its marginal productivity: capital received in interest an amount equal to the value it produced at the margin. The

supply of capital was dependent upon its cost of production; that is, the sacrifice the marginal saver or investor must undergo in postponing consumption. In a departure from marginalist categories Ely maintained that wages--the return to labour--were determined by bargaining, but within limits fixed by the product of labour and the costs of subsistence. The product of labour referred to the product of industry minus rent, interest, and profits. Finally, profit referred to the differential return due to the ability or efficiency of the entrepreneur. It was the surplus left after the payment of wages, rent, and interest, but not including "extra personal gains" which arose from monopoly or from chance. Ely ventured that profit, in fact, was similar to rent in the way it was constituted and determined. Both profit and rent were determined by differentials between marginal and superior land (in the case of rent) and entrepreneurial ability (in the case of profit). Hence it was possible to state that neither rent nor profit were <u>price determining</u> but, rather, both were <u>price determined</u>. Consequently, neither rent nor profit accounted for high commodity prices.(8)

The emergence of agricultural economics as a discipline represented the subordination of farm management and agronomy to economics in North American post-secondary education. It also marked the triumph of bourgeois economics in the analysis of family farming. Drawing on classical

economics, North American agricultural economists described the production and distribution of agricultural wealth in terms of a theory which assumed a triad of classes, namely landlord, capitalist, and labourer. The relevant factors of production--land, labour, capital (and management)--were identified, and the division of agricultural income was described in terms of rent, wages, interest, and profit. Furthermore, the historical approach in American economics produced a context within which a state regulatory role in the area of prices and marketing could be discussed. And marginal utility theory completely shifted the analytical focus from production to consumption and exchange, thereby giving the commodity producing household an equal standing with the capitalist firm in the economy. The early agricultural economists followed economists such as Ely in the theoretical categories they employed. They differed in the extent to which the analysis of agricultural economics required a greater emphasis on management and market regulation.

"Value," wrote Henry Taylor in Principles of Agricultural Economics, "is at the bottom of all our considerations in agricultural economics.... What we are needing as farmers is to learn how to adjust ourselves to price forces."(9) And what constituted value? According to T.N. Carver "value" meant exchange value, and it was determined on the basis of consumer want: "A concrete

individual article...has value only because it is wanted; and the more it is wanted in comparison with other things, the more value it will have."(10) Furthermore, every unit of a large supply of a given commodity was less wanted than each unit of a small supply because of the satiability of wants. As Carver said, this simply meant that if you gave a man all he wanted of a certain thing he would not want any more; the more his wants were satisfied, the less intense his desire would become. Price, which was regulated by the forces determining demand and the conditions affecting supply, was simply the monetary standard through which value was expressed.(11) The impact of demand and price in agriculture is illustrated in Robert Murchie and Henry Grant's Unused Lands in Manitoba.(12) They noted that a favourable agricultural price level between 1916 and 1920 brought marginal lands into production, but with the price deflation of the early twenties a considerable amount of marginal land was abandoned. In order for these "unused lands" to be resettled, according to Murchie and Grant, farmers had to build a buffer against the impact of the market by becoming more self-sufficient: "[t]he farmer needs to know a bit of gardening, fruit growing, dairying, stock raising, etc., if he is to perform the tasks involved in self and family maintenance."(13) Conrad Hammar, meanwhile, in a background paper for Unused Lands, invoked the concepts of "elasticity" and "inelasticity" to argue that market

demand could solely guide resettlement if production was adjusted accordingly:

> The demand for wheat...is inelastic and the amount taken from the market varies within comparatively narrow limits under ordinary conditions of supply. The price of such products, however, vary very widely, a shortage inducing a great rise in prices and a surplus a great fall. For products, the demand for which is elastic, on the other hand, the price changes due to changes in quantity supplied, are much less wide.(14)

In order to counter the effects of the dramatic price fluctuations associated with products such as wheat, then, commodities for which there was an elastic demand had to be produced on marginal land.

As Carver and Taylor revealed, agricultural production took place within this context of value and price. Carver began his analysis of the proper combination of the factors of agricultural production by positing the law of diminishing returns, whereby that which was produced on a given piece of land "does not vary in the same proportion as the labor and capital, increasing in proportion as they increase and decreasing in proportion as they decrease, but rather...the product increases and decreases less rapidly than these factors of production when the quantity of the factor, land, remains constant.."(15) On this basis he argued that labour and capital should be applied to land until the product of the last increment just covers the additional cost of capital and labour. Taylor, however, found this approach to be misconceived. He suggested

Carver's method was misleading "for the simple reason that maximum profits per acre is inconsistent with maximum profits per unit of managerial activity in all cases except that of the marginal entrepreneur who is assumed to make no profit."(16) That is to say, it took no account of the fact that the application of extra capital and labour required extra managerial activity, which meant it did not sufficiently account for the differential profits which accrued to the more efficient farm managers. According to Taylor, the application of capital and labour to land operated according to a law of increasing returns "until a point of constant returns has been reached, after which the law of diminishing returns per succeeding unit commences to operate."(17) The optimum proportional combination of factors varied from farm to farm and from season to season. But with the aid of cost accounting, farm managers were able to determine the most profitable use of labour and capital throughout the year:

> This principle, when applied to the application of labor and capital to land, will doubtless result in applying sometimes more and sometimes less, but usually less to a given area than is called for by Professor Carver's rule of applying more and more until the product attributable to the last increment is just enough to pay the cost of the increment of labor and capital.(18)

It followed, then, that the farm manager was crucial for an efficient agricultural production.

In their analysis of income distribution in agriculture both Carver and Taylor followed the broad model of classical

economics, with Taylor favouring a historical approach and Carver tending more to a marginalist method. In accounting for wage levels in agriculture Carver again invoked the law of diminishing returns, arguing that the demand and price for labour diminished as the number of units increased relative to the other factors of production. Successful farmers would "be hiring as many men as will, on the average, one season with another, produce a marginal product approximately equal to their wages. To hire more or fewer men would be to lose profits." Taylor, meanwhile, in a chapter entitled the "Human Factor" (which also contained his discussion of management), suggested that the differing physical, intellectual and moral qualities of men accounted for wage differentials.(19) There was more agreement on the question of interest, with Taylor invoking supply and demand to defend the rates charged by financial institutions and Carver explaining that interest accrued to the owner of capital equipment because of the service rendered by foregoing consumer goods in favour of capital investment. Similarly, in their respective discussions of rent, although Carver recorded some concern with Ricardo's differential theory, both agreed that rent was based upon marginal productivity. This meant the efficient farmer would apply labour and capital to land in such a way that the results of his superior ability would not be appropriated by the

landlord in the form of rent, but would accrue to the farmer in the form of profit.(20)

The category profit, and its companion category management, provided the fundamental link between agricultural economics and farm management as theoretical practices. "Farm management," wrote George Warren, "...may be defined as the science of the organization and management of a farm enterprise for the purpose of securing the greatest continuous profit." Farm management specialists, however, had a somewhat different interpretation of profit than did the agricultural economists. Although they arrived at basically the same conclusions, they took different routes. Agricultural economists, closely following classical-cum-neo-classical economics, defined profit as the difference between a farmer's gross income and the total of rent, interest, and wages, each accruing to the respective factors according to definite economic laws. In farm management, profit was determined through a simple cost accounting process. More importantly, though, it was considered to be part of labour income. By calculating the difference between farm expenses and farm receipts a farmer arrived at net farm income. His labour income was then determined by deducting from net farm income an amount equal to the interest on capital invested in the farm and an amount for unpaid family labour. This constituted his return for labour and for management. In some analyses

there was no further distinction drawn between wages and profits. In others, an amount equal to a hired man's wages was deducted, representing the farmer's return for labour, while the remainder was interpreted as net farm profit.(21)

The calculation of profit on the basis of farm management surveys provided the space to discuss cost of production formulae and state intervention as means to regulate the market and stabilise farm income, thereby linking discussions of individual enterprises with broader economic structures. Both farm management specialists and agricultural economists addressed this question. Henry Grant rejected price fixing by regulatory bodies in favour of the adaptation of producer practice to market forces. "The producer," wrote Grant, "must learn to curtail production at the proper time and...control it in the face of advancing prices" to guard against overproduction. Furthermore, commodity based producer organisations could bring supply into a closer relation with demand: "[s]uch an organisation which extends its control to both the marketing of the product and the amount produced is in a position to obtain the facts of demand, [and] it can ascertain just how much the market will absorb at a given price and advise the producers accordingly."(22) Henry Taylor, meanwhile, endorsed price regulation. He rejected a cost of production formula calculated according to cost accounts, however, proposing instead a programme based upon the alternative

market choices of farmers. In so doing Taylor admitted that the market was a less than adequate determinant of value in North American agriculture. Commissions and regulatory bodies were useful, then, in redressing "the unequal bargaining power of great distributing corporations on the one hand and...the isolated unorganized producers on the other."(23)

Subtle differences in the conception of profit should be understood in terms of the hierarchy of rural social science. Farm management was less theoretical than agricultural economics. This is evident in the organisation of texts. Although Carver's Principles was not purely theoretical, containing as it did chapters on historical development and social context, the book was organised in terms of "the factors of agricultural production" and "the distribution of agricultural income". Warren's Farm Management, meanwhile, had a much more practical and interpellative tone, with chapter titles such as "Shall I Be a Farmer", "Types of Farming", "Farm Records and Accounts", and "Choosing and Buying a Farm". While containing the agricultural economists' general categories, the farm management literature was addressed to farmers and their immediate problems. The distinctive factors of production were subordinated to the subjective unity of labour, management and capital in individual farmers. The task of agricultural economics was to deconstruct this unity to

reveal the economic unity beneath its surface. The task of farm management was to use this reality to mediate the reconstitution of the unity for individual farmers on individual farms.

II

The histories of bourgeois economics and of home economics are inextricably linked. Both areas of knowledge emerged from the same source during the transition to capitalism; that is, "domestic economy" or "rural economy". This political and economic discourse took household production, which was the main form of production in the early capitalist period, as its object of analysis. With the generalisation of the capitalist market, however, the production of wealth shifted to specialised work sites, and households became increasingly limited to private, reproductive units exclusively controlled by women. The ideology giving intellectual coherence to these practices changed in the process. On the one hand, by the nineteenth century a distinct body of political economy literature existed which focused on "the wealth of nations"--capitalist production and market exchange. On the other hand, and by the same period, domestic economy had become limited to the non-productive, non-market management of domestic formations, which were by then viewed as being separate from the "economy".(24)

Establishing the contours of what would later become home economics, mid-nineteenth century American household instruction manuals were constructed within this inheritance, and the more general ideological context of separate spheres. In the American Woman's Home (1869), for example, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Catharine Beecher offered an encyclopaedia of advice on how women could find meaning and fulfillment through the management of their allotted sphere. Paradoxically, however, fulfillment could only be achieved by adapting the private world of women to the public world of men. Although the spheres were separate, a systematic economy required a systematic household: men had to be well fed, well rested, and at their place of work at a specified time each day. An honourable and worthwhile housewifery, then, required a certain time discipline, orderly habits, and the general organisation of the household in accordance with the demands of the outside world. Although distinct from political economy, nineteenth century domestic economy was nevertheless responsive to and dependent upon it.(25)

When it emerged as a distinct discipline at the end of the nineteenth century, home economics turned explicitly to political economy for its organising categories. It ironically combined marginalism (which denied the significance of production in the formulation of value) with scientific management (which focused on the production

process). The various components of marginal utility theory--"an emphasis on demand rather than supply, a subjective theory of value to supplant labour-cost theories, an extension of the maximization principle from firms to households, [and] an interpretation of the consumer rather than the entrepreneur as the epitome of rational action," among others-- pointed to the consuming housewife as the archetypical economic actor.(26) Indeed, in Philip Wicksteed's classic exposition of marginalism, Common Sense of Political Economy, the homemaker was invoked to illustrate the universality of marginalist exchange:

> Whether our housewife is apportioning the stuffing of a goose at a table, or her housekeeping money in the market, or her time and attention between schemes for getting boarders and the more direct cultivation and furthering of the general tastes and interests of her life; and whether her husband is conducting family prayers, or posting up his books at the office, or weighing the advantages or disadvantages of a partial retirement from business...they and all the people they are concerned with are alike engaged in administering resources, in developing opportunities and choosing between alternatives.(27)

Home economists embraced the marginalist model of the economy, recasting the household as a business firm defined by its consumption and demand function in the market. They then turned to scientific management to rethink the internal management of the household.

Christine Frederick, the most important theorist of early home economics, appropriated a set of five principles from the "efficiency engineers" to frame her analysis of

domestic work and management. The first of these principles, ideals, was the guiding plan behind any business (profit in the capitalist enterprise). The second, standardised operations, conditions, and practices, referred to the establishment of standardised and definite conditions for workers to follow. The third, despatching and scheduling, was an extension of standardisation, whereby the when, how, and best order of work were determined. The fourth, reliable records, encompassed the maintenance of accurate information, budgets, and accounts. And the fifth, efficiency reward, referred to the benefits workers on the shop floor derived from scientific management (some of the monetary gains resulting from efficient work methods were shared with the workers, and the workers were happier when working efficiently). Efficiency engineers used these principles to guide their analysis and transformation of industrial workplaces. Frederick, and the home economists she influenced, believed the same principles could transform the domestic workplace as well. What, then, were these domestic categories?

To begin with, the home was conceived of as a business enterprise in this schema. As a business enterprise in a marginalist economy, the consuming household was the central determinant of value. Value and price, the cost of distribution, the marketing and advertising of products--indeed all economic activity--were ultimately decided by

demand strategies in individual households. The economic system was composed of a range of firms making rational decisions in response to market signals. And, if the system was to function efficiently, it was imperative that households act rationally in creating demand. As Frederick argued with respect to clothing material, irrational demand was the central impediment to an orderly textile market:

> The reason why clothing materials are so high is not because of tariff or high cost of manufacture--but because women are capricious and do not buy uniformly, and are swayed by hectic appeals or whims. If every manufacturer this moment knew within 15 percent just what and how, every woman would buy of the main supplies each year for three years, prices would come down with a thud, as much as 40 percent.(28)

Within the household firm, meanwhile, the various work areas were equivalent to the work environment of any artisanal or factory enterprise. In a chapter entitled "The Household Laboratory", for example, Martha Foote Crow wrote, "the kitchen should be a combination of laboratory, machine shop and studio. The work done there is just as complex as that!... The kitchen is not to be a place to which the housewife is condemned;...it is a laboratory where science has sway." But the farm household was even <u>more</u> of a business enterprise than other households since it was actually a site of market production. In non-farming occupations,

> the making and the keeping of the home, are a thing apart.... But with the wife of the farmer, the woman's laboratory-machine shop-studio is not a little room by itself; it is a dynamo from which

> goes out the power for the whole machinery; it is itself a piece of elaborate machinery without which the rest of the cogs and bands and phlanges would all go awry and break into pieces, doing damage to the whole farm-factory.(29)

In both its external relations with the market and its internal organisation, then, the domestic household was the equivalent of a capitalist firm.

But whereas the capitalist firm had profit as its goal, the household firm pursued specific familial ideals. These ideals varied between families, but generally they included the particular aims, tastes, and strivings of the family in question. One of the most important ideals in all families, of course, was the raising of children. "It should indeed be part of the ideal cherished in the depths of every country girl's heart," wrote Foote Crow in The American Country Girl, "that she will, if possible, make to the world a contribution of children." "To present a completed, full grown, thoroughly efficient man or woman to the world," she continued, "is a contribution to the world's storehouse of power."(30) Yet even such an apparently non-economic ideal as children had to be conceptualised using the categories of the firm and the market. For, as Frederick noted, children returned their own form of dividends:

> ...children can be looked on as "savings" or investment, and not as an expense. Healthy, efficient children represent a sentimental investment to their individual families; they are also the greatest social investment which can be made to the state and nation. We are just beginning to take this view as a community, that

> better babies, more sturdy and intelligent children, are investments to society.(31)

Raising children, and pursuing other family ideals, imposed a discipline on the enterprise which required the application of efficient management techniques.

In the organisation of household labour, standardisation oriented work towards time rather than the task, resulting in greater efficiency. Through the use of time-motion studies in cooking, cleaning, laundry and so on, both wasted time and the nervous fatigue caused by unsystematically jumping from one kind of work to another was eliminated. Furthermore, a standard practice for particular tasks could be devised, consisting of written instructions as to method and tools employed, the length of time the task should take, and the relationship of specific work processes to particular tools. Kitchen work, for example, was a series of interrelated processes involving, first, food preparation (collecting, preparing, cooking, and serving), and second, clearing away of dishes (removal, scraping, washing, and putting away). These processes could be standardised in such a way that each one was done exactly the same at each meal, with tools arranged to correspond with each step, taking a minimum amount of time and requiring minimal mental activity.(32) One of the main accomplishments of the factory was the breakdown of artisanal task orientation and its replacement by time

discipline; home economists were convinced a similar transformation could occur in the home.

With specific tasks standardised, all household work could be planned. This was the problem which despatching and scheduling addressed: "how to plan and work out a schedule of all tasks; how to relate work and apportion it so that it shall progress smoothly with as little interruption as possible." The order of work was determined, and then the time at which particular tasks were done was decided. Mental labour preceded manual labour in that, first, the absolute conditions around which the schedule must centre--meals, for example--were determined, and second, the order of regular daily tasks was decided on the basis of what worked best in a particular home. One possible morning schedule was to "wash all the breakfast dishes, straighten the kitchen, and start some cooking for lunch before going upstairs to make the beds..., [while another was] to merely put away food and scrape the dishes, proceed to making the beds, doing light cleaning, and return to start lunch later, doing breakfast and lunch dishes together." The best plan for a particular household depended upon which was most time efficient in a given situation. Once a daily routine was established, weekly and special tasks could be fitted into a schedule. The purpose of the schedule was to prevent the "piling up" of tasks which resulted from poor planning. "Without a schedule it

too frequently happens that the worker allows an unexpected piece of work to interrupt and confuse her entire day." With planning, the unexpected could be easily fitted into the schedule. And finally, the scheduling of tasks had to include the scheduling of regular rest periods. As in other labour, the household schedule "should provide a short 'rest period' in the forenoon and a longer one in the afternoon."(33)

The household firm was linked with the external world through the purchases it made, and, according to Frederick, the key to efficient purchasing was knowledge. "It took manual labour and skill to supply...[family needs] fifty years ago;" she wrote, "but it takes more thought and intelligence to purchase...by wise expenditure at the present day." In the case of food, for example, one needed to know how much value different foods possessed. In The Cost of Food, Ellen Richards showed that a variety of factors entered into the determination of cost. Seed, land rent, fertilizer, labour, machinery, interest on invested capital, waste due to rainy or dry seasons, market preparation, and the time and labour cost involved in table preparation all affected the eventual cost of food. An efficient consumption of any commodity, then, required a thorough knowledge of production and marketing costs. But efficient consumption was based upon knowledge of the difference between value and price. "Prices may fluctuate

because of economic conditions," claimed Frederick, "but the value of an article can be fixed only in the consumer's mind." The distinction was crucial because on it hinged the health of the marketplace. By purchasing on the basis of value rather than price, consumers told manufacturers that they were willing to pay a standard price for quality merchandise, and they would not support unethical manufacturers who peddled an inferior product. "It is the largest manufacturers of standard, well advertised articles," Frederick suggested,

> who are on the right side of the food fence, and who are working with the housewife for better food conditions.... The housewife must support the best manufacturers if she wants to encourage reliability, honesty, and purity in manufactured food products.(34)

Budgets and accounts both completed and co-ordinated the overall management system of the household. "It is necessary," wrote Frederick, "at the outset of running any business--to keep records of income received and income expended." Accounting stripped the emotional, unarticulated veneer off family relations to reveal and to elaborate the real calculations upon which they were based. After discussing one particluar budgetary scheme, which included three separate accounts--"The Man's Personal Account", "The Woman's Personal Account", and "The Family Account"--Foote Crow suggested that such an arrangement allowed family members to view all budgetary questions "in the abstract, pure from every selfish impulse..., freed from prejudice,

and in the dry light of reason." For Frederick, though, any system which was based upon an allowance for the household manager was unacceptable:

> I regard running the home as I regard running any business--with the wage earner as senior partner and the homemaker as junior partner.... [But] I cannot imagine any business in which the senior partner would hand the junior partner (sic) and say, "Here, John, is some money; get some togs with it."(35)

An accounting problem peculiar to the domestic firm was how to "place a value upon the labor of the house administrator." As much as one wanted "the mother in the home to be the final unmerchantable thing there", her labour had to be valorised if accurate accounts were to be kept:

> ...where work is done by the woman administrator that a house servant, if one were employed, would be doing and would be paid for doing, the woman administrator, the mother in her function of housekeeper, should be paid in money at commercial rates for those services; and this should be accurately recorded day by day and week by week and taken full account of in the budget.

And furthermore, in the case of farm households, it was desirable that produce and goods which came from the farm rather than the market be entered in the accounts "at market prices, as if they...[came] from butcher and grocer." "This," Foote Crow said, "is the normal, systematic and efficient thing to do."(36)

For domestic labour, greater efficiency resulted in more leisure time; indeed, it meant the creation of leisure in the home. Just as the application of industrial processes to artisanal production in factories produced a

division between work and leisure, a parallel application in the household yielded similar results. Furthermore, just as male working class leisure was a problem for bourgeois society, the newly found leisure of homemakers represented new ideological terrain. Scientific management separated the manual or physical area of homemaking into a discrete domain (the "mechanics of living", according to Frederick), leaving "three other and far more important ends of homemaking": providing a home atmosphere for husband and children; the homemaker's own physical, mental and spiritual development as a woman; and sharing in the larger home of community and nation.(37) By paying more attention to a husband's business, enhancing a child's cultural opportunities, taking one's values into the community, or developing and continuing cultural interests of one's own, women made effective use of their leisure time. But domestic labour, unlike industrial labour which did not control the work process, had both the power to construct a division between work and leisure and the responsibility to use leisure time wisely. The construction of that division, in the pursuit of a family ideal, was inherent in the definition of the household as a business enterprise. The wise use of that time involved close attention to the non-manual, non-physical aspects of the reproduction of the family both within the household and in society.

III

The ideological role of rural sociology was determined by both the place of sociology in North American social science and the relationship of rural sociology to sociology and agricultural economics. The specific form that sociology took as an academic discipline was determined by the earlier claim of economics to an area of social knowledge and the disagreement among sociologists as to how extensive their claim to expertise should be. As academic sociology took form in the 1890s, there were two visions of its place in social science. One foresaw sociology becoming a coordinating discipline which would synthesise the findings of economics, politics and jurisprudence to devise general laws in the tradition of Comte and Spencer. The other approach proposed that sociology organise basic social data and identify initial social principles which the specialised disciplines could then develop. Not surprisingly, sociologists came under attack, especially from economists, for their claim to be engaged in either a fundamental or synthetic exercise. Throughout the decade or so after 1895, sociologists, in reaction to this criticism, slowly refined their approach to focus on the social group and ideological community, and to rely less on grand evolutionary schemes.(38)

Rural sociology was constituted as part of the sociological rejection of classical political economy and

the sociology that had been built upon it. Paralleling Ely's work in economics, sociologists such as Lester Ward, Albion Small and Edward Ross constructed an alternative vision of society to rival the organicist, evolutionary and laissez-faire approach of Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism. This new sociology accepted Spencer's naturalistic method--the observatory technique and the amassing of data in the tradition of Darwin--but turned it in a different direction. Whereas Spencer and the Spencerians perceived the social world as natural, governed by identifiable laws, and therefore beyond human intervention, Ward and his colleagues considered society to be unnatural and requiring human guidance. In this new view of the social world, a naturalistic methodology could be used, not to identify social laws, but to identify social problems which could be addressed through social policy. The central social problem (expressed through studies of crime, delinquency, poverty, and immigration) was the discovery, study, and maintenance of moral or ideological community.(39)

Charles Ellwood's Sociology and Modern Social Problems (1910), used in sociology courses at MAC, was a representative text of the new sociology. Sociology and Modern Social Problems was theoretically structured according to five categories: the origin of society; the process of social development; a theory of social order; a

theory of social progress; and the nature of society. In rejecting both contractual and organic interpretations, Ellwood argued that society originated spontaneously out of the fundamental necessities of the life process, namely reproduction and the procurement of food. Sexual reproduction and parental care gave rise to the family which, in turn, was the basis of all regulatory and moral institutions. Indeed the family had a central role in society's institutional apparatus. Ellwood dichotomised human collectivities in terms of voluntary and involuntary groups, where the former were purposive (parties, trade unions, corporations) while the latter were what he called natural, community groupings (family, neighbourhood, the city, the nation); primary (intimate, personal, face-to-face relationships: family, neighbourhood) and secondary (not necessarily face-to-face relationships: state, political party) groups; and, finally, institutional (sanctioned by the larger community: family, property, church, school) and non-institutional (unsanctioned, voluntarist formations for which no examples were given). In this constellation the family was unique in being both a primary, involuntary group and an institution. Moreover, it was the chief primary group since it controlled the birth and rearing of children, and it was the most important institution because, by involving a close association of both sexes and all ages, it was a microcosm of the problem of human relations--the

"social problem". Furthermore, the family represented the link between the biological and the social in human society: it was through the family that the ultimate control of natural processes by mental processes was exercised.(40)

Social development and social change proceeded via adaptation and readaptation in relations between individuals. Social order entailed a settled and harmonious relationship among individuals or groups in society, and the problem of social order was the problem of maintaining this harmony. Order was maintained through the conscious exertion of social control. Institutions of control included government, law, religion, morality, and education. In complex societies, however, the most important of these were the latter three. Government and law, being repressive mechanisms of control, did "not go deep enough to secure a type of social order which is adequate for modern social life."(41) And of religion, morality and education, education was the most effective mechanism of control because it controlled the formation of habit and character in individuals. Moreover, education was best suited to securing a <u>progressive</u> social order because it adapted the young to society before they fully participated in it. And what constituted progress? Those changes "which secure a more harmonious adjustment of individuals to one another and a better adaptation of social groups to the requirements of their existence" were progressive. In this text, then,

social life was ultimately "a psychical process, not, to be sure, in the sense that it is purely subjective, but in the sense that its significant and controlling elements are mental."(42)

It was as a subdiscipline of the new sociology that rural sociology was constituted as a distinct area of enquiry. The theoretical structure which governed the analysis of rural society in this approach contained three elements or procedures: establishing a specifically rural domain in sociology; defining the problems in the domain; and identifying the mechanisms through which the problems could be solved and rural people could enter the ideological community. A close reading of John Gillette's Constructive Rural Sociology and some of Robert Murchie's Manitoba studies reveals how this structure operated in actual texts.

The domain of rural sociology was established primarily through the classification of communities. In his delineation of associational forms, Ellwood suggested that those natural groupings (family, neighbourhood, city, state) which he termed involuntary groups were usually called communities and, more importantly, sociology was the study of community problems.(43) In establishing a claim for an area of study, rural sociologists distinguished the distinctive characteristics of rural communities. Gillette drew a distinction between urban and rural communities on the basis of factors such as population, function,

associational life, and "the density of group living". He then classified four types of rural communities: a "pure agricultural" type, based upon established, specialised agricultural production; a "mixed agricultural" type based upon established, generalised production; frontier communities; and backward communities. It was noted, however, that all rural communities were primarily or completely agricultural, close to nature, sparsely populated, and socially homogeneous.(44)

Murchie, following Gillette, used the survey method to define the rural domain and to establish the parameters of community. In the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, geographic community was determined on the basis of municipal borders.(45) Beyond this, various questionnaires specified the social phenomena under scrutiny, which were population, religious organisation, schools, and the attitudes of farm people to rural institutions. And in the Unused Lands survey, population, national types, rural organisations, and social services were identified in constituting an area of study.(46)

Defining the problems in rural society meant conceiving of it as an area of human intervention amenable to change through social organisation, and identifying the socially integrative and disintegrative elements in a community. Gillette presented the social domain as an interdependent network in which the conditions of farm people were

determined by factors beyond their immediate control, but which could be affected through organisation. Thus social analysts (and farm folk themselves) had to recognise and cultivate the rural capacity for social action. Indeed, Gillette understood this in class terms:

> We are coming to a recognition that the farmers as such are a distinct and organic class in the national and international social mechanism, occupying a distinct place, having specific functions, with rights to obtain and defend, possessing characteristics by which they may be defined, and holding certain interests in common which constitutes (sic) a basis on which they may rise to class consciousness.(47)

But the purpose of this class agency was to ensure rural participation in the broader community, rather than to transform social relations. Agency presupposed an impetus to action, however. The impetus in this instance was the necessity of integrating rural society into an harmonious social order. What were deemed to be problems, then, were those institutions which were failing to perform this important task.

In Gillette's sociology people entered ideological community, and institutions facilitated that entry, through socialisation. "The socialisation of a community," he wrote, "involves revolutionising its citizens' minds to its institutions and utilities."(48) To socialise an institution was to reconstruct it and make it amenable to the uses society demanded. The specific subordination of the individual and the local to the social proceeded through

a number of avenues. Schools became social centres for the community and they became relevant to scientific agriculture and scientific homemaking. Churches began to act as social centres and as stimuli for rural improvements. Transportation and communication were improved to overcome rural isolation and put the country in touch with urban centres. Women's clubs helped keep the home in contact with the larger society so that women--"the great social factor"--were able to institute the reforms necessary for a better community and social life.(49) Through these avenues and others, rural people became more conscious of their sociability, became more amenable to social control, and, crucially, became active and willing participants in their adaptation to a broader social milieu.

In Murchie's work, problems were defined and solutions were proffered through an assessment of educational, economic, religious, and social conditions. In the case of the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, the positive and negative features of the community were delineated. Community leadership was considered a problem in Turtle Mountain in that, although there was leadership in specific areas, there was little wider community leadership "which is of such value in uniting the people in movements for rural betterment."(50) Localism, parochialism, and opposition to reform were deemed to be problems. Activities which built community spirit and contributed to a sense of social unity

were deemed socially progressive. Co-operative activity was progressive, and hence an ideologically cohesive factor, when it was broadly based. In Turtle Mountain co-operation was still largely economic, whereas in Swan River (and most other areas of rural Manitoba) it had moved beyond economics, fostering community spirit:

> The most striking thing, perhaps, in rural Manitoba for the student of sociology is the growing feeling of solidarity.... Especially is Swan River remarkable in this regard: co-operative enterprises...take the form ...of beef rings, livestock associations, farmers' elevators, co-operative stores, Boys and Girls' clubs, Home Economics societies, consolidated schools, and union Sunday schools.... These co-operative endeavors are the best index to the social mind.(51)

In Unused Lands, marginal areas of the province which had not been integrated into the larger society were identified. Those lands which were adjacent to settled and stable regions were deemed to be the best areas for the formation of stable communities.

In "The Place of Play in the Country", which appeared in the Grain Growers' Guide in 1923, Murchie showed how a problem was identified and a solution was posed in one specific issue affecting rural communities. In this piece Murchie identified both an immediate and a more general problem. The immediate problem was the presence of professional players on community sports teams. The general problem was the development of the social instinct, the creation of community spirit, and the making of good

citizens. The first problem was a manifestation of the second in that properly directed recreation was essential in building good citizenship, community spirit, and the social instinct. "Play in man and animals," Murchie wrote, "is an instinct that has served and does serve the purpose of education. By play we learn the business of life."(52) It was necessary, then, for rural communities to ensure there was ample opportunity for their members to participate in sports and recreation. Especially with the passage of the pioneer stage and the loss of the neighbourly spirit, it was argued, the recreational side of life needed to be organised, and the most important aspect of organisation was the development of competent leadership and direction. There was a role for the professional or expert here (in the form of a school teacher, school inspector, or other such "community leader", not the professional sportsman), "but his role is to demonstrate and teach, to organize and to supervise, not to play our games for us while we roast or freeze on the sidelines."(53) To illustrate, Murchie referred to various community baseball leagues organised throughout Manitoba and to an Interlake school inspector's use of organised play to assimilate Ukrainian children and youth. Recreation, in this text, was an integral part of the rural problem and its resolution. With the development of a more market oriented agriculture, it was implied, a division between work and leisure had emerged and, with it,

the growth of a sports players labour market. Although neither of these market incursions was deemed to be a fundamental challenge to rural communities in this analysis, both created problems because they affected a community's ability to reproduce itself under changing conditions.

As a theoretical ideology, then, rural sociology was an investigatory discipline that conceived of rural society as a field requiring active intervention. Problems were identified and solutions were offered in order to ensure that rural people were part of the ideological community.

IV

In defining their terrain, rural sociologists included the "rural school problem" as an issue that required social intervention. Given the nature of their enterprise--to identify problems in every area of rural society--this was hardly surprising. In reality, however, this particular aspect of rural sociology's domain was formed as much by educational as by sociological discourse. For at the same time that post-Spencerian sociology was developing in North America, what has variously been described as social education, progressive education, and new education was becoming established in educational theory and pedagogical practice across North America and Europe. Associated with names such as Pestalozzi and Froebel in Europe, Dewey and Hall in the United States, and (pedagogically, if not

theoretically) MacDonald and Robertson in Canada, this "movement" had a substantial impact on the organisation of knowledge in school systems in general and rural schools in particular.

New education was composed of two essential components: a shift in focus from formal curriculum to the child and adolescent, and a curricular shift from classical to practical and scientific training. Both of these were the result of developments in educational theory that ranged from late eighteenth century European thought through to the emerging discipline of psychology in America at the turn of the twentieth century. Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827) viewed the child as a unity of moral, physical and intellectual powers, believing that education should involve all of a child's faculties. Teachers, he felt, should adapt instruction to the individual child so that these natural powers could be allowed free expression. In its actual practice, instruction involved the observation of actual items and natural objects rather than books and reading. Friedrich Froebel (working in the mid-nineteenth century) accepted Pestalozzi's conception of, and respect for, the child, arguing that children should be allowed to develop through free self and group activity. In formulating his notion of kindergarten and positing the significance of play in child development, Froebel argued that teachers should act as surrogate mothers, seeking to reproduce a feminine,

familial atmosphere within the classroom. And G. Stanley Hall, writing at the end of the century, drew on Darwin and evolutionism in proposing his general psychonomic law as a means of theorising child development and, thereby, constructing the new psychological category of adolescence. This law, also known as recapitulation, held that human beings, in their individual development, recapitulated the evolutionary development of the species; this meant that physical life and individual behaviour went through clearly identifiable stages with each requiring special attention. What was especially new with Hall, in his three volume study Adolescence, was his identification (now viewed as part of an historical invention) of particular characteristics of youth which required special care, protection and, most importantly, their removal from adult life. For pedagogy, all of this meant that educational systems needed to be judged on the basis of their adjustment to the perceived natural growth of individuals through the life-stages.(54)

If Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Hall (among others) established the foundations of new education, it was John Dewey who systematised thought in the area and gave it philosophical coherence. Dewey's primary contribution was to discuss education in terms of pragmatism and post-Spencerian social science. With the latter, Dewey developed a social conception of the mind and a view that education was essentially a social process. He attacked both idealism

and realism for their individualism, arguing instead that mind and thought were the result of an active self interacting with an active social environment. Education had to recognise and reflect this relationship by viewing the child as an active being with impulses to communicate, create and investigate. The school, ultimately, had to be a social institution providing optimal conditions for the realisation of social goals in this view. Pragmatism allowed Dewey to conceive of thinking as essentially an exercise in problem solving. Rather than mind discipline (classical humanism) or the reception of pre-established truths (rationalism), thought involved the application of the scientific method to problems in his philosophy. Education, therefore, had to involve students in situations where they solved problems of intrinsic interest to them. Students, that is, had to be both thinking and doing, or, more accurately, thinking <u>by</u> doing.(55)

The new rural education was part of new education <u>and</u> the rural social discourse which linked agricultural economics, rural sociology, and home economics. Institutionally it connected educational departments with agricultural colleges, provincial and state extension services, and the federal departments of agriculture. More importantly, though, it structured the circulation of educational ideology among rural people and rural ideology among children and youth. How, then, was the new rural

education constituted? First, it was continuous with the rest of rural social science. The problematic of rural sociology was adapted to the educational milieu, and the categories of agricultural economics and home economics informed its construction. Second, the categories of new education and rural social science were combined to produce an understanding of rural society in which the educational played a significant role and rural children and youth acquired identities through these categories. There were three elements in the constitution of rural education: establishing education as part of the rural social domain; identifying the problems of rural education; and solving the rural school problem.

The first element consisted of three stages: establishing the existence of a social domain; conceiving education as part of it; and declaring an independence for education in that domain. Through this process education and educational systems were rendered areas of enquiry, and it became possible to generate and dicuss social facts about education. The first stage merely involved an appropriation of social scientific categories, while in the second stage these categories were applied to education. The growth of literature on rural education in the first two decades of the twentieth century was itself an indication of efforts to consider the place of education in rural society. But how did it actually proceed? In Albert Leake's <u>The Means and</u>

Methods of Agricultural Education (1915), the need to train the young "in the science and art of modern industries and professions" was the departure point for a text organised in terms of education as a social phenomenon. One chapter on the historical development of agricultural education, and another on the conditions of rural life, introduced a more detailed survey of specific areas and issues in rural education. From a discussion of various levels in the system (elementary to college) through consolidation and rural school extension (clubs and short courses) to teacher training and the special needs of women, rural schooling and agricultural education were cast as social questions demanding social answers.(56) In Rural Schools in Canada (1913), meanwhile, J.C. Miller assessed the relation of Canadian educational systems to rural education in terms of administration and financing, teachers, courses of study, attendance, and the role of agricultural departments and agricultural colleges. He also analysed the inspection and supervision of rural school systems, utilising extensive questionnaires sent to inspectors across the country to survey working conditions, professional improvement, inspection methods, duties, and patterns of appointment. Analytical methods and survey techniques gleaned from the social sciences framed Miller's investigation.(57)

In the third stage of this process the significance of specifically educational issues were noted. In James

Robertson's Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, for example, the forms of social analysis were given a content derived from the new pedagogy: the special needs and importance of children and youth in socialisation; the role of practical training in the socialisation of the young; and the significance of educational institutions in the wider socialisation of rural people.(58) Form and content were then linked in the second and third elements of rural education.(59)

The second element was placing the problems of education in the context of the broader rural social problem. "The problem to be considered," Leake proclaimed in his introduction, "is how the agricultural land may be made to produce an adequate food supply for the rapidly growing population, while at the same time provision is made for such social and educational advantages as will induce the best of our country people to remain in the open country." Within these general contours, five subordinate problems were specified: developing a system of education suited to local conditions and to the everyday experiences of country children; adapting the education of boys and girls, fourteen to nineteen, to productive efficiency in agriculture and homemaking; giving serious consideration to the farm home; teaching sound business methods and scientific principles of farm management; and revitalising and redirecting country life. These problems, in turn, were

situated within the "conditions of rural life", namely the shift in population to the city caused by the introduction of machinery and the lack of opportunities in the country.(60) Rural education, then, as a distinct issue, was deemed to be in need of reform as part of the larger problem of rural society.

Methodologically, significant facts were generated in identifying the empirical validity of a rural school problem, and judgements were made on the basis of these facts. The "facts" of declining enrolment, poorly paid and poorly qualified teachers, inadequate management, curricula unsuited to the needs of rural people, and a generally poorer quality of education in the country than in the city were produced. These facts were then interpreted using the categories of rural social science and educational theory. In the Royal Commission report, for example, the fact of rural population loss was presented, accompanied by four "undisputed" causal factors: the use of improved machinery; better education opportunities in towns; the freer circulation of money in the towns; and the attractiveness to young people of the amusements and excitement of town life. This was followed by four reasons why population should stay in the country: rural life created racial virility; agriculture created wealth without causing soil exhaustion; farming was a basis for national prosperity; and the cost of living in cities was a pressing problem. It was then

posited that, whatever the movement of population, rural communities "are entitled to and must have education suited to the needs of all their members."(61)

The third and final element in rural education was the actual solution of the rural school problem. It was argued that education should and must perform a socialising and social control function, easing rural people--especially children and youth--into the ideological community. Once identified, then, the rural school problem required human intervention on a variety of fronts.

In the analysis offered by Robertson and the other commissioners, permanent teachers were needed in rural schools so they could be integral parts of the community, and the ideal agricultural teacher was a farmer with high community status. The practical courses in agriculture and homemaking, while important in transmitting needed skills, performed the useful function of preparing people for life in a rural community and developing good citizenship: "[the spirit and habit of good citizenship] may best [be] accomplished by the student participating in forms of activity which are part of the social life of the community and of the social and intellectual life of the school as an institution." The ideal school would become as much of a total institution for children and adolescents as possible. Their recreation would be brought increasingly under control, informed by an appreciation for rural life as both

a buffer against the lure of the city and a further promotion of rural citizenship. At the specific level of practical pedagogy, children and adolescents would be trained in scientific reasoning and its application in their daily affairs. They would learn, said the commissioners, habits of observation, practical abilities from trial and experience, the habit of seeking empirical information, and "habits of forming reasoned judgements and opinions upon situations, conditions, theories, principles and methods of farm work and management."(62)

J.C. Miller considered organisational and administrative reforms to be necessary in solving the rural school problem. He used his detailed study to recommend changes which would improve the production and delivery of education in rural areas. In a chapter entitled "Agricultural Departments and Agricultural Colleges", for example, Miller described and analysed the relationships among agricultural colleges, agricultural departments, and departments of education. In so doing he prescribed an ideal articulation between the agricultural and the educational. In his mind these three areas, each of which contributed in its own way to rural education, needed to be more closely co-ordinated. Miller noted that, historically, agricultural departments were solely concerned with the commercial aspects of the agricultural industry, but departmental work in agricultural education was becoming

more extensive (aid to Farmers' and Women's Institutes, for example). The most significant governmental work in the area of agricultural education was being done in the agricultural colleges, however. The organisation, extension, and diffusion of agricultural knowledge were undertaken in these institutions. Provincial departments of education, meanwhile, were connected to agricultural departments and agricultural colleges through programmes to train rural teachers in agriculture. Intellectuals in these various institutions were implored to co-operate in devising new publications and other media to serve those people who were no longer in school. It was especially important, he felt, to reach those young people who were between twelve and eighteen years of age through the adaptation of institutions and curricula to their special needs.(63)

According to Leake, the first step in solving the problem was improving the conditions of the rural school. Increased funding was necessary; thus, community members had to see the school as a profitable investment, efficiently creating a valuable product. Highly qualified (especially male) teachers were needed, and they could only be attracted by better salaries and other inducements. Material equipment had to be improved, and one method of doing this was to arrange community buildings in an educational block or community centre. "Here," he wrote,

> could be grouped the school, surrounded by ample grounds and gardens, the residence for the

> shoolmaster and his family, the church, the public assembly and music hall, the park, the athletic grounds, the skating rink, the co-operative creamery, the cheese factory, the bakery and the like.

Most importantly, though, the size of the administrative unit had to be enlarged through consolidation. The consolidation of schools--the basic element in the "complete reorganization of country life"--meant, ultimately, the consolidation of neighbourhoods: "what before consolidation were two or three separate neighborhoods become one strong organized community...." Community was then reinforced through vocational training in agriculture and home economics. Practical education fulfilled the goals of both the new pedagogy and the new social analysis. Pedagogically it connected the school with real life, trained students to acquire information for themselves, and cultivated active rather than reflective instincts. Socially it created a dutiful regard for "industry in general", fostered a respect for farm and home occupations, and served as a means of keeping boys and girls on the farm.(64)

As an object of knowledge, rural social reality was structured according to these areas of analysis. Although related, the economic, domestic, the social, and the educational were defined as discrete domains, each employing slightly different analytical categories. Between them, a composite problematic of rural society was defined. It was

in practical ideology, however, that these theoretical ideologies connected with actual human subjects to form social identities. At the practical level, the disciplinary boundaries dissolved into the subjective unity of individual farm men, women and young people.

---

1. This account is based upon E. Roll, A History of Economic Thought, chapters VII,VIII,IX; J. Dorfman, "The Role of the German Historical School in American Economic Thought," American Economic Association, Proceedings (1955); J.B. Clark, The Distribution of Wealth (New York, 1924), "Preface" and "Table of Contents"; M. Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington, 1975), passim.; G. Therborn, Science, Class and Society (London, 1976), chapter 2; B. Rowthorn, "Neo-Classicism, Neo-Ricardianism and Marxism," New Left Review 86 (July-August, 1974); B. Fine, Economic Theory and Ideology (London, 1980), chapter 7; C.D.W. Goodwin, "Marginalism Moves to the New World" in R. Black, A.W. Coats and C.D.W. Goodwin, The Marginal Revolution in Economics (Durham, 1973).
2. R. Ely and G.R. Wicker, Elementary Principles of Economics (New York, 1904), p. 107.
3. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, Part I.
4. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, Part II.
5. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, Part III.
6. Ely made a point of distinguishing between income accruing to individuals and income accruing to the factors of production, arguing that the task of economics was to explain the latter. The fact that individual capitalists or individual workers receive particular incomes was the subject of considerations beyond economics, and therefore of little concern to the economist. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, p. 356.
7. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, p. 375.
8. Ely and Wicker, Elementary Principles, p. 433.
9. H. Taylor, Principles of Agricultural Economics (New York, 1919), p. 31.
10. T.N. Carver, Principles of Rural Economics (Boston, 1911), p. 290.
11. Taylor, Principles, chapter III; Carver, Principles, pp. 290-292.
12. In May of 1926 Premier John Bracken asked R.W. Murchie to prepare "an inventory of the unused lands within the

Province, with a view to developing a more effective programme for the settling of such of these lands as are suitable for agriculture." Bracken envisioned, and Murchie produced (with the assistance of Henry Grant and others), a survey of the acreage of unused lands, the suitability of the land for farming purposes, the location of different parcels of land, the types of farming best suited to the various districts, and the economic and social conditions in the respective areas. Bracken also asked that the report contain recommendations for "more economical production and more efficient marketing of farm products, as well as the further development of rural community life." In this chapter we analyse the economic and social sections of Unused Lands of Manitoba in order to illustrate how Manitoba rural social scientists employed the categories of their disciplines in their empirical studies. Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), John Bracken Papers, Box 130, File 1449, "Bracken to Murchie, 15 May 1926"; John Bracken Papers, Box 9, File 93, "Murchie to Bracken, 14 July 1926" and "Unoccupied Land Survey"; R.W. Murchie and H.C. Grant, Unused Lands of Manitoba (Winnipeg, 1926).

13. Murchie and Grant, Unused Lands of Manitoba, p. 34.
14. C.H. Hammar, "Economic Recommendations," pp. 2-3, in PAM, John Bracken Papers, Box 130, File 1449. In his marginal notes to Hammar's manuscript, Murchie described this approach as betraying Hammar's American bias, perhaps because Hammar chose oranges as his example of an elastic commodity. It is probable that the sociologist Murchie actually mistrusted Hammar's economic bias. No doubt Henry Grant had less difficulty with the analysis.
15. Carver, Principles, p. 179.
16. Taylor's review of Carver, Principles, in American Economic Review 2 (September, 1912), p. 622.
17. Taylor, Principles, pp. 153-154.
18. Taylor's review of Carver, Principles, pp. 623-624.
19. Carver, Principles, p. 295; Taylor, Principles, chapter X.
20. Taylor, Principles, pp. 213, 244-245; Carver, Principles, pp. 314, 296-301. "One special difficulty with the differential theory of rent...is that the same piece of land is worth different sums to different men.... [T]he same acre of land is worth a great deal more to a highly skilled scientific farmer than it is to a shiftless, unbusinesslike farmer." Carver, p.300.
21. Henry Grant argued that a "management charge" should be included in farm expenses. Hence his definition of net farm profit was any income left after deducting from receipts all expenses (including management), interest on capital, an amount for unpaid family labour, and a

return for the operator's labour. Profit, therefore, became a completely residual category bearing no direct relation to management or other factors of production.: University of Manitoba (UM) Archives, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, Box 3, H.C. Grant, "A Detailed Study of the Economic Factors Affecting the Productivity of Crops and Livestock in Thirty Manitoba Farms," p. 62; Warren, Farm Management, p. 15; Carver, Principles, p. 315; W.J. Spillman, "The Farmer's Income," and E.H. Thomson, "Profits That Farmers Receive," in T.N. Carver, ed., Selected Readings in Rural Economics (New York, 1916).

22. Grant, "A Detailed Study of the Economic Factors," p. 94.
23. Taylor, Principles, p. 488.
24. E. Fox-Genovese, "The Ideological Basis of Domestic Economy," in E. Fox-Genovese and E. Genovese, The Fruits of Merchant Capital (New York and Oxford, 1982), chapter 11; K. Tribe, Land, Labour and Economic Discourse (London, 1978), chapters 3 and 4.
25. S. Strasser, Never Done: A History of American Housework (New York, 1982), chapter 10; K. Kish Sklar, Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity (New Haven, 1973).
26. Therborn, Science, Class and Society, p. 99.
27. P. Wicksteed, Common Sense of Political Economy (London, 1933), v. I, p. 159: quoted in Therborn, p. 110.
28. C. Frederick, The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management (New York, 1912), p. 225; see also E. Richards, The Cost of Living (New York, 1899); Richards, The Cost of Food (New York, 1901); Richards, The Cost of Shelter (New York, 1905).
29. M. Foote Crow, The American Country Girl (New York, 1915; reprint 1974), pp. 137, 222.
30. Foote Crow, The American Country Girl, p. 214.
31. Frederick, Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home (Chicago, 1915), p. 282
32. Frederick, Household Engineering, pp. 19-21, 96, 150-155, 176.
33. Frederick, Household Engineering, pp. 65-69; Frederick, The New Housekeeping, chapter 5.
34. Frederick, The New Housekeeping, pp. 103-104, 110-111; Richards, The Cost of Food, pp. 7-8; Frederick, Household Engineering, p. 319.
35. Foote Crow, The American Country Girl, p. 223; Frederick, The New Housekeeping, pp. 118, 121, 123.
36. Foote Crow, The American Country Girl, pp. 224-226.
37. Frederick, Household Engineering, p. 505.
38. Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity, chapter 12.
39. S. Fine, Laissez Faire and the General Welfare State (Ann Arbor, 1964), chapter VIII; H. and J. Schwendinger, The Sociologists of the Chair (New York, 1974); A.

Oberschall, "The Institutionalization of American Sociology," in Oberschall, ed., The Establishment of Empirical Sociology (New York, 1972). The discipline of sociology, as Therborn has suggested, became committed to the strengthening of ideological cohesion: "...the central sociological contribution to a scientific discourse on society (whatever its value)...has essentially consisted in the discovery and study of the ideological community--i.e. community of values and norms--in human aggregates of various types and sizes. In the practical application of its theory, sociology has characteristically demanded a commitment to the stregthening of some such sort of ideological community. Originating as a successor to traditional political philosophy, sociology thus became in many ways a modern, sceintifically oriented equivalent to theology and moral philosophy--an investigatory rather than a dogmatic guardian of the ideological community." Therborn, Science, Class and Society, pp. 224-225: emphasis in the original.

40. C. Ellwood, Sociology and Modern Social Problems (New York, 1910), chapter IV, pp. 388-391.
41. Ellwood, Sociology, p. 397.
42. Ellwood, Sociology, pp. 400, 406.
43. Ellwood, Sociology, p. 76.
44. J. Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology (New York, 1913), chapters II and III.
45. The Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, conducted by the Social Service Council of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, were part of a larger programme of church sponsored social surveys of urban and rural areas. This social gospel commitment to the resolution of social problems was an example of the influence of sociological thinking among progressive churchpeople. Here we analyse the surveys in order to illustrate how Murchie, as the main author of the surveys and a Manitoba rural social scientist, employed sociological categories in his empirical work. R. Allen, The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28 (Toronto, 1973), pp. 12-13.
46. Swan River: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life (Winnipeg, 1914); Turtle Mountain: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life (Winnipeg, 1914); Murchie and Grant, Unused Lands of Manitoba, pp. 46-59; Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology, chapter XVIII, "The Rural Social Survey".
47. J. Gillette, "Nature of the Rural Social Problem," Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota 2 (April, 1912), p. 256.
48. Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology, p. 185.
49. Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology, p. 204 and chapters XIII and XIV generally.

50. Turtle Mountain, p. 24.
51. Swan River, p. 17.
52. R. Murchie, "The Place of Play in the Country," Grain Growers' Guide 9 May 1923, p. 597.
53. Murchie, "The Place of Play," p. 618.
54. L. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York, 1961), pp. 101-105; R.F. Butts and L. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York, 1953), pp. 380-382; C. Steedman, "'The Mother Made Conscious': The Historical Development of a Primary School Pedagogy," History Workshop Journal 20 (Autumn, 1985); J. Kett, Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present (New York, 1977), pp. 217-221; D. Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972, pp. 207-221.
55. Butts and Cremin, A History of Education, pp. 382-386; Cremin, The Transformation of the School, pp. 115-126.
56. A. Leake, The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education (New York, 1915), p. xv and "Table of Contents".
57. J.C. Miller, Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision (New York, 1913).
58. The Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education was established by Wilfrid Laurier's government in 1910 to enquire into the "needs and present equipment of...Canada respecting industrial training and technical education, and into the systems and methods of technical instruction obtaining in other countries." James Robertson, the chair of the commission, had been active in the new education movement for many years prior to his appointment, most notably in his activities with William Macdonald between 1899 and 1910. As Neil Sutherland has suggested, the report which Robertson and his colleagues wrote "was far more than a narrow study of industrial training and technical education.... [I]ts comments and recommendations made the report into a blueprint for the implementation in Canada of the 'new' education." In our analysis, therefore, we treat the royal commission report as a significant and representative text in the new (and rural) educational movement and the new (and rural) educational discourse. N. Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth Century Consensus (Toronto, 1976), pp. 198-201.
59. Dominion of Canada Sessional Papers (CSP) , Number 191d (1913).
60. Leake, The Means and Methods, p. xxii.
61. CSP, Number 191d (1913), pp. 39-40.
62. CSP, Number 191d (1913), pp. 43-44.
63. Miller, Rural Schools in Canada, chapter IX.

64. Leake, The Means and Methods, pp. 58, 84, 95, 82-83.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE PRACTICAL CONSTITUTION OF DOMINANT AGRARIAN IDEOLOGY

The dominant gender and class identities of early twentieth century Manitoba farm people were forged within the categories of theoretical ideology described in the previous chapter. In the practical ideology of the period ideal images of farm women, men, and young people were constructed. By the 1920s, when the rural social sciences were firmly established at MAC and the Extension Service was in place, a coherent language existed to address farm people as economic and social subjects. In the case of women and men, composite images were created around their economic activities in the farm enterprise and their social activities in the family and in the rural community. The farm man was, first of all, an efficient producer applying scientific methods learned, for the most part, through formal educational processes. Second, he was a market participant who adjusted his production and organised his enterprise according to the market. Third, he was a family head and community member who built a stable environment for his farm and home. The farm woman was a consumer and part-time market producer, a household manager and worker, and a subordinate business partner in her family and in the farm enterprise. In the rural community, meanwhile, she was a social housekeeper who had a duty to protect the farm family by co-operating with other women to solve social problems.

For both women and men these various components produced professional identities: the professional farm homemaker on the one hand, and the professional farmer on the other. Images of farm youth as economic and social subjects active in the market and communities were constituted in this ideology as well, but young people were also viewed as being special agents in the general socialisation and revitalisation of rural life. This chapter sketches the contours of these images, suggesting what the various agrarian identities were in this discourse.

I

In 1920 the Grain Growers' Guide published an advertisement for Seager Wheeler's Profitable Grain Growing and John Bracken's Crop Production in Western Canada, presenting the two authors as the agricultural equivalent of efficiency engineers in industry. Suggesting that the engineer "must combine the latest science and the most workable practice and apply them to solve the problems he meets", the advertisement offered the farmers of Western Canada the hire of Wheeler and Bracken for $3.00 for life.(1) Although explicit use of the language of industrial efficiency was peculiar to the post-war years, the knowledge/production equation was common throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Speakers and participants in the farmers' institute meetings of the 1890s

drew the connection closely, particularly in discussions of the depression in the early years of the decade.(2) The "Better Farming Trains" in 1912-14, sponsored by the railways and conducted by the agricultural college, were designed to introduce farmers to better agricultural technique in the interests of increasing production.(3) And, generally, discussions of agricultural education from the late nineties through the war years began with the premise that the most important factor in an enhanced productivity was for Manitoba farmers to have greater access to agricultural advice.(4)

A particular type of farmer was most successful in translating agricultural knowledge into a more productive and efficient farm. This special type was practically oriented, accepting the limits of nature while becoming a general expert in the various fields which bore upon agrarian life. He approached his work systematically, drawing upon scientific innovations while retaining past wisdom. Scientific farming, according to The Farmers' Advocate, was "simply farming in harmony with the laws which the great Architect...has implanted in the soil, the air, the plants, and animals...." Within this cosmic context, the successful farmer was a botanist in his knowledge of plant life, an architect or engineer in constructing a barn, an entomologist in combatting insects, and so forth across the many fields of agricultural knowledge.(5) Similarly,

the Central Farmers' Institute in the 1890s conceived of the progressive farmer as one not brilliant but possessing common sense and good judgement, not highly educated but well informed, and not having great esteem but self-confidence.(6) With the systematisation of knowledge in the agricultural college, this image of the producer became more tightly organised, yet the basic elements remained. In the curricular reorganisation of 1919-20, the notion of the general expert was invoked to justify and explain the diversified Diploma Programme in Agriculture. "The typical farmer," it said, "is his own engineer, his own manager and worker, his own carpenter, and sometimes his own veterinary surgeon."(7)

While a systematic and general expertise could be partially built through received wisdom, the truly successful farmer was responsive to literature and thereby accepted the importance of formal education. Farmers had to accept the leadership of the colleges, institutes, and extension service by reading and utilising their products. The editor of The Farmers' Advocate told the MAC constituency in 1915 that farm prosperity was based upon brainwork, meaning "the study of every available publication...dealing with agriculture, the sorting out of information suitable for the farm and utilizing it in a definite system of farming."(8) This, in fact, was old advice which had been offered for the previous twenty-five

years in Manitoba. In the institute approach, as we have seen, farmers presented papers using bulletins, books, and agricultural newspapers as source material.(9) That method was never truly effective in reaching the "less progressive" farmer, however. The Extension Service was designed to overcome this problem, but even a well organised lecturer's programme faced many of the difficulties of the institute approach. In 1913 E. Ward Jones of MAC lamented that many Manitoba farmers did not take advantage of the educational material available to them, suggesting "these men...do not often attend agricultural meetings, and, if they do attend, they make little effort to grasp the material being presented." For Jones the solution lay in the "up-to-date farmer", who attended meetings, carrying the message to his less progressive neighbours by example.(10) Two years later this role was largely appropriated with the initial appointment of district representatives who would work directly with farmers, combining scientific education with practical training.(11)

Competition was an important element in the construction of an efficient agricultural producer. In the nineteenth century the agricultural society fair (basically a livestock show) and plowing matches were the main media of producer competition. But after the turn of the century, with the expansion of grain growing and the establishment of the Extension Service, Manitoba farmers were able to

participate in various competitions, ranging from the traditional ones to summerfallow competitions and seed fairs. And all the competitions had a common purpose: to improve agricultural technique and increase efficiency through friendly rivalry and the raising of community production standards. In the case of the plowing match, the model for other field competitions, the language used to legitimise it invoked science; through science, people's lives were improved in their home and community. By a simple enhancement of agricultural technique the plowing match produced better profits, an enthusiasm for farm life, and a happier home. On a less modest though no less important scale, the seed grain and livestock fairs reproduced the market by serving as a meeting place for buyers and sellers.(12)

For his place in the market, the farmer acquired a sense of himself as an agricultural businessman. The categories generated in economics and agricultural economics--profit, demand, supply, production, consumption and so forth--were used here to address producers as economic actors. Farm men were identified first as producers <u>in</u> the market and second as businessmen <u>of</u> the market. The producer in the market had to understand its mechanisms and adjust his production to its demands. More importantly, though, the producer had to become part of the market as a manager and an entrepreneur. As an entrepreneur

he participated in the wider economic world; as a manager he organised his enterprise in conformity with that world.

The first and most general element in a producer's market identity was a recognition of the dynamics of capitalism as an international system. In a representative text which appeared in the Guide during 1924, for example, Henry Grant sought to correct certain misconceptions concerning the economic situation of the day. He wanted to show farmers that the depression through which they were suffering was not peculiar to their own country nor was it a unique historical event. "It seems hardly creditable," wrote Grant, "that we should be so ignorant of world affairs as to believe that present conditions are the result of some inherent weakness in our own country." Rather, farmers "should realize that periods of depression and progress have an inevitable habit of recurring, and that from now on, the advent of good times should breed sane conservatism, and the arrival of depression bring fortitude and faith." And Grant went so far as to suggest that the farm man truly became a business man through his entry into the world market:

> The western farmer now realizes that he must produce for the world. He is no longer the slave of pioneer restrictions and rustic conventions. It exalts a man to be made a part of a world system, and the wholesomeness of great relations is meaning that the indolent, passive, vegetative farmer is giving place to the virile strenuous man.(13)

More specifically, the various components of the economy were conveyed in the agricultural economics courses taught

at MAC. College examination papers suggested that such things as the role of supply and demand in agriculture(14), the importance of the gold standard(15), the advantages of the North American method of marketing grain crops (and the role of "middlemen" in that system)(16), the positive features of banking in a community(17), and the place of capital and labour in the economy(18) were important themes.

The farmer of the market was a manager pursuing profit in his combination of land, labour, and capital, and an entrepreneur maximising returns through different marketing strategies. The ideal farm manager viewed his farm as a firm functioning in a competitive marketplace. In the 1908 "Agronomy" examination at MAC students were presented with the following question:

> Supposing you, on April 1st 1908 assumed the management of a farm of 640 acres that had not been managed previously at a profit, but which was considered to have the necessary equipment to make it pay. What important features would you at once consider, and why?(19)

When farm management became a distinct offering in the MAC agricultural economics curriculum in 1913, Warren's Farm Management (1911) was the text. In that and subsequent years (1913-1917) farm management students studied the organisation and management of a farm business, the various types of farming, farm size and the investment of capital in the enterprise, and the organisation of labour on the farm.(20) In examinations during that period students were asked, for example, to "[e]xplain fully how you determine

the 'Labor Income' of a given farm. a) Is there any relation between size of farm and Labor Income; or b) the amount of Capital invested in the Farm and Labor Income."(21) In later years these topics were supplemented by farmstead planning and, more importantly, assessments of farm management surveys and interpretations of survey results.(22)

The survey method, as we noted in chapter four, played a significant part in the development of cost accounting in North American farm management. Farm managers used farm management surveys to determine farm profitability. "It should be recognized," Alva Benton wrote in 1919,

> that the chief value of a farm management survey lies not so much in determining the actual income of farmers as in determining the principal factors which influence the profits secured. The amount of income that farmers make in any given locality varies from year to year with the crop yields received, and with the prevailing prices for farm products, but each year under the same conditions some farmers succeed better than others because their system of management takes into account factors entering into profitable farming.(23)

Accounting was part of MAC's farm management courses from 1913 onward. In examinations during March of 1914 students were asked, first, to give "a concise plan for keeping the farm records and accounts" and, second, "[h]ow would you proceed to introduce a system of cost accounting in order to determine the standing of different enterprises?"(24) By 1916, the agricultural economics curriculum included a separate "Farm Business and Accounting" course in which the

"general principles of business, the use of commercial paper...[and] systems of cost accounting and records" were taught.(25) Students who wrote the "Farm Accounts" examination in 1919 were asked "[w]hat records are necessary to find the profit or loss on a certain crop or livestock enterprise?" They were also asked to calculate "the Labor Income of a farmer from the following data: Average inventory, $25,000; Total receipts, $3,000; Total expenses, $1,000; rate of interest, 5%."(26)

The entrepreneurial farmer actively participated in the market, pursuing various marketing strategies for his grain and livestock. Marketing courses at MAC taught agricultural students how to understand the market and participate fully in it. The first specifically marketing course offered at the college, in 1912-13, included the following topics:

> How the price is affected by supply and demand, by communication, transportation, competition, exportation and visible supply. The inspection of grain in accordance with the Manitoba Grain Act. Sample markets; systems of marketing grain.

"This course," it was noted, "will include a visit to the Grain Exchange, the grain inspector's office and the flour, oatmeal and linseed oil mills." "Principles of Marketing", offered in 1925-26, involved "analyses of market functions, marketing channels and marketing agencies with special reference to storing, grading and market financing of farm products."(27) In the examinations set for marketing

courses, students were asked to identify the components of the grain trade, as in this example from 1915:

> a) Define the following terms as applied to the speculative wheat market: "Bull Speculator"; "Bear Speculator"; "Long" and "Short"; and "Put" and "Call";
> b) What is meant by "cash" or "spot" wheat.

Or, they were asked to solve marketing problems like those contained in the following scenario:

> Mr. J.R. Dutton of Gilbert Plains shipped to his own order at Port Arthur one car of wheat weighing 60,000 pounds, which graded No. 1 Northern with a dockage of 1%. The car arrived at Fort William on September 15th and the grain was stored in the terminal elevator until October 30th, when he sold it through the Grain Growers' Grain Company for $1.00 per bushel. The freight rate from Gilbert Plains to Fort William is 15 cents per 100 pounds. Interest rate is 6%.
> a) What amount did he pay for storage?
> b) What amount did he pay the CNR?
> c) On the form provided make out the account sales rendered to Mr. Dutton by the Grain Growers' Grain Company.(28)

As the reference to the Grain Growers' Grain Company in the above quote suggests, co-operation was an important marketing option for farmers. By 1914-15, co-operative marketing was being taught as a component of agricultural economics and, in the "Rural Economics" courses offered after 1916, the subject of agricultural co-operation ("its history, co-operative legislation, formation of co-operative organisations, scope of agricultural co-operation") accounted for about one-third of the subject matter.(29) By 1925-26, there was a separate "Principles of Co-operation" course involving an "intensive study of motives, methods of

organisation and business management of co-operative associations. In examinations during the fall of 1925, students were asked to "[s]tate and explain the two general groups of co-operative organization from the standpoint of form of organization followed" and to "[d]iscuss the results of overenthusiastic and extravagant claims."(30)

As a 1925 extension bulletin illustrates, however, the subject of co-operative marketing was constrained within acceptable limits in this discourse. In his introduction to the bulletin, John Bracken wrote:

> To those who are starting in co-operative enterprise, it should be emphasized that co-operation of itself carries with it no miraculous solution for our problems of marketing: we must produce what the market demands and produce more efficiently than our competitors. Producer organizations, whether co-operative or otherwise, cannot evade the laws of economics and business. They can do a great deal, however, towards standardizing production, eliminating wastes in marketing, and providing new markets.

In the main text of the bulletin, Henry Grant enumerated the benefits which would accrue from adopting co-operative methods, notably efficient action in the market and the construction of a market mentality. The four "Possibilities of Co-operative Marketing" that he listed were "1. Standardizing and improving education, 2. Regulating the flow to market, 3. Improving the distribution between markets, 4. Developing new markets." Much less important was the development of co-operative ideals. The seventh and last item in a list entitled "What should a co-operative

member do?" was "Develop an intelligent understanding of the meaning of co-operation", well below "Eliminate excess varieties and improve his products" and "Make intelligent use of market information."(31) Hence, co-operation was a marketing option which the market-wise farmer could use in pursuit of a better return on his investment.

But the farm was something more than a capitalist firm; it was also the material foundation of family and home. The farmer had to operate his farm as a business while using it to construct a family environment. The task of providing material support for the family was accomplished by being a good farmer. So the farmer who produced efficiently, and managed his farm as a business, was serving his family well. But the creation and maintenance of a solid family environment was a more difficult process. Physically, it meant organising an attractive farmstead. An ideal farmstead included a treelined avenue from the main road directly to the house, a shelterbelt on the north and west, a lawn inside the shelterbelt and around the house, beds of flowers, and a space "for such enjoyable summer games as tennis, croquet, and like pastimes." Such a comfortable and pleasant environment provided a context for "father and mother, sisters and brothers [to] gather together." By making the home "magnetic and attractive" in this way, the farm man did his duty to family and community.(32) In his domestic relationship, meanwhile, he treated his wife as a

partner in the farm, leaving her alone to manage her own department in the enterprise. The "only way that seems to work out in terms of cash profit for both of them," Margaret Phillips argued in 1923, "is when certain departments of the farm are called John's and Mary's and each carries the responsibility of seeing that work is accomplished." In this vision, the traditional patriarch gave way to the benevolent patriarch. He was still firmly in control but in a managerial rather than a paternal sense. On the traditional farm, "John plans and bosses everything and Mary just does the jobs he assigns her", but on the properly managed farm:

> the independent Mary will tell John that while he can boss all the broad acres and plant them to his own joy and wisdom, she craves a few square feet to dig and delve all her own way, and, if she so desires, plant acorns and peanuts without interference.

Just like horses in a tandem team, "John may lead the load, but Mary surely does her share of the pulling."(33)

To complement his private face as a benevolent patriarch, the first component of a farm man's public face was service to the community through active participation in community organisations. Community service meant breaking down individual, familial, and rural isolation in the interests of a broader community and rural stability. So, the farm man, in the interests of non-sectarianism and community wide endeavour, became active in agricultural

societies, farmers' institutes, grain growers' associations, UFM clubs, and similar groups.

Descriptions of two community movements which developed in the late teens and early twenties convey this vision of service. The first, consisting of community clubs, took form in the immediate post-war period under the auspices of the Social Service Council of Manitoba. Its purpose was to organise whole communities--grain growers' associations, business groups, churches--"to put on a program of community activities through which life in the country may become more wholesome, more attractive, and more complete."(34) The second, called the district builder movement, was formed in the face of southwestern Manitoba crop failures in the twenties. Those involved in the movement saw the solution to the "unprofitability" of farming as residing in pan-community activity. The organisational method used was to form committees of farmer-experts (farmers who had made a financial success of their own farms) who then shared their expertise with their neighbours. In this way, solutions were forged in the community, "directed toward community betterment" and drawing upon "the inspirational forces which every community possesses", while simplistic analyses which blamed the banks, the tariff, the grain trade or the railways for people's woes were rejected.(35) The man who participated in these organisations, in whatever capacity, was performing a service to his community.

The ideal farm man played a leadership role in his community. The MAC graduate, in particular, bore a great deal of responsibility for rural leadership. To begin with, he was specifically trained for this task through the "rural leadership" courses which were part of the rural sociology curriculum by 1919. In these courses, he studied "some of the practical problems of rural life in Western Canada...[and the] methods of redirecting rural social life...."(36) After graduation, if he chose to farm, he returned to his own or another rural district prepared to socialise the community (in the sociological sense discussed in chapter four):

> By his words and deeds he should spiritually, morally and economically help his less fortunate brother.... An agricultural student, having studied rural sociology,... can and should perform a great work in his rural district by the organization of boys' and girls' clubs, agricultural meetings, dramatic and other social organizations.(37)

He and other farm men were taught how to establish rural values and better farming through the MAC short courses.(38) If he did not choose farming as his vocation, there were many other opportunities in rural leadership open to the "college man". These included:

> ...teaching or supervising the teaching of agriculture; scientific investigations...in government stations; rural landscape improvement; agricultural experts or county agents; agricultural police duty, including inspectors of all sorts; organization of co-operative societies; agricultural advisers in employ of railways, chambers of commerce, etc.; representative of commercial organizations, i.e., farm machinery,

> canning industries, dairy supply houses; rural YMCA work; [and] rural civic improvement.(39)

The enlightened rural man could, through effective leadership, facilitate the construction of community.

Effective rural leadership yielded the co-operative rural citizen. The "redirection of social life" or the "socialization of rural communities" meant imbuing rural areas with a spirit of co-operation. As rural people were drawn out of their isolation and into associations, they learned to be co-operative. "Associational life," John Gillette wrote, "is desirable for social solidarity: local pride and community devotion must be to small communities what patriotism is to nations." And, G.W. Fiske added, "the greatest need of the rural community is co-operation.... Success in business co-operation can lead to plans for social co-operation...in home, church, [and] school."(40) According to the author of a MAC extension bulletin that addressed the issue of Boys' and Girls' Clubs, "the best results will be accomplished only when the whole community, including the churches, homes and the various farmers' and women's organizations, co-operate with the school in lending dignity and sympathy to the movement."(41) And, Professor T.J. Harrison of MAC claimed, the solution to rural social problems depended upon two things: "...co-operative or community movements among farmers, and...the co-operation of the community with the government and rural leaders."(42)

To co-operate was to overcome social divisiveness in the interests of a wider harmony.

The image of professionalism was constantly invoked in this ideology. It was used to construct a status for farmers in which they identified themselves as equal to traditional middle class professionals, notably doctors and lawyers. The professional farmer was a perfect combination of efficient producer and manager, the skilful market player, and the solid family and community man.

The first and major aspect of any profession was a body of exclusive knowledge that was acquired through specialised training. MAC, especially in the Agriculture Diploma Programme, was the training ground for Manitoba farmers. Just like other professional students, the agriculture student studied a varied curriculum of specialised courses. He learned the precise details of crop and livestock production, proper methods of farm management and marketing, and a systematic approach to rural leadership and community betterment. Upon graduation, students were "practical, intelligent successful farmers, and good citizens" with the skills required to make a positive contribution to rural life; furthermore, they had acquired the scientific knowledge and the business ability to engage in the increasingly complex "business of farming".(43) The farmer who was to succeed needed this training, and the farmer who lacked it was something less than a professional. The

proponents and defenders of agricultural education, who were often faced with a sceptical farming population, invoked professionalism in their defense. In addressing the UFM convention in 1925, for example, Professor C. Hopper of MAC made the following argument:

> ...farming is an important business and is a difficult business. I think you will admit that in both these respects it will measure up with the business of the lawyer, the banker or the teacher.... Theory and practical experience alike point to the same conclusion, such a life business as farming requires and abundantly repays special training bestowed upon it. The man who contends that a good education is not helpful in farming is hurting his own profession.(44)

If, on the one hand, farming was to prove its social worth or, on the other, farmers were to weather the vagaries of uncertain markets and an uncaring nature, the farm man had to embark upon a programme of special training and, in the process, become professionalised.

The true professional had the best livestock, crops, machinery and seed, kept a well maintained farmstead, made regular improvements to roads and fences, and followed an enlightened yet cost effective management plan. Professionalism meant "good farming", that is, and the good farming competition was designed to reward farmers who set a professional standard in their community. Based upon the assumption that agriculture was a permanent profession, the competition judged and assessed the various components of an operation with a view to rewarding the farmer who transcended the mere acquisition of wealth, exuding an air

of stability and longevity.(45) Furthermore, the fact that farmers had to master so many areas of endeavour was an indication of their professional status. "It should be evident to all," wrote Fiske in Challenge of the Country,

> that agriculture today is thoroughly scientific when rightly practiced, which is simply saying that the practice of the new agriculture is a profession. It is among the most difficult and highly technical of all professions. No profession, with the possible exception of medicine, has a broader scientific basis....(46)

Moreover, a failure to acquire scientific knowledge was deemed by some to be tantamount to unprofessional behaviour. "What would we think of a doctor," D.F. Wilson asked rhetorically in an 1893 plea for greater agricultural knowledge, "who knows as little of his profession as we do of ours?"(47)

The ideal farm man, then, identified with the professional and bourgeois elements in society. As an economic actor he was the same as any other businessman or entrepreneur with whom he shared the market, and as a social actor he had a status equal to that of any other man in the local or national community.

II

As the crucial actor in the economy, purchasing approximately three-quarters of all products bought for the home, the farm woman needed to be a trained and efficient consumer. She was the "purchasing agent" for her firm.

Whereas in the nineteenth century she had been a manufacturer, producing goods for her family, in the twentieth century she was the "director of consumption" who, according to one MAC graduate, "must select...from among goods made under the supervision of those more deeply interested in profits than in quality or usefulness." Hence, she had to be knowledgeable. The changes in modern industry had not relieved the housewife of the burden of supplying the needs of her family; rather, "in becoming the purchasing agent of her family and society she has larger responsibilities [than in the past] calling for trained intelligence, knowledge and constant vigilance."(48) As the following examination questions illustrate, that responsibility was great indeed. In the MAC course "Economics of the Household" (1918) students were asked, "In what ways may it be true that the housewife is responsible for the high cost of living?", while in the same course the following year they were asked, "In how far (sic) can an intelligent demand control the market?"(49) Hence, farm women learned the terrain of the marginalist economy, including the role of consumption, the effect of demand, and the relative value and merits of various manufactured products (trademarks, labels, etc.: "[e]very householder should remember that when companies...spend huge sums in advertising these goods, they are practically guaranteeing their quality.")(50) Furthermore, as a consumer she had a

responsibility for the well being of her community. If women sent their money out of the community "to build up large centres", as many did, it meant "deserted towns", "vacated farms", and a loss to the community of thousands of dollars. To neglect her responsibility and training was to be a poor mother, a poor wife, and a poor citizen.(51)

Farm women were not simply consumers, however. They also had a productive link to the market. Women continued to perform production functions on Manitoba farms well into the twentieth century, and many continue to perform some of the traditional functions to this day. But with the institutional expression of home economics in the first two decades of the century, this work became overlaid with the language of the new disciplines. From the mid-nineteenth century, a public forum for women's production existed in the form of horticultural shows at the agricultural society fairs, where women competitively displayed fruit, vegetables, canned and pickled products, and flowers. But, in a move that contributed to the formation of home economics societies around 1910, fairs came under attack as being out of touch with the needs of women. What eventually emerged was a system of fairs integrated with the extension service, in which production for domestic use was linked to production for market exchange.(52) In the home economics programme at MAC, courses were given instructing women in those aspects of the market that were of direct relevance to

them in their role as goods producers. In "Poultry", for example, home economics students heard lectures on the following subjects: "...artificial and natural incubation and brooding, feeding and rearing chickens; feed and care of ducks, geese and turkeys; poultry diseases; market eggs; marketing poultry products."(53)

As a manager, the ideal farm woman applied the rules of capitalist efficiency and scientific management to her household. She followed a business model in co-ordinating and combining her consumer and producer activities. In the area of budgets and accounts, for example, the Manitoba Department of Agriculture bulletin "Financing the Farm Home" addressed the woman in the home as a financial manager and household accountant. The text began by establishing the legitimacy of a woman's control over the area of household management. Via a discussion of various plans for disbursing the family income (drawn from Christine Frederick), women were described as equal partners with men. "When a man can trust his wife with his name, his honor, and to be the mother of his children, surely he can trust her to be an equal partner in the business of the home," proclaimed the bulletin's authors. The overall planning of the household budget fell to women and, as the household accountants, they, like accountants in other businesses, "keep a careful record of all money spent and all received, this being their only way of knowing whether the company is

running at a gain or a loss." The farm accountant had to calculate more than just monies spent and received; she also had to include in her accounts the exchange value of food and clothing used for domestic use, and the exchange value of the farm family's living accommodation:

> To arrive at an estimate of the cost of running a farm home, one must charge one's self with this produce. When the potatoes are put in the cellar in the fall, the whole quantity may be charged at one time. In the same way, when animals are killed for home consumption, record of their weight and value should be entered in the accounts. It is somewhat more difficult to deal with the milk and vegetables, but their value may be estimated and charged.... In the receipts column one should enter any cash received for produce sold and any received otherwise, and the value of home products consumed, and an estimated amount for rent.

Then, in her role as financial manager, the homemaker used her accounts from one year to budget for the next. But here she entered into discussions with the "senior partner" of the firm, planning a budget which he, she, and the other family members were able to follow.(54) All women experienced their activity as an extension of exchange relations in this ideology. Adopting a management system, of which household accounts were a significant part, meant applying a business perspective to the home and its place in the economy. And, in the specific case of farm women, the non-market goods production in which they were engaged was subordinated to exchange through their identity as accountants and managers.

In her relation to housework, the homemaker was addressed as the manager of the domestic labour process. According to Martha Foote Crow,

> the woman in the heart of the farmstead is her own route-clerk, and order-of-work clerk; she is her own instruction-card clerk, time-and-cost clerk, gang boss, speed boss, repair boss and inspector. All these and much more she must be in order to gain the effects of scientific management in that factory which is her home realm.

The household manager was responsible for transforming the traditional household, which had existed unchanged for centuries, into a home in step with the times. "If the wife of Julius Caesar could step into the home of the farm today," Mrs R. Whiteside wrote in 1922, "she would find nothing to confuse her, but if Julius Caesar were to come to the modern farm he would not be able to operate any one of the labor saving machines which have replaced old methods of farming." In one important area, for example, the manager could use Frederick's techniques to change the old, roomy, multipurpose farm kitchen into a small compact workspace with logically arranged equipment. Whiteside advised homemakers to "use the same intelligence in running the home that is necessary to make other great enterprises a success. Saving steps means saving time, strength, energy and health. It means comfort and enjoyment, thus lifting housework above drudgery."(55)

Equally important, though, the homemaker was addressed as a worker--specifically the efficient, disciplined, and

happy worker ideally created by scientific management--through her relation to housework and motherhood. The "Better Babies Movement" of the teens and twenties, for example, sought to create efficient and expert mothers through the organisation of conferences and baby shows in which women learned the correct processes of child care.(56) It was the MAC trained mother and housewife, however, who was the archetypical rural domestic worker. Her experiences were both a confirmation of the validity of household management and an example to other women. One college graduate pointed to her training in "House Planning" as having been invaluable in facilitating her domestic labour:

> The house well planned is the first thing to lighten housekeeping duties, and our little house, although small, has been planned to save steps, make the work easier, and there is no waste space. Had I embarked upon the adventure of marriage and housekeeping without some knowledge of house planning I should probably be working in a very unhandy, poorly planned house.

For another graduate, the college experience of "working in a well equipped kitchen or laundry with porcelain top tables and sinks, hot and cold water on tap, hardwood floors to clean, nice refrigerators, gas or electricity with which to cook, and stools to sit on at much of our work" gave her "higher ideals in life and a broader outlook":

> I have just been married three years.... I have a good sized house to keep, two men besides my husband to cook for, a little girl two years old and a baby five months. We have a lot of visitors and go out quite a bit ourselves. I do all the sewing for myself and my children so I never feel time dragging, but can keep up with each season's

> work, and am not often very tired mentally or physically.

Echoing these sentiments, Mrs. R. Clark suggested that the most valuable aspect of her training had to do with "the attitude of the worker in her home to her work. The student at the college is made to feel and understand that the work of making and keeping a home requires system, art, business ability, energy, perception for details, that it need not seem to be just a haphazard conglomeration of jobs."(57)

While her specific domain was in the home, the farm woman was part of a larger enterprise. Her work, and the approach she adopted to her work, contributed to the success or failure of the farm. Whereas it was required of men that they provide an environment for home building, a crucial component of the farm woman's identity was a clear understanding of her role as an intelligent and capable, though subordinate, partner in the farm. Partnership entailed managing her domain not simply as a small capitalist firm, but as the important department of a large firm. With the woman in her department and the man in his, both being as efficient as possible, "happiness and self-respect spur them on to greater labors and accomplishments, and love and sympathy...make a fine harness to help pull the load with joy."(58) The philosophy underlying MAC as an institution was in fact based upon this notion of partnership. Home economics complemented agriculture in the constitution of the symmetrical farm family. "With the

advance of agricultural training in any community," wrote the MAC administrators in 1920,

> comes the demand for scientific and practical education in the chief of all industries for women--that of homemaking.... [T]o fit young women of the Canadian West for the great work which devolves upon them in the development of the country, and to give them an intelligent working knowledge of those things which are vital in their work in the home, the course in Home Economics has been planned.

In this programme, instruction was given:

> ...in the fundamental principles and practice of domestic science, including the study of foods and cooking, the interior and exterior surroundings of the healthful home and its management; the health and general well being of its inmates; the study of textiles and fabrics; the making of women's and children's clothing and millinery; and also instruction in dairying, horticulture and poultry raising.(59)

The woman thus trained could take her place as a scientific homemaker alongside a scientific farmer, building a "better home" and a "better farm". "A real man's wife," wrote Esther Thompson in 1918, "must be something more than his housekeeper and mother of his children. She must be his companion--one who understands him and can fully enter into his life, giving sympathy and inspiration." Her nurturing, caring qualities had the effect of domesticating the pure pursuit of wealth in agriculture, transforming the farm from an economic to a familial and social unit.(60)

The farm woman's social identity was based upon her homemaking role and was expressed through male language and institutional models. As the custodian of the farm family,

she was propelled into community activity. But her experience in the home did not equip her for public discourse. She therefore relied upon the language and institutions used by men and designed for their purposes. The image of women in this ideology was constituted through the same categories as men--social co-operators and community leaders--but it was expressed through the ideology of homemaking. The ideal farm woman became a forceful and self-confident public actor, but within the limiting and subordinate roles of community homemaker and social housekeeper.

MAC trained farm women, and those farm women who participated in extension lectures and short courses, were expected to play community leadership roles. Both home economics and agriculture students were given instruction in rural leadership at the college, but for women this was supplemented by courses in the "History of Home Life" and "Social History" which taught the fundamental significance of family and home in historical development. "Women who have had the advantage of special training," wrote Nellie McClung in 1916, "have a heavy responsibility.... They must lead in new avenues, putting higher value on woman's work." As community leaders, farm women organised and facilitated various female and youth activities in their district, ensuring that stable families and homes were integral elements in an uplifted social life and a new rural

civilisation. Voluntary leadership provided a link between state institutions and specific communities, especially prior to the introduction (and in the absence) of home demonstration agents.(61)

By participating in Home Economics Societies and Women's Institutes, women not only learned household skills, but they also acquired a social identity. In the discussion following the presentation of papers at institute meetings, for example,

> [s]olutions would be found for many difficult problems now confronting many timid and shrinking women. Encouragement and sympathy would relieve the stress of many lonely situations. A better and therefore a higher knowledge of her sister-women would be gained, reflecting a warmer friendliness and deeper kinship with mankind.

Participants thus developed social skills "that were dormant, and as a result--they are better fitted for homemaking, motherhood and citizenship." And a social identity gave the homemaker the ability to create a truly home atmosphere for her family:

> There is more than manual labour to be done if there is to be a real home. The mother must radiate cheerfulness, hope, faith, and again faith. She must generate energy and emulation and perseverance. She must lead and yet appear to trail behind. <u>How shall she do all these without human association and interchange of ideas with her sisters</u>?(62)

Social co-operation for women meant working together to protect and enhance the home, while contributing womanly skills to the general stability of the community. Like male co-operation, it was directed towards breaking down

isolation and sectarianism in the interests of a wider community. When Mary Speechly arrived in Pilot Mound from England in 1902, for example, she encountered a social life which was organised around the churches, with little contact beyond one's church group and little contact between farm women and women in town. After it was launched in 1911, the Home Economics Society set about to overcome sectarian and partisan barriers, freeing people from the "petty ideas" separating neighbours, towns, and rural districts by "encouraging sociability among its members and...work[ing] for the social, moral and educational betterment of the home, the community and the nation."(63) In the Home Economics Societies and Women's Institutes, "a fine spirit of co-operation [was] aroused" as town women and farm women met and worked together. Furthermore, extension lecturers and home demonstration agents not only instructed girls and women "in dressmaking, millinery, cooking, etc.," but they also assisted them "in developing co-operative effort in connection with the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, Women's Institutes, United Farm Women, etc." Through their collective endeavours and the guidance of the extension service, women built "better homes, better schools, better health, better roads, better farms, and better laws" in the societies and institutes.(64)

The co-operative activities of society and institute women ranged from community through provincial to national

concerns. In the local community, they sought improved school conditions, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, town rest rooms for farm women, community libraries, medical inspections and improved medical facilities generally. Money raised through teas, dinners, and catering community events such as plowing matches supported these activities. At the provincial level, rural women agitated for better conditions for "working girls", the Canadianisation of foreigners, support of the juvenile court (especially the appointment of female judges), film censorship, reformed dowry laws, and suffrage. Funds from community projects supported the Social Service Council, the Red Cross, the Prohibition Alliance, the Children's Aid and other charitable organisations. Farm women were most active nationally during the war years. The Home Economics Societies and sister organisations worked in the home to conserve food and in the community to raise funds for patriotic purposes in aid of the war effort. Rural women thereby came together as social housekeepers, submerging other conflicting and overlapping identities in a common womanhood seeking a common community. As the 1923 president of the Manitoba Women's Institutes expressed it, "[i]n the world there are all classes of women; in our Women's Institutes there is only one. There is no dividing line. We meet together that we may grow as citizens into finer womanhood."(65)

The professional farm woman was the composite consumer, domestic producer, household manager/worker, and community participant. Professionalism brought these individual, mundane components together, elevating their status. "How can a woman expect to be a proficient housekeeper or homemaker," Edith Charlton asked in 1907, "if she had no training along those lines which the profession includes?" The Home Economics programme at MAC served to train women professionally, transforming farm girls into farm homemakers:

> Housekeeping has been given a place among the professions, and to fit young women of the Canadian west for the great work which devolves upon them in the development of the country, and to give them an intelligent working knowledge of those things which are vital in their work in the home,...[the course in Home Economics is offered].

Thus women's work--the most important in society in this view--was given a scientific and professional standing. Academic and semi-academic training encouraged women to think of themselves as professionals, allowing them to confidently and energetically assume their private and public roles. As an integral part of the ideal farm, the farm woman required a professional identity to complement her husband's professional status. "Farming," it was argued,

> is now recognized as a profession. Women are fast realizing that housekeeping, also, is a profession. Men find study necessary to feed stock properly or to prepare the soil for seed. Surely, then, women need to know how to feed their

> families properly or how to study and train their children.

The domestic equivalent of a "permanent, stable agriculture" was a "permanent, good home". Together, the progressive, professional farmer and the progressive, professional homemaker constructed a farm, a home, and a community, which all fitted neatly into a larger, society-wide community.(66)

III

The new rural educators did not make a fundamental distinction between girls and boys in the way they addressed children (as opposed to adolescents) in the schools, nor did they (for the most part) address farm children as specifically rural. Nature study, which had become a generic term for school gardening, elementary agriculture, and agricultural education by the time the Dominion Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education was published in 1913, was a pedagogy applicable to all children. It was not designed to be technical instruction, but rather a means of giving children a practical orientation through interaction with the physical environment. This operated in two ways: children were treated as unique individuals and they were viewed as active social participants. In speaking generally of the new education in 1901, the Principal of the Manitoba Normal School wrote:

> [E]ducation has been defined as the process whereby 'The individual is elevated to the species'. This implies that no individual should be free to follow, without restrictions, the leadings of his nature, but it does not necessarily imply that all pupils should be moulded after a single pattern.(67)

Education, that is to say, had to adapt to the peculiarities of individuals. Nature study was child centred in that it placed the individual child in a natural context, teaching the child her place in the natural domain and allowing the child to freely interact with nature within fairly broad parameters established by the teacher. According to Inspector A.S. Rose of Brandon, the best results in nature study were achieved when the teacher was incidental to instruction. He felt that the introduction of system destroyed student interest, transforming nature study into science.(68) This semi-autonomy also promoted practical activity. Through natural activities, a child's senses were disciplined and a bond of sympathy was established between the child and nature.(69) Especially after the introduction of the school garden programme around 1907, children were able to actually work with other students learning the processes of food production, including the condition of seeds and plants, a knowledge of the soil, the destruction of weeds, and so forth.(70)

Beyond the narrow parameters of a specific item on the curriculum, nature study was also meant to be a method of teaching, informing all subjects by giving them a practical

orientation. In 1913, for example, it was suggested that the whole curriculum could be revised to become more relevant to farm life and practical endeavour. Hence composition would involve writing descriptions of agrarian processes and letters related to farm business, history and geography would become the geography of local communities and the history of imports and exports, arithmetic would apply to farm problems, bookkeeping would deal with farm accounts, and the reading curriculum would include "How to" books for the farm.(71)

Adolescents, meanwhile, were addressed as future consumers, producers, and social participants in rural communities. Through agricultural practice taught in the classroom, competition in school and club fairs, and participation in team demonstrations, farm boys were formed as agricultural producers and farm managers oriented to market demand and profit maximisation. To the extent farm women were producers, farm girls also studied agriculture and participated in the various production contests associated with school and club fairs. For the most part, however, they were trained for domestic work, specifically as household managers and market-wise consumers. Both boys and girls, in other words, learned the business skills relevant to their respective domains. For, as the MAC Boys' and Girls' Club Bulletin noted, "[b]usiness methods are being followed now by all successful farmers, and Boys' and

Girls' Clubs afford the best possible place to begin the practice of business methods."(72) Furthermore, explained an American club pioneer, "club work trains the young people to become managers of their own business, and proprietors of farm land, animals, machinery, crops...and helps them understand the supremacy of this position over that of being always a wage earner."(73) But demonstrations and clubs also created social service and leadership identities through which boys and girls could perform community functions. Working together on a project taught young people the values of community co-operation, while presenting their work in demonstrations and fairs trained them in skills such as public speaking. "The Boys' and Girls' Club," wrote Margaret Speechly (referring to farm girls), "...gives her training which both attaches her to homemaking and makes her an efficient leader in the community...[ready to take] her part as a citizen, with power to use her influence in the affairs of the state."(74)

The team demonstration competitions of the early twenties were particularly important in giving this training. In these events, community organised club teams demonstrated the various components of a production process or a domestic activity in competition with teams from other communities. The form the competitions took constructed an identity of interest between young homemakers and farmers on the one hand, and the capitalist market on the other. The

Junior Livestock Breeders Week in 1921, for example, brought farm boys to Winnipeg under the joint auspices of the local agricultural, educational, and corporate apparatuses. Sponsored by the Canadian Bankers Association, United Grain Growers, and the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, the itinerary included a visit to "some modern banking establishments" (the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the Merchant's Bank, and the Union Bank), a visit to Eaton's, an inspection of grain marketing methods at the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, "a motor trip through the business and residential districts and beauty spots of Winnipeg", a visit to the Guide and the United Grain Growers, a luncheon and tour of "a modern packing plant" (Swift's), and a visit to "a modern manufacturing company" (Vulcan Iron Works). Interspersed with these activities and the competitions were speeches from governmental authorities and other figures, notably Bracken from MAC (president), Thornton from the Ministry of Education (minister), Malcolm from the Ministry of Agriculture (minister), and E. Cora Hind from the Free Press.(75)

More interesting than this state/corporate sponsorship, however, was the language used in the demonstrations themselves. At the 1921 provincial girls' competition, for example, a team of three from Minnedosa demonstrated a food chopper. The demonstration began with one student discussing its manufacture:

> We have discovered that every manufacturing plant is a real university and we are glad to have an opportunity to get acquainted with one branch of this great industry. The great iron and steel industry comes second in providing human wants. Agriculture is, of course, first.

Patenting, blueprinting, and moulding were explained: "[m]ore than one piece of hardware can be made at once [with moulds]..., and this is the reason they sell things at a lower rate than if they made but one at a time." The demonstrator then displayed the various parts of the chopper, noting they "pass through the stage of manufacture and commerce, finally landing in the home or other places of industry." The second student discussed the retailing of the chopper, arguing there were two main factors involved: first, consumer interest, and second, the creation of desire for products, which involved showing the chopper to be labour-saving, time-saving, or food-saving. She noted that every manufacturer had a catalogue listing their products for sale, which meant that "through mail and parcel post homes are supplied with household conveniences of hardware and farm tools which might not [otherwise] be possible since they could not be obtained at local stores." Finally, the third student discussed the home care and use of the chopper, suggesting that before "the days of the food chopper the housewife was compelled to use the chopping bowl and knife. It was wearisome, noisy and slow." But, she continued, "[n]otice how this food chopper prepares the food easily, quickly and in better condition for cooking."(76)

In the minds of these young women, then, the homemaker and the manufacturing enterprise were integrally linked through the market.

From the 1890s and 1900s in Manitoba, but with increasing intensity after the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education report, the connection was drawn between the education of the young and the future of rural life. The first systematic linkage was made in commentary on the MAC Commission at the turn of the century. S.E. Lang, a school inspector, simply lamented in 1902 that the rural school "does not offer to the majority of country boys and girls getting into their teens a bill of fare sufficiently attractive under present economic conditions to secure their serious attention to it"(77) But H.S. Maclean, Assistant Principal of the Winnipeg Normal School in 1899, offered a more sophisticated analysis. To Maclean, the shift of population was an inevitable outcome of the application of science to industry and the consequent division of labour. The problem for rural society, and rural education in particular, lay with "the perverted sentiment" which identified farming solely with manual tasks in the division of labour. Although the "lure of the city" had an economic cause, it could be counterbalanced by challenging the false assumption about mental and manual labour in agriculture. Education, he argued, revealed that there was a great deal of scope for the exercise of mental

labour in farming.(78) After 1910, and especially after 1913, articles and commentary were increasingly produced in which the problem of youth leaving the country for the city was posed, and the solution posited was to build a more positive image of the countryside. From discussions of school consolidation through agricultural short courses for teachers to the boosting of club work, farm life was simultaneously portrayed as being worthy of the young and in need of improvement to keep the young. "Club work," Margaret Speechly suggested in 1919, "demonstrates how to make farming and homemaking a practical business and give the rural young people an argument to help them refuse positions in the city."(79)

More specifically, the raison d'etre of the rural school system was defined by the rural problem. At one level, the problem provided the general context in which teachers were trained. The Brandon Normal School, opened in 1912, was explicitly described within its terms:

> There are two large classrooms, library, manual training rooms, gymnasium, etc., and the school is expected to give special attention to the rural school problem. Its geographical location, its ample grounds, and the equipment generally, will aid greatly in dealing with that problem.(80)

At another level, the purpose of the rural school curriculum, especially after the appointment of a Director of Elementary Agriculture and Nature, was to facilitate "the great movement for the improvement of country homes and country life." Indeed, educators such as Robert Fletcher

went so far as to suggest that schools should take the lead in improving agriculture and rural communities through the complete appropriation of the educative function. He wrote:

> If agriculture is to be improved, the community must take agricultural education in hand. It has too long been left to the home to provide that instruction. But the method and outlook of home instruction in agriculture is traditional, non-scientific and non-progressive.(81)

While it may have been too ambitious for educators to think they could gain such complete control over the young, it was generally accepted among proponents and supporters of rural education that the schools could be used to reach into the farms and homes to educate and transform the practice of adults. Hence, one commentator noted in 1912 that "one great advantage of the public school is that the pupils are able to be home every night and so apply the new knowledge that they acquire daily."(82) It was the fairs and clubs, however, that performed this task most effectively. Boys and girls carried on their projects at the home farm, under the distant but effective direction of a teacher or extension worker. This expertise, although mediated through the student, did reach the farm woman or man. In fact, agrarian intellectuals considered this mediated education, and its social effects, to be among the main purposes of club work. Of eight "objects and aims of club work" enumerated in 1918, the first three were:

> 1. To bring home and school closer together in understanding, sympathy, and co-operative efforts.
> 2. To make the school the centre for the

> acquisition and dissemination of information of direct practical value to the community and to make the home and the home farm, with its implements, its livestock, its fields and farm buildings, the laboratory where all this knowledge will be applied under actual farming conditions.
> 3. To arouse a spirit of loyalty to the school, the community, and the Province by a more complete realization and appreciation of the assistance which members may be able to render each other.(83)

Furthermore, and finally, the young and the school system were used to conceptualise and build rural communities. Club work was described as being useful in bridging the gap between local businessmen and farmers, and townswomen and farmwomen. Bankers in particular, it was said, gained a better understanding of the farm economy through their participation in the clubs.(84) But it was the school consolidation movement that was particularly important in community formation. Proponents of school consolidation viewed the demise of rural schools and the rise of centralised (in towns and villages) consolidated schools as an important contribution to community identity. Country children could enjoy all the advantages of a "city school" under consolidation, and escape the "lure of the city". Moreover, the consolidated school could become a genuine community centre, providing an institutional focus for the community. It could draw the isolated farm family under its influence, and overcome the parochialism and divisiveness of country life.(85) The Wingham Consolidated School, as described by Margaret Speechly in 1922, for

example, was central to the development of a "new community era" in the Wingham district near Elm Creek. Prior to the construction of the school, many of the younger adults were planning to move to the city for the winter because of a lack of social activity, and older people were also suffering from the absence of a community centre. But with the new consolidated school, teaching was available for young and old:

> [A]fter school hours the plant is used by the older members of the community. On Sunday everybody turns out to attend church in the auditorium, with Sunday School following the service--in fact, even a wedding was held there recently. The UFWM, the Community Club, the School Board, the Young People's Association and other organizations have their regular meetings in the basement of the school, which seats 250 people. Dances, debates, concerts and such events are well attended for everyone in the district feels right at home in a place which belongs to the whole community....

"Why," Speechly asked rhetorically, "do we hear so much about the cityward drift, the lack of rural leaders, the drabness of country life? Because in many cases the people in rural districts have not had the vision of the Wingham Idea or the means to put it into practice."(86)

Ideal male and female identities were constructed for young people, then, that were designed to prepare them for farming and homemaking. But young people, and the institutions created for them, had a special place in this ideology since it was believed that the identities of all rural people could be moulded through the young.

The texts considered in this chapter, and the broader discourse in which they operated, addressed farm people as individual and collective subjects participating in market-oriented agriculture and stable rural communities. It was reasonable to expect that farm people, occupying a contradictory position in capitalist society, would identify with these images since the images were at least a partial reflection of people's everyday work experiences. Farm men were producers, and farm women were household workers and managers, participating in a market economy. They were all members of rural communities. As has been suggested throughout this chapter, however, these were ideal visions. Below them there was a competing vision at work which attempted to comprehend and explain the reality of simple commodity agriculture in different terms. This alternative offered a challenge to the discursive unity of the dominant system, appropriating and transforming some of its elements while refusing to be limited by its boundaries. But, failing to generate its own theoretical categories, it ultimately succumbed, leaving a populist residue. The rise and fall of this challenge is the subject of chapter six.

---

1. Grain Growers' Guide (Guide), 10 March 1920, p. 546; S. Wheeler, Seager Wheeler's Book on Profitable Grain Growing (Winnipeg, 1919); J. Bracken, Crop Production in Western Canada (Winnipeg, 1920).
2. The Farmers' Advocate (TFA), 20 January 1893, p. 24; 20 December 1893, p. 1; 5 December 1895, p. 1.

3. MAC Gazette (February, 1912), p. 13; Manitoba Sessional Papers (MSP), Number 19 (1914), p. 667.
4. Guide, 18 February 1925, p.196; MAC Gazette (March, 1908), p.42-43.
5. TFA, 20 July 1895, p. 274.
6. TFA, 20 June 1893, p. 223.
7. University of Manitoba (UM) Archives, Manitoba Argicultural College (MAC) Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-20, pp. 34-35.
8. "Our Real Problems," MAC Gazette (December, 1915), pp. 4-5.
9. J. Orr, "Farming as a Specialist," TFA, 5 April 1893, p. 123; J. Elder, "The Institute Campaign," TFA, 1 January 1893, p. 9.
10. MAC Gazette (March, 1913), p. 364.
11. Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff, 1913-70 (Winnipeg, 1974), pp. 12-15; MAC Gazette (March, 1913), p. 364.
12. "Plowing Matches," TFA, 20 June 1900, p. 326; "Annual Convention of Manitoba Agricultural Societies," TFA, 30 January 1907, pp. 158-159; UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1913-14, "College Extension"; "Agricultural Fairs," Manitoba Department of Agriculture (MDA), Bulletin, Number 36 (1919); MDA, Annual Report (1921), p. 72.
13. H. Grant, "Three O'Clock in the Morning," Guide, 17 December 1924, p. 1437; N. Cameron, Minister of Agriculture in 1922, used similar language in his assessment of the year: N. Cameron, "Season's Stock Taking," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (December, 1922).
14. "How may a farmer be guided in estimating the extent of future demands for farm products, so that he may have for sale those for which the most profitable prices can be obtained?"; "Discuss the Law of Supply and Demand in relation to the price of farm produce." UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Agricultural Economics, 1908" and "Agricultural Economics, 1910".
15. "a) Show the importance of the world's gold supply upon the general level of prices, pointing out three important qualifications to this quantity theory of money; b) Explain why practically all countries have adoopted the gold standard." MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Economics, 1914".
16. "What are the methods adopted by various countries for marketing grain crops? State the advantages of the North American method."; "To what extent is the 'middleman' a producer? Is there any use of talking about eliminating the middleman?"; "Discuss the middlemen and their services under the following headings: a) Whey they exist; b) Popular view concerning

them; c) Helpful remedies for improving middleman services." MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Rural Economics, 1921", "Agricultural Economics, 1923", "Principles of Marketing, 1925".

17. "a) What are the chief advantages of a good bank to any community?; b) What are the features of our Canadian banking system that safeguard holders of banknotes and depositors?" MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Economics, 1912".
18. "Define capital and capital goods and wealth. How does capital originate and why do we encourage its increase?...a) Give three strong arguments in favour of trade unions; b) Give three weaknesses of trade unions." MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Economics, 1920".
19. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Agronomy, 1908".
20. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1912-14, "Farm Management Investigations," p. 59; MAC Calendar, 1914-15, "Farm Management," p. 85; MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Farm Management," p. 41.
21. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Farm Management, 1914".
22. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1924-25, "Farm Management," pp. 51-52.
23. A.H. Benton, "The Business End of Farming," Guide, 19 February 1919, p. 349; Benton, "Farm Management Surveys," Guide, 20 November 1918, p. 2438.
24. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Farm Management, 1914".
25. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Farm Business and Accounting".
26. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Farm Accounts, 1919".
27. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1912-13, "The Marketing of Grain and the Factors of Price," p. 27; MAC Calendar, 1925-26, "Principles of Marketing," p. 58.
28. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Marketing of Grain, 1915".
29. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1914-15, "Agricultural Economics," p. 59; MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Rural Economics," p. 47; MAC Calendar, 1917-18, "Rural Economics," p. 30; MAC Calendar, 1918-19, "Agricultural Economics," p. 35.
30. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1925-26, "Principles of Co-operation," p. 58; Examination Papers, "Advanced Co-operative Marketing, 1925".
31. "Co-operative Marketing in Manitoba," MDA, Bulletin, Number 80 (1925), pp. 3, 15-16.
32. A.H. Matheson, "Home Magnetism," MAC Gazette 1(1) (March, 1908), pp. 21-22.
33. M. Phillips, "Pulling Double in the Marriage Harness," Guide 13 June 1923, p. 732.

34. F. Middleton, "Manitoba's Community Movement in City and Country," Managra (November, 1919), p. 10.
35. P. Macdonald, "The District Builders," Guide 21 May 1924, p. 649; see also Macdonald, "The District Builders," Guide 22 April 1925, p. 516 and C. Hopper, "An Agricultural Education," Guide 18 February 1925, p. 210.
36. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1921-22, "Rural Leadership".
37. "College Man," Managra (February, 1917), p. 8.
38. "President's Annual Report of MAC, 1916," MSP, Number 11 (1917), p. 637.
39. G.W. Fiske, The Challenge of the Country (New York, 1916), chapter VIII.
40. J. Gillette, Constructive Rural Sociology (New York, 1913), p. 195; Fiske, The Challenge of the Country, chapter VIII.
41. "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, Bulletin, Number 8 (1916), p. 20.
42. T.J. Harrison, "Helping Solve Farm Problems," Guide 8 March 1916, p. 308.
43. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-20, p. 35.
44. C. Hopper, "An Agricultural Education," Guide 18 February 1925, pp. 196, 210.
45. H.E. Walker, "Good Farming Competition," MAC Gazette (December, 1908), p. 11; UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1909-10, "Department of College Extension Work".
46. Fiske, The Challenge of the Country, pp. 108-109 (emphasis in the original).
47. D.F. Wilson, "How Best to Overcome the Present Agricultural Depression," TFA 20 January 1893, p. 24.
48. C. Frederick, Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home (Chicago, 1915), p. 315; M.G.R., "The Function of the Graduate in Home Economics," Managra 16(4) (February, 1923), pp. 10-11; Frederick, The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management (New York, 1912), pp. 106-107.
49. UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Economics of the Household, 1918" and "Economics of the Household, 1919".
50. "Protecting the Housewife," Guide 10 January 1923, p. 47.
51. "Home Economics Societies," Guide 27 February 1918, p. 444; "Farm Women's Congress," MAC Gazette 6(1) (November, 1912), p. 86; T.C. Guild, "Is Thrift Worthwhile?," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 1(10) (December, 1921), p. 7.
52. "Agricultural Fairs," MDA, Bulletin, Number 30 (1919); "Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work," in "MDA Report," MSP Number 4 (1916), pp. 792-793; PAM, Valentine Winkler Papers, Box 1, pp. 588-594, E.C. Hind

to V. Winkler, 15 September 1915, re. programme for women at MAC; UM Archives, Mary Speechly Collection, Mary Speechly, "My Interests in Practical Education";

53. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Poultry", pp. 88.
54. "Financing the Farm Home," MDA, Bulletin, Number 57 (1921), pp. 3, 9, 11.
55. M. Foote Crow, The American Country Girl (New York, 1915; reprint 1974), p. 150; R. Whiteside, "Using System in the Home," Guide 15 November 1922, p. 1284; L. Duncan, "Kitchen of Today," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 2(8) (September, 1922), p. 8.
56. M.P. McCallum, "Making Motherhood Efficient," Guide 31 October 1917, p. 1745; E.S. Martin, "Roland Believes in Better Babies," Guide 14 June 1922, p. 720.
57. "From College to Matrimony," Guide 3 March 1920, pp. 493, 531.
58. "Pulling Double in the Marriage Harness," Guide 13 June 1923, p. 732.
59. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1920-21, "Division of Home Economics," p. 53; see also Manitoba. Royal Commission on the Establishment of the Agricultural College (1903) and J. Cochrane Smith, "The Necessity of a Domestic Science Course," MAC Gazette 1(1) (March, 1908), pp. 30-31.
60. H.E. Walker, "The Future of Western Agriculture," MAC Gazette 1(8) (February, 1909), pp. 28-29; E. Thompson, "Education for Women," Managra 11(5) (March, 1918), p. 16; A.H. Matheson, "Home Magnetism," MAC Gazette 1(1) (March, 1908), pp. 21-22; UM Archives, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Home Furnishing, 1918".
61. UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1921-22, "Rural Sociology and Civics," "History of Home Life," and "Social History"; N. McClung, "Women's Place," Managra 10(2) (December, 1916), p. 7; "Summer Months with the Women's Institutes," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 1(9) (November, 1921).
62. "Women's Institutes," Guide 16 November 1910, p. 20 (emphasis added); "Rural Women's Short Course" in "Home Economics Extension," MDA, Annual Report (1925-26), Legislative Library of Manitoba (LLM).
63. UM Archives, Mary Speechly Collection, clipping from Institute News (March, 1960); PAM, MWI Papers, Box 13, "Constitution for Local Home Economics Societies" in "Early Institute File"; "Home Economics Handbook," MDA, Bulletin, Number 6 (1916); E. Thompson, "Glimpses of Possibilities of Extension Work," Managra 18(5) (March, 1925), p. 35.
64. "Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work: 1915 Report," MSP Number 14 (1916), pp. 798-799; "Home Economics Extension Work," MDA, Annual Report (1921), LLM, p. 95.

65. See "Annual Report of Home Economics Societies, 1914," MSP Number 13 (1915), p. 641; "Money Earned and Spent by the Institutes" in "Home Economics Extension," MDA, Annual Report (1925-26), LLM; "Manitoba Home Economics," Guide 21 February 1917, p. 329; "Home Economics Societies," Guide 27 February 1918; "1921 Convention Resolutions," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (March, 1921), p. 8; "Summer Months with the Women's Institutes," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (November, 1920), p. 8; "Twelfth Annual Convention of Manitoba Women's Institutes," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (February, 1922), pp. 15-16; "1923 Women's Institute Convention Resolutions," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 3(7) (July-August, 1923); D. Watt, "Presidential Address: Women's Institute Convention, June 1923," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News 3(7) (July-August, 1923), p. 6.
66. E. Charlton, "Scientific Housekeeping," TFA 3 July 1907, p. 1023; UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1914-15, pp. 97-98; "Home Economics Societies," MAC Gazette 6(4) (February, 1913), p. 297; "Better Farm Homes," MDA, Bulletin, Number 21 (1918); R.W. Murchie, "The Home of the Husbandman," Guide 9 July 1919, p. 1466.
67. W.A. McIntyre, Principal of Normal School, "Report" in Manitoba Department of Education (MDE), Annual Report (1901), p. 472.
68. A.S. Rose, Brandon Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, Annual Report (1903), p. 587.
69. A. McIntyre, North-East Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, Annual Report (1899), pp. 42-43; W.J. Cram, South-Central Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, Annual Report (1904), p. 43.
70. MDE, Annual Report (1907), p. 30; Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, in Dominion of Canada Sessional Papers (CSP), Number 191d (1913), p. 154; A.J. Madill, History of Agricultural Education in Ontario (Toronto, 1937), pp. 123-124.
71. W.A. McIntyre, "Provincial Normal School Report," MDE, Annual Report (1913).
72. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," MAC, Bulletin, Number 15 (1916).
73. quoted in A.J. Roe, "Organizing Citizens of Tomorrow," Guide 20 August 1919.
74. M. Speechly, "Anchoring Tomorrow's Women," Guide 12 October 1921, p. 1276; Speechly, "Investments in Youth," Guide 9 April 1924, p. 456; "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, Bulletin, Number 8 (1916), pp. 17-18; Madill, Agricultural Education in Ontario, pp. 123-124; R. Fletcher, "Deputy Minister's Report" and C. Newcombe, "Superintendent's Report" in MDE, Annual Report (1915); "Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs," Managra (December 1916), pp. 8-9.

75. PAM, 4H Papers, Box 4, "Junior Livestock Breeders' Week Programme, October 10-15, 1921". See also "The Extension Service," MAC Gazette (March, 1916), p. 7 on study clubs for teens; "Report of Extension Service" in "MAC Reports," MSP (1917) on bankers in club work; S.E. Lang, "Secondary School Reports" in MDE, Annual Report (1913) and (1914) and "Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Enquire into and Report upon the University," MSP (1910), p. 483 on agricultural high schools; "Demonstration Teams to be Guests of Milling Companies," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (May, 1921) and PAM, 4H Papers, Box 4, "Menu, CNR Banquet for Boys' and Girls' Swine and Cattle Clubs" on the alliance between the educational and the corporate, the latter being of particular interest because it involves W.J. Black, first president of MAC, presenting the W.J. Black Trophy in his capacity as a CNR functionary; and the various Boys' and Girls' Club reports in the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, Annual Reports in the Manitoba Sessional Papers.
76. "Demonstration Teams," Manitoba Agriculural Extension News (February, 1922), p. 9.; PAM, 4H Papers, Box 4, "The Story of a Pleasant Trip," Manitoba Department of Agriculture Pamphlet (1921); M. Speechly, "Anchoring Tomorrow's Women," Guide 12 October 1921, p. 1276. On domestic science in the schools see M. Speechly, "Science Puts on an Apron," Guide 14 February 1923, p. 185; B.J. Hales, "Brandon Normal School Report," MDE, Annual Report (1916), p. 71 and (1917), pp. 234-235; UM Archives, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1912-13; Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education (1913), in CSP, Number 191d (1913), pp. 143-144; J.G. Wilson, A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966 (Winnipeg, 1969), pp. 154-156.
77. S.E. Lang, "Inspector's Report," MDE, Annual Report (1903); see also "Why Educate the Farmer's Son," TFA 20 August 1898, p. 363.
78. H.S. Maclean, "Agricultural Education," TFA 20 December 1899, pp. 639-640.
79. Roe, "Organizing Citizens of Tomorrow," Guide 20 August 1919, p. 1744.
80. R. Fletcher, "Deputy Minister's Report," MDE, Annual Report (1913).
81. Fletcher, "Deputy Minister's Report," MDE, Annual Report (1913).
82. J. Rayner, "Agricultural Education in the Public Schools," MAC Gazette (February, 1912), p. 31.
83. PAM, 4H Papers, Box 4, "Handbook: Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs," February, 1918.
84. PAM, 4H Papers, Box 4, "Organization Circular, 1919"; see also "An All Year Boys' and Girls' Club," Manitoba Agricultural Extension News (June, 1921), p. 5.

85. C. Newcombe, "Consolidation of Schools," MDE, Annual Report (1909); M. Hall Jones, "Consolidation of Schools," MDE, Annual Report (1912); N. Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society (Toronto, 1976), pp. 193-197.
86. M. Speechly, "The Wingham Idea," Guide 8 March 1922, pp. 273, 278.

CHAPTER SIX: THE LANGUAGE OF MANITOBA AGRARIANISM, 1890-1925

During the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century, the language of the Manitoba agrarian movement was characterised by a discursive tension between the dominant ideology outlined in the previous two chapters and popular ideologies that challenged the official conceptions. The radicalism of the Patrons of Industry (Patronism) imparted a significant oppositional tone to the language of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association (MGGA) and the United Farmers' of Manitoba (UFM). The "main" (men's) movement continued to employ something of a class analysis that it inherited from the nineteenth century, while the Women's Section, after its formation in 1918, combined this inheritance with a mild form of gender analysis which had been filtered through middle class feminism. By the time of the farm movement's reentry into electoral politics in the 1920s, however, the popular was effectively constrained by the dominant. This chapter traces the contours and usage of this popular language, and its subordination to dominant social and economic discourse, between 1890 and 1925.(1)

I

Although a Grange local was founded at High Bluff in the 1870s, significant agrarian insurgency in Manitoba really dates from the early 1880s. The fall of 1883

witnessed the formation of two organisations, one in Manitou and the other in Brandon, dedicated to agrarian reform. The western group, the Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Union, adopted a platform calling for tariff modifications, Manitoba's right to charter railways, the settlement of public lands, lower freight rates, and an end to elevator monopoly. The southern organisation, the Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Protective Union, meanwhile, sought the general repeal of laws which favoured monopolists and oppressed farmers.(2) The Protective Union was a more purely farmers' organisation than the Farmers' Union because the latter included grain dealers within its ranks. Although both movements failed within three years, they left a legacy of political agitation and a system of co-operative enterprises, notably a number of farmer owned elevators around the province, upon which future activists could build.(3)

After a period in the later 1880s during which the Liberal party dominated agrarian discontent, the decade of the nineties opened with the formation of the Rockwood Farmers' Alliance, the organisation of the Farmers' League of Manitoba at Cartwright, and the establishment of new farmer owned elevator companies at Carman, Carberry, Neepawa, Crystal City, and Morden.(4) In retrospect, these activities simply presaged the emergence of the Patrons of Industry in the winter of 1891-92. An immediate outgrowth

of the Ontario Patrons, formed in 1889, this latest expression of insurgency was, like the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, and the Farmers' League before it, part of a broader North American movement. The first Manitoba locals were, in fact, initiated by an American organiser. Subassociations then grew quickly throughout the settled areas of Manitoba and into the Northwest during 1892. Constituted as fraternal brotherhoods, with the accompanying paraphernalia and ritual, the Patrons were also heavily engaged in various aspects of co-operative buying and selling throughout their existence. By 1894, however, their primary energies were shifting in the direction of electoral politics.(5)

The first element in Patronism was a labour theory of value in which farmers and workers shared common interests as the creators of wealth. In a letter to The Patrons' Advocate in 1895, "Pro Patria" wrote that "the greatest misfortune of a country is poor farmers." He then elaborated in terms of a labour theory of worth:

> Every man should be secured in his labor and in his homestead; he should work for himself and not for others, no one should share in the profits who does not share in the production. Labor must have the exclusive right to the produce, if we are ever to achieve permanency and stability in agriculture.... Laws must be passed to secure the exclusive right of the occupier of the ground to the fruits of his labor.(6)

Besides succinctly stating this radical conception of wealth as it applied to agriculture, this statement is significant

for its use of the phrase "permanency and stability in agriculture". As was noted in the previous chapter, permanency and stability were integral components of the ideology of market agriculture. But here permanency and stability would be achieved only by removing the "tyranny of capitalists".

The passage is also noteworthy for its use of the term "labor", although the specific focus is agriculture. An exclusively agrarian theory of value was sometimes employed in Patronism, but this "physiocratic" sentiment was rare.(7) "Without wasting space by needless demonstration, let us assume that society rests upon the labor of farmers," wrote Henry Clay in an editorial plea for Patron co-operation with "Labor Unions" and "Trade Organizations". On the fundamental basis of food production, he argued, carpenters and masons provide shelter, tailors provide clothing, the merchant comes into existence, and factories and mills arise to supply the merchant. But, "[t]he whole procession is headed by the farmer."(8) More commonly, no distinction was drawn between the labour of farmers and workers. For example, Spender Percival of Glenora, an occasional contributer to the Advocate, referred to "the farmer and working classes--the producers as the source of wealth to the country" in an 1895 letter.(9) Clay, meanwhile, in a late 1894 article entitled "Indirect Taxation and Agriculture", used the term "laborers", and then added the

following clarification: "...when I say laborers, I include the farmer, for whilst in theory he is a capitalist, in practice he is a laborer and producer, and is largely dependent on capital in our complex society."(10) A radical producerism is paramount here, but the apparent tension between the dominant agrarian identity (farmer as capitalist) and the radical inheritance (farmer as worker) reflects the emergence of a pattern which became increasingly evident after the turn of the century.

It followed, of course, that farmers should learn from the experiences of workers. Trade union organisation was viewed as a useful model for agrarian mobilisation in the Patron analysis. Employing the radical terms of political power and privilege, the Advocate drew attention to the ways in which workers banded together in unions to counteract the overpowering influence "wealth exerts when used by unscrupulous hands". Trade unions improved social conditions for their members and, more importantly, challenged "the right of the political and moneyed classes to frame laws by which Labor has only to contribute and the Capitalist but to enjoy." The Patrons of Industry, it was concluded, could be to farmers what unions were to the wage earner.(11) In more forceful language, Henry Clay wrote on the first day of 1896 that farmers, in comparison to workers, were complacent. Whereas workers had revolted in strikes and riots, gaining concessions from "monopolists",

farmers had patiently endured the smallest rewards. "Had we united--refused to produce as workmen strike--would the railroad companies," he asked rhetorically, "contemptuously disdain our petitions for redress? Would wheat buying syndicates squeeze us?" Workers, facing the loss of their homes and their means of subsistence, persevered and conquered. But farmers, often in a better position than workers to resist because they had food enough to survive and homes free of rent, patiently suffered. The lesson, if it needed to be stated, was that "[w]e must connect the farming community into a powerful organisation with which we can confront our oppressive monopolists, and make each farmer feel a brotherly interest in his neighbors welfare."(12)

Furthermore, the necessity and desirability of worker-farmer co-operation was stressed in this analysis. In an Advocate piece entitled "Massing for Attack", for example, the Patron policy of excluding non-farmers from the organisation was criticised by Clay. It was becoming clear, he argued, that the Patrons should include in their fold "every honest man who earns his bread by labor". Hence, with a view to ultimately joining with labour, all Patron sub-associations were urged to discuss the question of co-operation with trade unions.(13) Moreover, the leadership of the movement addressed a constituency which extended beyond the farm and the countryside. At the 1895 convention

in Brandon, Grand President Braithwaite focused on the public debt and the tariff as means of discussing the problems producers were facing. "Think of these things," he urged in his speech to delegates, "analyze them for yourselves and see if it is not the time we farmers and laborers cast aside our old prejudices, and without bias, fear or favor take a common sense view of the situation." It was time, he continued, "to lift our craft and calling out of debt, indifference and apparent serfdom."(14) Patronism, as a form of anti-monopoly radicalism, in fact demanded the mobilisation of all wealth producers. But there were organisational and ecological impediments which had to be overcome: there was little or no daily interaction between farmers and workers, and farmers found it difficult to sustain the sort of solidarity which, for workers, grew out of shared work experiences. Although the will existed at one level, then, a successful alliance required a high degree of organisation. At another level, however, the will did not exist; a focus on politics as the source of oppression could not sustain the required mobilisation around economic and social issues.

But who were the oppressors in this analysis? Outside the producers, and pitted against them, stood the monopolists, combinesters and parasites who manipulated politics and the state in order to rob the producers and enrich themselves. The most significant actors here were

the railway corporations, mortgage companies, financiers, and manufacturers, but the analysis also included lawyers and other professionals, especially in their roles as politicians and "party wire-pullers". In one particularly vivid rendition of this perspective, an Advocate correspondent appealed for potential members to join the Patrons:

> FELLOW WORKERS: ...Canada does not belong to the people of Canada who by their labour and toil produce its wealth. No! Canada does not even belong to the British Crown, but to a handful of financiers, capitalists and bondholders in England and some other countries who have for their agents...a gang of titled and decorated snobs and boodlers to whom the people of Canada have unfortunately too long entrusted their affairs.

He went on to charge that every year the tariff and other forms of taxation took millions out of the unpaid labour of workers and "the depreciated produce of the toilers of the soil.... Look at the unemployed in cities and towns, the laborer without work, the farmer toiling without hope, and all the time the salaries and incomes of the drones and parasites who live at our expense remain the same."(15) While weaving elements of an older with a newer analysis (the image of aristocratic privilege alongside a working class salutation), this passage touched a number of the bases in Patronism.

In this analysis, the oppressors constituted a discrete social group who were defined negatively as those who did not produce. In some cases, a distinction was drawn between

the "classes" and the "masses". For Spender Percival, the masses had been divided between two political parties, while the classes--"Capitalists, Manufacturers, Combinesters, Directors of Railroads, Loan Companies, and Lawyers"--were united in sucking the people dry.(16) In other Patron statements, a dominant and a subordinate class were identified. "Are mortgages and [the] CPR," asked an Advocate correspondent in 1894,

> oppressive to this great Western country, and to the liberty and fraternal bonds cementing Confederation? Are they not the mouldering branches that prevent us from making our little ones as comfortable as Sir John Thompson? Why all the injustice and social inequality between the two classes of society, millionare (sic) and pauper...?

He appealed to Patrons to "combine against the misrule that has given the country the pile of mortgages and its pile of millionaires", and he invoked a distant radical heritage in conclusion by demanding "social revolution [to] give us back the liberty of free men."(17) For Manitoba and Northwestern farmers, according to this analysis, class exploitation felt particularly acute given the conditions under which they arrived in the West. One Patrons of Industry subassociation, in passing a resolution urging the government to take action against the "grain combine", produced a settler's image of class relations:

> ...this Association views with alarm the action of the grain combine in this country, and we call upon all farmers, especially Patrons, to rise en masse and press upon our governments the urgent necessity of freeing us once and forever from

> these manipulators of our prosperity in this Western land. The Dominion government brought us here and gave us free homes. Now they allow railroads and combines to rob us (by law) of the products of our industry obtained from our land which makes the gift worse than nothing.(18)

The "manipulators of prosperity" achieved and maintained their dominance through political "chicanery" in this ideology. Lawyers and politicians, serving the combinesters and monopolists, both created and manipulated laws in order to rob the producers. Everything from the tariff, freight rates, and government expenditure to wheat grades, Royal Commissions, and even agricultural education was understood in these terms. The denunciation of this political immorality is what ultimately defined Patronism.

Government expenditure, taxation, and the tariff were manifestations of the legalised robbery facing producers. The "oppressor" rather than the "oppressed", it was said, should be taxed. Corporations received millions of dollars worth of land grants and timber limits for which producers ultimately paid.(19) Public debt was the result of the wealthy enriching themselves at the expense of the people. The 1895 Dominion deficit, for example, projected to be five million dollars, was denounced at a Killarney Patrons meeting as an unjust burden foisted upon labourers and farmers. "Where did the money go?" Brother Hossack asked rhetorically in addressing the assembled crowd:

> ...spent on harbor works and Curran bridges, and thrown broadcast amongst wirepullers and party heelers.... Now has patience ceased to be a

> virtue, let us rise up as one man against such red tapeism and be not deceived by their sweet speeches while they sit at banquets, laughing and mocking the clodhoppers and hayseeds.(20)

The burden could only be reduced by eliminating public expenditure on those items which benefitted the wealthy. One Patron MLA recommended, therefore, that monies be diverted from the Lieutenant Governor's office to clothe people who could not afford proper clothing and from the University of Manitoba to be used to support common schools.(21) Another Patron, in the context of a call to shift the tariff burden from necessities to luxuries, made a similar proposal. The reduced revenue from a reformed tariff could be offset, he said, by abolishing the Senate, Lieutenant Governorships, High Commissionerships and pensions. Then additional revenue, for more worthwhile endeavours to aid farmers and workers, could be raised by taxing concentrated capital.(22)

The tariff, the major source of public revenue in nineteenth century Canada, was frequently the focus of producer wrath. Indeed, to many it was the penultimate symbol of plutocracy. A composite image existed in Patronism (and other radical analyses) of the parasitic class, protected behind a legal barrier, growing rich through the labour of others. In a survey of the situation in which farmers were forced to exist in the 1890s, for example, John Fotheringham of Grenfell, Assiniboia wrote:

> They found themselves toiling with little results in comfort--small returns and heavy outlay for the necessaries of life and labor. Merchants, lawyers and others, especially manufacturers, were serving themselves unmercifully out of their toils. Such classes had come into the possession of legal advantages by which they could line their pockets out of yours.... Good men labor and labor and can scarcely make any preparation for sickness or old age. Why should this be so in a good land like ours? It comes largely or mainly through political causes. Favored industries and parties are protected and become wealthy at our expense, and use their wealth in maintaining and supporting this unhappy situation.(23)

And for some, the fight against the tariff was nothing less than the historic struggle of free-born Englishmen:

> From Runnymede to the time the Stuart lost his head and the family the dynasty, the Anglo Saxon has been struggling to be free, from the time of the Tudors to the present the struggle has gone on, and we are more in earnest than ever. Free trade is the cure for a great many of the evils from which we suffer.(24)

In protesting the inequities of the tariff, then, farmers were not simply or calculatively seeking fairer access to markets. Rather, they were seeking the elimination of their oppressor.

Political manipulation extended throughout the state apparatus in the Patron view. According to Henry Clay, the statutory regulation of wheat grades was foisted on the farmers in the interests of middlemen. In the 1890s, the Act specified that Number 1 Manitoba hard wheat should be at least 60 lb./bu. and 2/3 Red Fyfe. But the Act also constituted a "Board of Standards" to fix a yearly standard which could vary upward from the minimum. Hence, in 1895-

96, the standard for Number 1 hard was 63 lb./bu. and 75% Red Fyfe. "All through the paragraphs of this crazy law," Clay wrote, "we find the same variation, the Act states so much, the standard so much more. There are many kinds of harm this foolish arrangement causes." Specifically, he maintained, the speculator was permitted to ship from Fort William on the Act and not the standard, thereby robbing the producer of the difference. "In no other country that the Advocate is acquainted with," the editorial concluded, "would such official assistance to rascality be even attempted."(25)

A more explicitly ideological forum for the operation of "rascality" was the public investigatory body. In reporting a rumour in 1894 that a Royal Commission might be appointed to enquire into the problem of CPR freight rates, Clay urged farmers to mobilise and be on their guard against the deceit of the rich and powerful:

> The task of fighting the mighty company is an enormous one. Every big city in the East...will array themselves against us. The examiners will be met with chicane--with humbug--with threats and open lies by the legal rascaldom that lays itself out for hire on such occasion.... [T]he whole brigade of managers and grain mixers will be ready to testify to anything that Van Horne may desire. Our examiners will have to wring reluctant evidence from the creatures of that powerful company by every means in their power, and as their means are not very extensive in the confused present state of the law, they must have an overpowering--overwhelming--flood of angry public opinion behind them to back them up.(26)

The state, in this instance, was seen as being potentially neutral, assuming a high degree of popular pressure could be maintained upon the government.

Political manipulation even extended to school texts in this analysis. One Advocate reader, in submitting a poem in reaction to a letter from a farmer who was being hounded off his land by a mortgage company, anticipated that agricultural education in a corrupted state would be ideologically skewed against a producerist perspective. Prefacing his rewritten mortgage deed by suggesting it "should be put in our proposed agricultural school books to teach the boys how to rent a farm", he wrote:

> Whereas cute lawyers always use Whereas at each line end,
> The Lord has failed the last few years enough good wheat to send
> Wherewith to square your nine percent, Your farm is pawned my friend.
> Beyond redeem, so pray give heed and close to me attend.
>
> You'll promise, won't you honor bright to live on straw, no chaff,
> And like a stupid donkey toil, And nothing do by half.
> Don't murmur though your children starve, Your wife should need a shroud
> Don't let your chicken heart rebel, Poor men should ne'er be proud.
>
> Whereas you'll promise won't you now next year to pay three rents
> Though it be far from human ken, To (sic) know our God's intents
> And be prepared within a week to quit your hearth and home
> And oe'r (sic) the storm swept prairie in search of shelter roam.
>
> Don't talk of rights, your (sic) but a serf, A fool, a lazy hog

> Go to your kennel or I'll kick As (sic) if you were a dog
> Yet hold, should you to death succumb, Just (sic) will your son and heir
> To send the money from the farm As (sic) though you still were there.(27)

No area of the state, then, from the tariff to textbooks, was free from the pervasive influence of oppressive manipulation.

It is hardly surprising, given this analysis, that political organising was central to Patronism. Political oppression, after all, required a political response. The politics of Patronism was based upon the assumption that not only the state, but inherited political practice as well, was corrupted by the influence of capitalists, lawyers, and various other undesirables. Producers, notably farmers, had to create a new politics to take control of their own and the country's affairs. The key to this was nonpartisanship. From a twentieth century perspective--specifically the experience of Brackenism--nonpartisanship has a businesslike, apolitical meaning. But the Patrons, as they proclaimed in their rallying cry, were "non-partisan, but intensely political."(28) To them, nonpartisanship meant rejecting parties which were merely media through which nonproducers milked producers. "Extreme partizanship," according to the Patrons' Sentinel,

> robs the poor. Extreme partizanship is a means for the rich to become wealthy. Extreme partizanship causes the strife and struggle amongst the few for supremacy and causes deadlock

> and chaos in the House of Commons at the present time and the people foot the bill.(29)

Or, as expressed in the Declaration of the Independent Industrial Association which succeeded the Patrons in 1898:

> Realizing...that the partisan spirit predominating has resulted in enabling combines, trusts and other monopolies to procure legislation and privileges to the detriment of the great mass of the people,...we, the Associated Independents of Manitoba, deem it necessary that all men of free spirit should unite, to arouse and inform public opinion, to terminate the practice of government by party dictators, to frustrate the ominous designs of predatory corporations, to free the community from present exactions which rob the people of the fruits of their labor, and, generally, to take such independent political action as the public advantage may indicate.(30)

The Patrons wanted to transform legislative and parliamentary representation by replacing the lawyers and other professionals with farmer and worker delegates. And the Liberal party, since it appropriated much of the radical rhetoric while remaining under the control of nonproducers, was the object of most Patron wrath. The secretary of the Boissevain Patrons association suggested, for example, that Liberal policy directives came from above, while in the Patrons they came from below. If the Patrons were like the Liberals, he maintained, the following is the type of circular the Grand Association would send to the subassociations:

> Dear Brethren--We consider it our duty to inform you that we have been laboring under a mistake in believing that the Protective Policy has worked to our disadvantage, that it is only right and just that the CPR should charge such freight rates as will enable them to declare a satisfactory

> dividend to the shareholders, and that owing to the superior knowledge and understanding of the learned professions they are best qualified to act as parliamentary representatives. This is our conclusion and we hope you will govern yourselves accordingly. We are sorry you have been misled in the past, and advise you to seek for future relief, only in diversified farming and the practice of economy in the home.

In the Patrons of Industry such arrogance would cause uproar because Patrons were attached to principle rather than party.(31)

The various aspects of Patron political practice were conducted within the terms of nonpartisanship and a broader radical discourse. Patron election platforms were cast within the assumptions of the radical inheritance, even though they appear to be moderate, reformist documents from the perspective of the later twentieth century. The Dominion platform demanded that public lands be reserved and preserved for actual settlers, that the tariff exist only to raise revenue, and that legislation be passed to protect farmers and labourers from the undue price increases of monopolies and combines. Furthermore, it sought rigid economy in the public service, simplification of laws, the abolition of the Senate, the disfranchisement of the civil service, and a general reduction in the machinery of government. The provincial programme repeated the call for economy in the public service, while also demanding the "purity and independence of Parliament" which meant, in practice, that no MLA should receive a free railroad pass or

a fee beyond his sessional indemnity. Formulated as it was in the 1890s, the local platform also had to address the issue of public schools. On this question, Patrons stood "unalterably opposed to any appropriation of public monies for sectarian purposes." Hence, their position was little different from that of the Liberals, and a significant factor in their demise. For Patrons, however, the provision of public funds for religious schools was a species of special privilege fundamentally at odds with their vision of an uncorrupted state.(32)

The Independent Industrial Association included most of the Patron demands in its platform. They were supplemented, however, by calls for the public ownership of railroads and other "natural monopolies", reflecting the influence of both labourite "socialism" and new school economics.(33) Patronism was, in fact, quite friendly to the socialism it encountered in the Manitoba of the 1890s. In answering the objections many people had to socialism, however, the Advocate simply applied the categories of radicalism, interpreting socialism within its terms:

> Socialism, pure and simple, means equality before the law.... Socialism does not propose to divide existing wealth, but assume control of all monopolies and sources of wealth and utilize them to put it beyond the power of any man to become a millionare (sic) , and insists every citizen will have equal rights with other citizens.(34)

The Advocate response to the specifics of the Labor Party platform, meanwhile, was rather sceptical, although all the

objectives were viewed as being desirable. But those proposals that involved relations between capital and labour, unmediated by the state, were seen as being difficult to attain. For example, the Labor Party sought "equal remuneration for equal services rendered, irrespective of sex." The Advocate, though supportive in principle, felt the proposal did not belong in a "political" programme.(35)

The electoral element in Patron political practice was sustained, to a certain extent, by a utopian undercurrent, which suggests that it had more substance than twentieth century reformism and a solid connection with earlier utopian variants of radicalism, notably Owenism. The Harmony Industrial Association formed in Assiniboia in the mid-nineties, was a utopian experiment based upon radical premises. The Vice President of the Association, writing in the Advocate in 1895, told Patrons that he and his comrades were laying the foundation of a new social system. "Now the economic development of the present system [competition] produces co-operation," W.C. Paynter argued, "which is compelled by monopoly, [which ultimately results in] government ownership of monopolies. This in turn leads to the 'co-operative commonwealth'." The Harmony settlement was modelled on combines, but unlike monopolies and combines where "all the profits accrue to the shareholders, and none to the men who actually are the producers," the means of

production were held in common, each farmer was an employee of the Association, and annual income was divided according to labour performed.(36)

A more specifically Patronist vision of utopia was contained in the fictional story "Home Rule in Manitoba", which appeared in the Advocate in 1895. Presented as an 1899 recollection of the insurrection that established "home rule", the narrative began at an auction in Melita. Farmers interrupted the auction, burning machinery and implements so that capitalists could not reclaim them. They then proceeded to Winnipeg, arrested the police, mayor and aldermen, cut the electricity, took over communications, and issued a declaration:

> To the Citizens of Manitoba: Most of us have found it impossible to make the barest of living in Manitoba. This is not the fault of the country, but of the laws, the railway freight rates, and the protective tariff.... Let us manage things in future that we get some return for our money and our labor.

Residents of the city were then asked to send delegates to a convention. This assembly of rural folks and urbanites decided to cease sending parliamentary representatives to Ottawa and to no longer receive the federal subsidy nor pay the tariff. Free trade was declared with the rest of the world. After reaching these decisions and others, the assembled producers dispersed to sack the Customs House, the Land Titles Office, and lawyers' offices. Then, upon hearing that the NWMP were moving in from Regina, the rails

were torn up at Oak Lake.(37) Although the story ends there, one presumes the associated producers of Manitoba, freed from plutocratic oppression, lived happily ever after.

Patrons constructed an image of themselves, their constituency, and their social world based upon a set of assumptions that had existed as a more or less coherent discourse, in one form or other, throughout the nineteenth century. The image was one of producers creating all wealth within the context of a political system in which they were controlled, oppressed, and robbed by nonproducers. The Patron response to this political manipulation was a theory of nonpartisanship in which traditional politics, rejected as inherently corrupt, would be replaced by a new morality based upon class rather than party loyalty. With the collapse of the Patrons, this form of analysis began to fade as a unified system of thought. Not only were its categories being stretched to the limit in an attempt to comprehend new economic and social realities, but it was being challenged, in a systematic though indirect way, by the new academic disciplines. It did not die, however. Many of the categories, and the concepts which linked them together, lived on into the twentieth century, giving oppositional substance and form to critiques developed in the twentieth century farm movement.

II

The turn of the century did not mark a sudden shift from radicalism to a less oppositional analysis. But by the 1920s there was a new, and more conservative, discursive system at the heart of Manitoba agrarianism. In the period from 1904 to roughly 1916, a more or less coherent radical analysis continued to exist in the mainstream of the movement. From about 1910 onwards, however, dominant categories began to displace radical categories and, by the post-war period, the mainstream discourse of Manitoba agrarianism was subordinate to the dominant rural ideology. This section first looks at the new discursive system (which we will call the new analysis or the new ideology) that became systematised in the later teens and the twenties (from about 1916 to 1925); it then traces some of the radical language that did survive in the history of the movement (from about 1903 to 1925).

The economic discussion that characterised the new analysis was conducted squarely within the context of market production and consumption. Most importantly, co-operative marketing and purchasing, which were central to the grain grower vision of agriculture, were understood simply as strategic interventions in a neutral market in which middlemen, interspersed between producer and consumer, had developed an unfair advantage. The capitalist market was the given terrain upon which co-operation worked. The

appeal of co-operation was that it reduced inefficiencies while claiming a larger proportion of the surplus (profit) for agricultural producers. "One of our biggest problems at the present time," President Burnell told the 1924 UFM convention,

> is to bring the price of those commodities which we have to buy and which have to do with our cost of production, down to the level of the products of our farms. One factor in the price of these commodities is the costly system of distribution--this can be remedied by co-operation.

Furthermore, it was noted the following year, co-operation would return "to the producer all the profits accrued over the cost of the operations in marketing his product."(38) Besides these immediate commercial objectives, farmers learned from the MGGA's Rural Citizenship that co-operative organisation also drew isolated farmers together in a community of interest, restored agriculture to its proper place of dignity "which has been lost through bad business methods", and replaced bad business methods with good ones. And at a higher level, Hopkins Moorhouse argued in Deep Furrows, the various actors in agriculture (farmers, merchants, railways, etc.) could co-operate to create a truly efficient economy.(39) Ultimately, the Wheat Pool was the archetypical co-operative marketing organisation in this new analysis. It was voluntarist, based upon the individual wills and decisions of producers (as opposed to the compulsory "state socialist" Wheat Board). It was completely equitable, basing its price offered for grain on

"real" values in the world market. And, finally, it operated on the basis of managerial expertise, hiring the best and most market-wise grain trade managers available. In other words, the Pool combined an efficient management and market sensitivity with democratic producer control.(40)

In a 1921 statement on trade, C.H. Burnell maintained that "the law of supply and demand can only be temporarily abrogated. Ultimately it makes itself felt and adjustments are made in harmony with that law." The UFM president went on to argue in his convention address that the solution to agricultural depression lay in "adopting a trade policy based on sound economic principles--a policy that will discard the fallacious principle that trade is necessarily war, and will recognise that trade is a matter of mutual advantage to buyer and seller." Hence, the emphasis in discussions of the tariff and protection had shifted over twenty-five years from the politics of monopolist oppression to the economics of market distortions and trade impediments. In this new analysis, farmers required wider markets for their productive output and a freer market in the inputs and consumer items they purchased. Protectionism continued to be "essentially inequitable, immoral and vicious" in this ideology, but marketing and trade considerations were paramount:

> 1. It [the tariff] artificially restricts and hampers the exchange of products--exchange which is natural, legitimate and of mutual advantage....

> 2. It takes large sums of money from consumers generally without any possibility of their knowing how much is taken, into whose hands it passes, or for what purpose it is expended....
> 3. It leads business and manufacturing interests to depend upon arbitrary enactment and not upon natural economic conditions and necessities for their industrial progress....
> 4. It is a system so vicious in its fundamental essence that through all its history, in this country and in other countries, it has invariably been found lending itself to frequent manipulation by class interests for their advantage at the expense of others.(41)

The concepts of productive technique and farm management were part of the movement's economic vocabulary as well, but these were subordinate to issues such as marketing and transportation. The main initiatives of the movement affected management and production in two ways. On the one hand, better farming and better farm business methods were seen to result inevitably from the movement. The Pool contributed to better farming, for example, by allowing farmers to market their crops in an orderly fashion throughout the year, which, it was said, meant farmers were better able to properly husband their land. And, according to the MGGA:

> Beside helping you to better farming, the movement is designed to help you to better business success.... The Grain Growers' movement has already done much to improve the business of farming both as regards distribution of supplies and as regards disposing of products.... Now is your opportunity of getting into the movement for the opportunity it affords of bettering your business.(42)

On the other hand, the movement had to be careful not to neglect farm management as it took on the larger questions.

The Guide, while focusing most of its attention on marketing strategies and politics, editorialised from time to time on the need for farmers to engage in "education, organization and co-operation" in order to conduct their "business on economic lines". Similarly, the UFM president often alluded to the importance of farm management as an area of organisational involvement. In 1925, for example, President A.J.M. Poole implored United Farmers not to overlook "the importance of efficiency in farm management and operation" as "the profit determining factor in agricultural production." Hence, whereas farm management, production, and individual entrepreneurship tended to receive primary emphasis in the dominant ideology, within the new movement ideology these were subordinated to the larger profit determinants of market manipulation and countervailing action.(43)

Rural society consisted of a series of problems requiring resolution in the new ideology. The executive of the MGGA urged in 1919 that a department be established at MAC "in order that the varied problems of rural life" be given careful study, the country life report and philosophy figured prominently in the MGGA's Rural Citizenship, and the central question in the UFM's 1928 membership questionnaire was "Is There a Farm Problem".

The central social element in the solution was the notion of community. In a 1918 MGGA pamphlet, the question

"What has the movement done" was posed. The second recorded accomplishment (in a list of ten) was that it had "helped to educate toward real knowledge of public issues and real community consciousness and efficiency." And, in a 1921 Managra article, W.R. Wood (UFM Secretary) suggested that one of the primary achievements of the UFM was that it had helped farmers learn the lesson of community life, which was that their lives were interrelated.(44) But the concept of community had variable intonations. There were essentially two types of community. On the one hand, there was the broad national community comprised of different interest groups. On the other hand, there was the rural community inhabited by families and individuals. Within this discourse, the farm movement increasingly saw itself as an instrument for constructing local community cohesion and participating in the pursuit of national community harmony.

At the national level, agriculture and the farm population sought to co-operate with other classes or groups. The sense of farmers being part of a constituency of producers receded, and was replaced by the image of grain growers as one of a series of interest groups on the social terrain. This perspective was present in the MGGA as early as 1904 but, at that time, it was still cast in terms of radical analysis. "This," President J.W. Scallion proclaimed in justifying the organising efforts of grain growers,

> is an age of huge organizations, combinations and trusts. Every manufacturing industry, every profession is thoroughly united for the purpose of promoting its own special interest by procuring favorable legislation and otherwise; and nearly all legislation is but a compromise between contending interests.

Twelve years later the Council of Commerce and Agriculture (consisting of businessmen and farmers) was launched to provide "a medium whereby interests that have very often appeared antagonistic may be brought into closer touch with each other and given an opportunity of looking at things from each others viewpoint." And, in an MGGA pamphlet, it was noted that the organisation had won "respectful recognition among the organised interests of the nation, and a fuller chance for a square deal." This co-operation and recognition was pursued in the name of community. The first two objects of the MGGA constitution, for example, sought:

> a) The all around development of rural life with a view to making it as satisfying and as effective in the commonwealth as possible, and the establishment of right relationships between rural and urban communities;
> b) To forward in every honorable and legitimate way the interests of the rural population, not in antagonism to other elements of our population, but in cordial co-operation with all.(45)

At the local, rural settlement level, the movement was actively engaged in the construction of a pan-community identity. In the ascent from individual through familial to community self-consciousness, the authors of the "UFM Handbook of Practical Work" maintained, UFM activists should play a prominent role:

> The human individual only gradually comes to full self-consciousness. The human community comes much more slowly to its full self-consciousness. Family self-consciousness is reached sooner, but we cannot be satisfied until the community realizes itself and begins to live its corporate life.... Just as a family has its conferences and consultations, so the community must talk over its interests and prospects. If there is a weakness or a difficulty that may be overcome by concerted effort, the community ought to work together on it.... The local board of the United Farmers' Association ought to be leading in the work.... Help your community to full self-consciousness.(46)

Hence, a 1918 convention resolution urged local organisations to:

> Unify and inspire the local community for its fullest self-consciousness and its most efficient activity; Enlist the sympathetic co-operation of all the best elements, the finest moral spirit, the best trained intellect in the community for the cause;... Encourage the development of effective community workers and leaders.(47)

Through organisations such as the Bureau of Social Research, the Grain Growers and United Farmers were linked with other organisations, such as the churches, schools, and agricultural societies, in breaking down "partisan and sectarian walls" and encouraging community enterprises.

The most significant change in the political language of the Manitoba farm movement between the 1890s and the 1920s was the transformation of the Patrons' version of nonpartisanship into the citizenship of the UFM. Citizenship was the political equivalent of economic co-operation and social community in the new analysis.

What was rural citizenship, and what was its place in agrarian political practice? In 1921 the UFM President told his convention audience that:

> every citizen...must set himself to live for a citizenship of intelligent and conscientious participation in public life, and every group must devote itself to co-operative and sympathetic investigation of conditions and discussion of principles and methods by which evils may be averted and the people's true well-being promoted.

And, his predecessor claimed, the farm movement trained women and men in citizenship "in order to fit them, when the occasion should arise, to be the mouthpiece of their class in farming (sic) such legislation as would tend to place our economic burdens more equitably upon the shoulders of all classes of the people."(48) This residual language of class was somewhat at odds with a language of citizenship. More appropriate was the suggestion in an organisational pamphlet from the early twenties that the "farmers of this country are not a class; they are the majority of the Canadian people...[and] they are awakening to a fuller consciousness of their responsibility in all that makes for citizenship." Essentially this responsibility meant co-operating and seeking common ground with other groups. R.C. Henders, addressing the 1916 Joint Committee on Commerce and Agriculture, cast agrarian relations with bankers and manufacturers in these terms. He explained that farmers, in seeking to influence legislation, "welcomed the co-operation

of other interests, and felt sure that all interests only desired a square deal."(49)

With its entry into electoral politics, the UFM had the opportunity to put this notion of citizenship into practice. There were five fundamental principles enunciated in the 1922 political platform: the "Spirit of Good Will", which held that democratic citizenship was "practically co-operative goodwill"; the "Ideal of Common Good", through which the seeking of class advantage was repudiated in favour of the well being of the whole people; the "Co-operative Method", which meant working with those who had common objectives; the "Law of Progress", to "maintain and promote the forward looking attitude; and "Citizenship the Basic Problem", whereby the fundamental task of government was to provide all with education for citizenship. The platform also noted that, since the UFM was much more than simply a political organisation, the association should retain its independence from any and all governments. This, of course, extended to a "UFM" government as well. Indeed, as George Chipman argued immediately after the 1922 election:

> the farmers have problems that simply cannot be reduced to questions of politics alone...and, to complete the work accomplished on July 18, the farmers of Manitoba should set themselves the task of making the UFM a thoroughly representative organization, covering the whole field of ways and means of improving the conditions of rural life and developing a creative citizenship.(50)

A sense of the distance and autonomy between movement and administration, as part of the ideology of citizenship, was conveyed in a memorandum submitted by the UFM board to the UFM government in the fall of 1922. Urging certain reforms, the board prefaced its suggestions by stressing "that these recommendations are made with no thought or intention of any attempt at dictation, but with cordial goodwill and the desire to be of practical assistance in promoting the well being of the province and the true efficiency of public administration."(51)

The reality, of course, was that the sort of nonpartisanship that became known as Brackenism was a practical rendering of this ideology. In a "legislative review" at the 1926 UFM convention, Bracken presented his political philosophy through a recollection of the situation that gave rise to the formation of the farmer government. "There had been," he began, "a clash of partisan and class interests in which manufacturer, artisan, farmer, manual labourer, merchant, salaried employee, professional man and others of all classes had sought the advancement of their own interests as opposed to those of other classes." This divisiveness, he continued, coupled with the partisanship of the "historic political parties", produced a situation in which "a businesslike and economical administration of Provincial affairs, with very considerable retrenchment in expenditure, was absolutely necessary to save the Province

from disaster." Hence, "the UFM decided to take action politically." The Premier concluded by telling his audience that the aim of his government had been to give the province honest, progressive, efficient, and patriotic administration, which meant the following:

> honest, because that is an indispensable quality which any Government should possess as trustees for the people--progressive, so that its whole outlook shall be forward looking and advanced, ...efficient, because the finnancial condition of the province then as never before demanded a businesslike and economical administration..., and patriotic because it was bound to regard the best interests of all the people and not solely any particular class of people.(52)

The citizenship and service that constituted UFM political practice in both the government and the association, therefore, was subordinate to the broader economic and social imperatives of co-operation and community.

But, precisely because they were social phenomena, co-operation, community, and citizenshp had to be consciously constructed. Hence, the most important aspect of organisational work in the new analysis was the education of members and potential members. According to W.R. Wood, general secretary during the later teens and early twenties, a shift had taken place in the movement's history:

> In the early days of our organization, our time and thoughts were principally concerned in dealing with the grievances and disabilities in connection with the marketing and transportation of our produce, but now, while we do not neglect these things, we recognize our obligations in regard to developing a fully efficient citizenship on the part of our people, and much of the energy of our local associations is being directed toward

> educational development and efficiency in rural leadership.(53)

Under Wood's impressive direction, numerous local and provincial educational programmes were organised. "As rural people," one pamphlet noted,

> we must be in touch with what is happening in the world. We must know about our relationship with other interests and other groups of citizens. We must understand the tendencies of trade and industry, and be prepared to take our rightful place in working out equitable adjustments.

This process was called "education for citizenship", which meant:

> [knowing] not only how to grow wheat, but how to market it..., [knowing] how to act as a member or an officer of an agricultural society or a school board..., [being] acquainted by practice with working in association with neighbors... [and knowing and feeling that one] exists to serve his community.... In a word, Education in our democracy must practically prepare for co-operative participation in the ordinary service of the community life.

Therefore the UFM political platform called for the whole educational process to be imbued with "the ideal of preparing for co-operative service and civic duty", with rural schools working toward "the unifying of our population, the development of community efficiency and the raising of the standard of citizenship."(54) Education, then, was the way in which individuals were moulded into social beings. By first awakening people to the fact they were social, then training them to act socially, the movement would, it was hoped, produce an economically, politically, and socially conscious collectivity.

In the end, these various levels produced a reformed public persona for farm men. In Deep Furrows (1918), which might be described as an "official" association history of the farm movement, Hopkins Moorhouse contrasted the organised "New Farmer" with the pre-Sintaluta "Hayseed". To the farmer of old, he wrote,

> it appeared that he had no business! He merely grew the grain. Apparently the farmer was a pair of pants, a shirt and a slouch hat that sat on a wagon load of wheat, drove it up the incline into the elevator and rattled away again for another load!

But this began to change with the Manitoba Grain Act and the Sintaluta case. For the railways, the court decision on car distribution meant "that the time had come to recognize the fact that there was a man inside the soil-grimed shirt." Farmers, meanwhile, "began to appreciate...the task which faced these energetic men in successfully handling the giant organization for which they assumed responsibility." They both, therefore, "began to entertain for the other a greater respect." Ten years later, during the "Siege of Ottawa", the Grain Growers were popularly referred to as "Sod-Busters" "It was rather startling to find them," Moorhouse noted, "merely a new type of Business Farmer...." It was, he concluded, "a far-seeing, clear thinking New Farmer who has come forward in the last decade. Through his associations, his marketing experiences, his contact with railways and banks and manufacturers and governments, he has become a student of economics."(55)

The ignorant, biased, and individualistic sodbuster and hayseed gave way to the knowledgeable, respectful, and organised rural businessman in Moorhouse's account. In the MGGA and UFM organisational literature, the businessman was also a community citizen. Through improvements in business organisation and community life, it was said, "we have raised the whole social status of farm life until today, the farmer is no longer termed a moss-back, or hayseed, but is recognised as a citizen equally competent and efficient with all others in the community." And, more forcefully:

> He knows the place of agriculture among national industries. His range of thought is enlarged. His views are listened to by members of other groups. He is, in the fullest sense of the word, a man among men.(56)

He was, simply, the ultimate product and personification of the movement. The movement, after all, had become more concerned with socialising and raising the status of farm people than with facilitating radical social change. The farm man, given an apparently equal standing with corporate officials on the economic terrain or a legitimate claim to democratic citizenship on the political terrain, was a worthy and fulfilled man. Ironically, however, the ideal UFM man ceased to be recognisable as a farmer in any meaningful sense; he simply became another citizen, community participant, and businessman, albeit a rural and agricultural one.

Although the dominant categories had mostly displaced radical categories in popular agrarian ideology by the twenties, a radical analysis continued to be evident in the Manitoba farm movement throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century. To be sure, it was stronger earlier in the century and weaker later, but it was present nevertheless. It is possible to discern a pattern of post-Patronist radical discourse that, while less overtly political, utopian, and resistant than its nineteenth century predecessor, was a significant, though increasingly subordinate, component of Manitoba agrarianism.

In proposing a resolution in favour of government ownership of elevators at the 1908 MGGA convention, the mover declared that "[t]he time has come for farmers to assume the control of their own storage facilities and derive for their labor its full returns." Two years later, W.D. Lamb of Plumas (Manitoba) provided this statement with some analytical depth in a letter to the Guide. To answer the question "Will government elevators pay?", which was frequently posed in those years, Lamb responded by asking rhetorically "Who pays for the elevators?" It was farmers and workers, of course. An elevator, he maintained, was a product of human labour. Labour produced the lumber, nails and paint, and put the building together. "It is not capital that erects elevators," then, "but labor. Capital itself is a labor product and could never have existed if

labor had not first existed. The capitalists are men with money, the stored up labor of other people." Furthermore, the labour of farmers produced the crops, without which the elevators (and railways and implement companies) would have no business. "But farmers 'own' none of these things, although it is their labor that produces them...." Hence, he concluded, government elevators would "pay" in the sense that farmers would finally own and control, through the government, the wealth they had created.(57) A labour theory of value continued to be employed in the movement, then, although with a slightly more agrarian tone than had existed in the 1890s. In a broader indictment later in 1910, the President of the Gilbert Plains Grain Growers' Association asked the rhetorical question "Why is Canada prosperous?", and answered using explicitly producerist language:

> Your government had $100,000,000 of a revenue last year. Where did the money come from? Your manufacturers are millionaires. Where did their money come from? Your railroad magnates and charter mongers are rolling in wealth, even your merchants are prosperous. Is it because Liberals or Conservatives rule? Or is it because of the millions of toilers who are producing the wealth from mother earth? The miners, [the] lumberjacks, the mossbacks are producing the wealth of Canada.(58)

This oppressive and exploitative class was defined, for the most part, in terms of monopoly, although, by the century's second decade, "interest" was beginning to displace "monopoly" in many speeches and texts that were

otherwise governed by radical premises. Early MGGA convention discussions and resolutions, for example, were often framed in terms of monopoly, as in a 1910 speech by J.D. Hunt on the background to the elevator question: "railroad monopoly has come in a great many different disguises. Its latest and sweetest form was a great big wooly Elevator combine."(59) The single tax, meanwhile, a popular cause in the farm movement, was an important medium for discussing monopoly in the early twentieth century. J.H. Richards of Chater argued in 1914 that monopoly and combination, but especially the land monopoly, "is the power that enslaves our people and fills the land with poverty and want." But, he claimed, "when the Single Tax is fully and completely adopted...the toiler will then receive the just reward for his toil, and his limbs will no longer bear the fetters of industrial slavery." And, as late as 1920, the UFM page of the Guide contained a song entitled "Big Interests" which was clearly radical in inspiration:

> We have in this country a wonderful thing,
> Though scarcely a topic of which one should sing;
> The fact is, though strange how it e'er came to pass,
> We live 'neath the sway of a Governing Class.
>
> They weren't set up by the B.N.A. Act,
> But that they now rule is the surest of fact;
> They've no place by right in the ship of the realm,
> But surely as sure they preside at the helm.
>
> ...And so from the toilers from poor and from rich,
> From labor, from farmer, with never a hitch,
> They draw them a tribute to pile in their banks,

And never a soul who contributes get thanks.

..."Who are they?" the Barons of High Tariff Town,
By an ancient N.P. made the lords of renown;
First they rule through the Tories and then
through the Grits
Till the H.C. of L. [high cost of living] drives
us out of our wits.(60)

More significant than these scattered references were the persistent radical definitions of oppressors and oppression in MGGA Presidential addresses. At the 1911, meeting R.C. Henders drew attention to "a lack of interest and sympathy that seems to exist between the governments of our country and the great wealth producing class of our population, while on the other hand capitalistic and combination interests seem to experience very few if any of these disabilities and inconveniences." The following year, reverting to the language of monopoly, he made the connection between political power and economic domination more explicit:

> Oppression by an aristocracy of industrial monopolists is as bad as oppression by an aristocracy of political monopolists.... We are governed by an elective aristocracy which in its turn is largely controlled by an aristocracy of wealth. Behind the governments and the legislatures are the corporations and trusts. Behind the machines, the rings, and the bosses are the business monopolists, the industrial combinations, and the plutocrats; behind the political monopolists are the industrial monopolists.

Later in the decade, Henders analysed the causes of the high cost of living. Class legislation and economic injustice, he claimed, began with the acquisition of land. Land fell

into the hands of a few, and its rising value created fortunes. Since the creation of wealth was social, however, some people suffered when others took more than their share out of the common product. He concluded, therefore, that the "power to extort surplus and unearned increment is at the root of every economic and social wrong because...it not only creates poverty in one class, but it lessens the total wealth of the community."(61)

The tariff, while increasingly viewed as simply a market impediment in the twentieth century, did continue to be viewed within the Manitoba farm movement, by some and at times, as a political instrument of class exploitation. "The protective system," the MGGA leadership told Laurier in 1910, "creates a class whose interests are essentially different from the people at large", and, J.W. Scallion added, it was "a breeding ground and shelter for combines and trusts which prey upon the individual life of the people."(62) This class, created by political means, secured and enforced laws to protect its economic interests. "Therefore," Grain Grower delegates were told in 1913, "if we have a class which owns a large part of the national wealth we may expect that that class will see to it that the vast power exerted by the machinery of government is exerted in its interests", and most notably by means of the tariff. Farmers and workers were compelled "to contribute a large percentage of the products of their labor to the privileged

and protected classes" through the tariff. This method of "collecting taxes", which put "the burden on the backs of working people" and exempted the rich, resulted in a concentration of wealth that had "become the mightiest undercurrent in national life." According to one grain grower, this "power to tax" was "the power to destroy one class to build up and enrich other classes." And the tariff's significance in economic and social life, the MGGA President said in 1913, was that, "in short, we cannot enjoy economic equality without political equality."(63) The tariff, therefore, symbolised and was the most significant manifestation of a corrupted state.

A corrupted state, of course, was accompanied by corrupted political practice, and a radical sense of both inherited politics and the possibilities of a new producerist politics lived on in the MGGA as well. J.B. Parker, in his 1910 account of "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce", sketched a portrait of the old style political farmer:

> At Grandview I saw one of our farmer candidates on his own political platform, with a muzzle on, and two corporation lawyers were pleading his case for him. One of these lawyers...said that when he read Sam Hughes was elected, we would hear him cheering all the way from Winnipeg. The love of these corporation lawyers for the farmers' candidate is very touching.

J.W. Scallion, in addressing the 1912 MGGA convention as honourary president, decried the lingering party divisions among farmers. "All other classes can unite for their

common benefit," he lamented, "[but] farmers alone are divided and conquered by the predatory interests and their political tools, and just as long as farmers are more concerned for the success of a political party than for their common good, present economic conditions will continue" "The interests", on the other hand, supported any party or government they could use as a business asset and opposed those they could not use.(64) But this sort of partyism would be transcended by the people--farmers and workers--uniting to create a new politics. The radical variant of this vision persisted through the post-war period and into the twenties. So, in 1918, a Guide contributer could write:

> ...let us get close to labor.... We are the same people, we all work for a living.... Legislation that is bad for one is bad for the other; and what is more important, if farmers remain as a class by themselves and wage earners in another class by themselves, neither caring for the others interests, neither will be able ever to combat the power of the big interests.(65)

More importantly, in the UFM "Farm Problem" questionnaire of 1928, while most of the answers were structured in terms of market economics and social co-operation, some of the responses to the question "What is the solution" (to the agricultural depression) reveal that the dominant categories did not completely control agrarian discourse in the twenties. One local, invoking Bellamy's Looking Backward, suggested "the only solution to the problem is...state socialism and the abolition of money as

we have it...." Another local advocated "revision of the banking system making it work for the good of the people and not to make profit. The ultimate solution is the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth, production for use and not for profit. The Capitalistic system lies at the bottom of all our troubles."(66) This presaged newer political organisations and analyses that moved beyond radicalism to proto-socialist and socialist forms.

The analysis that was pre-eminent in the post-war Manitoba Grain Growers Association and the United Farmers of Manitoba subordinated inherited Patronist elements to categories drawn from the dominant ideology. By the 1920s, market, community, and citizenship displaced class, politics, and producerism as the main organising principles of Manitoba's male agrarianism. Patronism had been characterised by the determining unity of the political. In the twentieth century this unity was deconstructed, and then reconstructed around the discrete elements of economy, society, politics, and education, in which the economic and social were determinant. The market and co-operation defined the economic, the social was viewed in terms of community and cohesiveness, citizenship and service defined the political, and the educational encompassed the subjective acquisition of these various aspects of knowledge. The new unity, personified by the ideal MGGA/UFM man, subordinated the popular movement to practices that

supported rather than challenged the structures of power. Radicalism, while subdued, was not defeated, however. It lived on as a subtext of the movement, laying the linguistic foundation for the left insurgencies of the thirties and forties.

III

The formation of the women's section of the MGGA at the 1918 convention marked the first organisational expression of female agrarianism in Manitoba. Although women may have been involved individually in the Patrons and earlier formations--as they were in the MGGA from 1912--they did not exist as distinct entities in those pioneering groups. In contrast with their urban, middle class sisters who struggled for suffrage, then, Manitoba farm women were rather slow to organise. Indeed, organised female agrarianism was a post-suffrage phenomenon, becoming a force only after women had won the vote in the province. It was against a popular background of male agrarian and middle class feminist agitation that the vocabulary of the women's agrarian movement was constructed. On the one hand, feminism created a space for discussion of the political, economic, and social status of women. The women's section of the farm press, often staffed by suffrage feminists, kept farm women informed about the struggles and actions of middle class women. More importantly, though, these

publications provided a forum for readers to discuss and assess their own experiences as farm wives and daughters. On the other hand, the radical language of the men's movement, although somewhat less resistant by the later teens, imparted a critical and class tone to the analysis which developed. Like the men's movement in the same time period, however, this analysis was constrained by the dominant ideology.

The ideological space created by middle class feminism allowed farm women to contemplate their domestic existence as a problem with identifiable causes and possible solutions. The central questions then, as now, revolved around whether or not men were responsible for the difficulties and oppressions women faced. Were women to blame for their own predicament? Were men really the problem? Or, were men merely the victimised intermediaries in a larger system? Two series of letters from The Farmers' Advocate of 1897 and 1905 illustrate this debate.

Both series began with a criticism of men. One correspondent in 1897 cited the case of a southern Manitoba farmer who, attempting to build a kitchen onto his house as cheaply as possible, refused to accede to his wife's request to include a cellar for storing milk. "The good wife got angry," readers were told, "and threatened to make a public exposure of the disadvantages of a farmer's wife, telling these dairy lecturers [who happened to be visiting the farm

at the time] that it was not knowledge we wanted so much as a chance to put what we know into practice." She concluded that,

> if every woman was to strke for better accommodation and reasonable house improvements it would be the beginning of better times. Until an improved lot of men help their struggling wives and daughters by providing better facilities for carrying on their part of the work there cannot be anything but discontent.(67)

Eight years later, and with more forceful language, farm men were indicted for treating their wives with contempt. There were many women, this writer claimed, who had to build their own henhouses and garden fences because men would not, clean up after men when they tracked manure and mud into the house, and endure men's curses when they requested things. This, she said,

> is really a true picture of by far the greater number of farmer's homes in some vicinities, and it is the lack of all that constitutes a real home that makes women detest the farm.... How would the same conduct appear in the eyes of the public, if it were acted between man and man? The usurper would be justly called a plain thief. Does it make the action noble or honest because it is only a helpless woman he is defrauding? ...It remains in the hands of the farmer to remedy this evil.(68)

Other letters pointed to a double standard existing on most farms whereby men enjoyed fine horses, fine barns, and every form of farm technology while the women--"the hardest worked and poorest used of anyone in the country"--were struggling with meagre resources to make the home comfortable and attractive. "Farmers should appreciate everything their

wives do," one said, "and not look upon them as if they were a machine or a football; they are human beings and want to be treated as such."(69)

There were two types of responses to these criticisms. One was to blame women for their predicament. Hence, one woman wrote in 1905 proclaiming that she had just married an OAC graduate who was truly a gentleman. In her mind, it was a woman's own fault if she was a slave. There were brutish men who enjoyed submitting women to drudgery, she conceded, but she felt a woman should simply refuse to do such work!(70) In a somewhat similar, though far less strident vein, a more experienced woman related how she had been married to a farmer for fourteen years. With a household ranging in size from six to ten, she did all her own sewing, housework, and quilting, milked the cows, churned, picked apples and dried them, and always had time for fancy work and reading. She concluded that life was what one made it, and it disgusted her to hear people talk of the drudgery of farm work in an age of cheese factories, creameries, and other conveniences.(71) The other response, which later became the dominant ethos in the farm women's movement, was to defend men while criticising the larger system that exploited both women and men. Men were too busy with their own work to improve domestic arrangements, the argument went in one letter, and the fundamental problem was a lack of capital on the farm. If the government reduced freight

rates and the burden of taxation, farmers would have the money to improve their own, and their wives', working conditions.(72)

When a systematic analysis emerged after 1918, farm movement women adopted the male language of radicalism to link the position of women in the home to the political struggles of farm men. Within the Women Grain Growers and the United Farm Women, the tariff, as the symbol of agrarian political oppression, was viewed as a mechanism that specifically exploited women as well as men. Farm women, according to this view, had an equal status with men in the producing class. "Agriculturists in Canada, and that term must include also the farmer's wife," Mary McCallum wrote in 1919, "produce a wealth equal to all others, yet there is no class which uses and enjoys smaller returns for its labor." And, since it was estimated that one-fifth of farm income was extracted by the tariff, she lost one-fifth of the value of the eggs, butter, and cream she produced. "How long," it was asked, "will women be content to give one-fifth of all their time, their labor, and their produce to the enrichment of the few plutocrats who benefit by the tariff?" Furthermore, the farm wife also felt the exploitative effects of the tariff in her role as chief consumer for the home. It was especially oppressive in the kitchen, "the housekeeper's workshop". McCallum claimed that the farm woman, "each year, on things she buys for use in her kitchen

alone, pays more in taxes than is levied directly on an entire half-section farm for all purposes." Hence, when these various aspects of the tariff's operation were combined, women were found to suffer more than men:

> Women and children have been the special victims of the tariff ever since there was a tariff. Homes have been robbed and families reduced to penury because of the tariff. From the time a woman is born until she dies she is fraudulently though legally bereft of the returns of her labor through the tariff.... It is an unseen, unsuspected presence, closer than a brother, nearer than mother or father, but exerting an influence that is fiendishly sinister and absorbing.

It was little wonder, then, that so many farm homes lacked the simplest labour-saving devices or the smallest comforts. On the one hand, the price of household items was inflated because of the tariff and, on the other, there was little money available in any event because virtually all of the farm income went into the purchase of farm machinery and farm supplies. And to add insult to injury, it was noted in passing, the tariff favoured rich women at the expense of poor women by invariably taxing necessities at a higher rate than luxuries.(73)

It was within this discursive context that the UFWM made a submission to the Tariff Commission in October of 1920. "In presenting my paper putting forth claims for redress of Tariff oppressions for an oppressed people, the agriculturist," Mrs. James Elliot of the UFWM said in introduction, "I offer no apologies. All my statements are

facts gleaned from actual toiling agriculturists (men and women)." The submission, in fact, was based on a survey undertaken by the UFWM to ascertain the conditions under which farm women were working. This popular appropriation of the survey method revealed families living under difficult conditions in which women were forced to work long hours with little technological or human assistance. Of the forty-eight women surveyed, for example, all rose between 4:30 and 7:00 in the morning, and all but five ended their working day between 9:00 and 11:00 in the evening. None of the households had water in the kitchen, two had cistern pumps, none had hard water without hauling or carrying, none had a bath, and only seven had an indoor winter toilet. Although every home had a sewing machine, "in order to get the greatest possible results out of the women", the only other labour saving devices were egg beaters, dust and floor mops, potato parers, and a few power churns. Every one of these items, it was noted, bore a tariff. Sewing machines had a rate of $14.00, which meant that a total of $670.00 was extracted from the forty-eight households through sewing machines alone. But it was the cost of clothing that was particularly repulsive to the UFWM because it was this that caused children to suffer the most. It was pointed out to the commissioners that woollen garments--a necessity for the Manitoba winter--were simply too expensive for most people to buy. "The brutality of it all," Mrs. Elliot protested,

"is the manufacturers realize the labouring people, which includes farmers, cannot pay the price, hence few, very few woollen articles are secured by our country stores." "Why," she asked, "must such brutality be exploited on the little children?" "In the face of such conditions," she concluded, "can anyone deny the reasonableness of the request to lower the tariff restrictions on the needs of the home makers of our land."(74)

But this use of the tariff symbol represented more than an appropriation of radical terms. It also revealed that women viewed their oppression as being a part of the exploitation of all farm people. As women grain growers were reminded in 1919, during a review of their varied activities, "it is well not to lose sight of the purpose of the organization, that it was established primarily to help the farm people by educating them to understand the economic and political influences that affect the agricultural class."(75) Furthermore, the first clause of the women's constitution ("women shall have the same standing in the asociation as men") was understood to exclude the notion of distinct women's and men's sections. Rather, the MGGA was perceived as an association of women and men in which the women also had an autonomous section. Women, then, were members of their local grain growers' association first and members of the women's section second. Two separate bodies, it was argued, would mean separation and weakness, whereas

an association with a women's section co-operating was "a demonstration of the fact that the farm men and the farm women are in the organization for the promotion of their common interests, and that after all, most of the problems which concern either men or women concern both."(76)

The strength of this class identity was most strongly felt around the issue of the "Women's Party" in 1918. This imperialist, militarist, high tariff, and anti-worker party, organised by prominent Toronto feminists close to the National Council of Women, was soundly criticised and rejected by farm movement women. And, in the process, the discussion helped crystallise women's thoughts about their relation to women from other classes and men of their own class. "It is possible for classes to unite on national policies," one farm woman concluded,

> but utterly impossible for sexes. A woman's party makes women's voice and opinion on public affairs as innaccessible (sic) as if they resided on Mars. Let us be done for ever with sex enterprises. They can't work. Let the farm people, men and women, make up the voice of agriculture. Let industrial or other workers, men and women, make up the voice of labor.(77)

With this image of themselves, farm movement women concentrated their energies on a range of activities born of the traditional domestic responsibilities. By 1925 there were seven committees in the UFWM to co-ordinate the various lines of endeavour. Emphasising education, social welfare, and legislation affecting women and children, the organisation strove to improve social conditions and develop

local tastes for the "finer things of life". In the area of legislation, for example, movement women monitored and sought changes in the fields of child welfare, divorce, marital property rights, naturalisation for married women, and education. At the local community level, meanwhile, they complemented the work of the Women's Institutes by engaging in Red Cross and patriotic work, maintaining rest rooms and libraries, or organising musical, literary, and educational evenings.(78) The very fact that movement and institute women were able to co-operate in the way they did indicates the extent to which the dominant ideology provided the vocabulary and defined the goals of the movement. For, while movement women employed the rhetoric of radicalism and were influenced by middle class feminism, they were constrained by the categories of market, consumption, rural problem, community, and education for citizenship. In a way which paralleled the new analysis in the male mainstream of the farm movement, then, the language used by movement women was ultimately defined by economic, social, political, and educational categories drawn from rural social science.

For farm movement women, the economic was the terrain upon which they produced commodities for the market, consumed items from the market, and experienced the injustice of their situation most acutely. It was, in the end, the most significant factor in the determination of rural conditions. "Should the stress of economic

conditions," Mrs. James Elliot of Cardale (UFWM President) asked in 1923, "not be the one factor to bind the rural people together in this Association? 1922 gave a bountiful harvest but the cost of production and garnering was out of all proportion to the meagre pittance received for the grain." And, she continued two years later, "farm people must realize for themselves a greater share of the wealth which they produce that they may have the purchasing power necessary to establish...homes," and achieve the educational, social and political goals of the organisation.(79) More specifically, and with reference to a particularly offensive economic problem in the eyes of the farm movement, Mary McCallum made a connection between land speculation and the condition of women. Because of the impossibility of finding reasonably priced land in the settled areas of the province, she argued, farm people were forced to homestead in unsettled regions. In a trip to such a district she found housing of the most basic, pioneering sort and, therefore, housekeeping "of the most difficult and discouraging kind". There were no telephones nor was there mail delivery. More shocking was the fact that the nearest doctor was forty miles away; hence many women bore children without the aid of a doctor or a nurse. The profiteering of the land speculators, she concluded, "directly acts disastrously on our farm women," making this aspect of the economic very much a woman's problem.(80)

The central concept in UFWM discussions of domestic production was co-operative marketing. The marketing committee noted in 1921 that a general decline in agricultural prices meant farm women were receiving less for their butter, eggs and poultry. This made the co-operative method of marketing "an intensely woman's problem". "Our own one-hundred per-cent organized resistance, with intelligent co-operation," women were told later, "is the one thing that is needed to bring about better marketing conditions"(81) And, of course, women were connected to and affected by men's co-operative endeavours. The Pool, Tracy Patrick suggested in her "Pool Woman" column in 1925,

> can make her burden lighter--enable her to possibly see that little debt which worried her more than anyone knew, cleared up; make it possible for her to have certain little comforts for her home.... And, just as the Wheat Pool has been instituted to help the woman on the farm, so the Pool wants and needs the help of that woman..., willing to cheerfully make temporary sacrifices and suffer certain temporary inconveniences in order that she, her family, and her neighbors may ultimately benefit.(82)

As much as the economic realm might determine conditions for farm women in this analysis, the most significant change occurred in the social realm. More precisely, the rural problem and its resolution were the categories through which society was most frequently contemplated in the movement. At their first convention in 1918, Irene Parlby of the United Farm Women of Alberta told Grain Grower women "that a common attitude of the old farmer

was to consider that there is no rural problem, that things will adjust themselves if only left alone." She maintained, however, that there was a problem "and that a share of it is uniquely women's work." During the following decade the farm women's movement concentrated a goodly portion of its efforts on identifying and solving this putative problem. In 1925, for example, it was explained in a UFWM document that rural women had discovered that the improvement "of rural life can best be accomplished by systematically following a carefully prepared program." Hence, the UFWM board was divided into seven committees, "each responsible for undertaking research along lines vital to the welfare of the rural home."(83) This problem identification approach to rural society was clearly evident in the three rural surveys of farm women conducted between 1920 and 1923. The survey method, of course, was an integral part of the sociological definition of a social problem. In the first survey, done in preparation for the presentation to the Tariff Commission, movement women essentially appropriated the method for their own political purposes, using it to generate facts for a criticism of the tariff. The other two surveys, however, were not tied to an explicit political project. In these instances the social problem that was revealed was linked more closely to a purely social solution.

This social solution, as one might guess, was defined by the notion of community. Community existed along that continuum from individual to nation which constituted social life. And the farm women's movement, activists claimed, served individual, community, and national purposes. It served the farm woman herself by bringing her into social contact with the women and men of the organisation and the community, it served the community by awakening interest in community conditions, and it served the nation--the community of communities--by creating a higher standard of social life.(84) Moreover, women were crucial, if not central actors in community organising. "No body of people has any real claim to call itself a community organisation," the UFM Handbook advised, "so long as it has not enrolled the women of the community in its ranks. For effective service along the lines of entertainment, social development and education, the help of the women must be enlisted." And what made women effective? One opinion, proffered by Mrs. J.S. Wood of the women's auxiliary of the Oakville grain growers' association (and subsequently first president of the women's section of the MGGA), was that "with that innate desire to please, they are just the right sort to put forth that community spirit that is so necessary to the uplift of farm people."(85) While women's traditional role as servants was no doubt important, a more significant factor was the place of the home in socialisation and the

construction of community. The MGGA's Rural Citizenship placed the home firmly in the context of the rural problem when it asked "What is the farm home accomplishing? What are its needs? What are its possibilities? How can they be realised?" It answered that the rural home was a contradiction. On the one hand, the "sturdy manhood, wholesome womanliness, [and] high moral standards" of the rural home represented the highest development of home life, while, on the other, the rural home was plagued by "monotony, drudgery, petty jealousy, [and] conservatism." The farm movement, and movement women in particular, had a responsibility to overcome this contradiction by allowing the positive to flourish at the expense of the negative. Indeed, as Mrs W.H. English argued in 1916, the home "is the testing place [of the movement], and if we do our best there we are sure of trying to extend our influence to those around us. It is not enough to strive after 'Better Farms' and 'Better Stock'--we must extend it to our homes."(86) Most importantly, a number of women noted over the years, co-operation--the foundation of community for the farm movement--needed to begin at home. This might mean women co-operating with men by appreciating that improved farm technology had a higher priority than domestic labour saving devices, or, more progressively, men assisting with domestic work to reciprocate for women helping with outside chores. "The problem of getting better social life in many of our

communities" could be solved, Mary McCallum concluded, if farm women made their homes centres of "high ideals, true neighborliness and tolerance."(87)

Educational endeavours were especially important for farm movement women since they, like other women, were deemed to have responsibility for educating the young. At one level, this concern was expressed by monitoring rural education. One of the main objectives of the MGGA Women's Section was better rural schools, which was pursued by studying the rural school problem at both a local and provincial level. In a 1921 UFWM Education Committee report on rural education, for example, consolidation and a larger administrative unit were offered as solutions to the problems of rural school attendance and the competency and turnover of rural teachers.(88) At another level, farm movement women experienced the broader social anxiety over adolescence which had spawned the Boys' and Girls' Clubs. The Junior UFM, which operated under the direction of a UFWM committee, sought to bring youth into the purposes of the organisation and the development of rural life. It was believed that young people, especially those around school leaving age, were in danger of being lost to the "lure of city lights" or "narrow individualism" if a special effort was not made to "take the drudgery out of farm life" by offering them "social inducement and recreation" in the movement. This was especially critical because other youth

organisations were failing to train the young. They were falling short of movement ideals, one report argued, in the same way "our public school system of textbooks fall short of properly training our rural boys and girls." Hence, the UFWM took on the responsibility of having the young people of their communities "come to know each other better, and thus learn to co-operate more effectively in all that makes for community betterment and national progress." A special effort was needed, then, to bring youth into the social world. "Like ourselves our boys and girls need development. They need the spirit of co-operation both in work and play." And this could be accomplished by moving beyond "book learning and general school work" to "[r]eal intrinsic education [which] comes when our Young People grapple with the economic, social and fiscal problems of the day." So the UFWM approached youth work by organising around educational, economic, social, and vocational themes. Essentially, this involved citizenship and leadership training, granting young people some economic autonomy (giving them their own livestock, for example), emphasising farming's professional status, and, most importantly, drawing youth into socially co-operative systems.(89)

For women themselves, education meant adequate and proper training for the responsibilities of political citizenship. Through papers and lectures with titles such as "The Woman's Part" or "Women and Service", movement women

and intellectuals in the post-suffrage period prepared the new voters for their new public roles. The franchise, coupled with their formal entry into the MGGA, provided a great opportunity for women according to this analysis. They could begin to change some of the laws that were so unjust to women and children, and, as well, lead the way into nonpartisan political behaviour. More importantly, though, this marked their entry into true community membership. "No community can accomplish its best purpose," Mrs Albert McGregor told the Winchester MGGA in 1916, unless it has "the loyal, devoted service of its whole citizenship." With women's political and organisational participation, this would be the case. Furthermore, there were ways in which women brought special qualities to citizenship. Through service in the home, Mabel Finch argued in 1918, "women's best qualities and highest powers are developed." Through service to the state, women's influence and experience in the home could be extended to the community and nation. Finally, with the acquisition of citizenship, women took their rightful place alongside men in the movement and in the affairs of state. After suffrage and MGGA membership, McGregor promised, "we do not expect to talk any more of the rights of women. We have our rights, and it will be a case of men and women working together...." And, giving the radical inheritance a novel inversion, she concluded "woman...will take her place by his side neither

as parasite nor competitor, but as mate." So, through meetings, discussions, lectures, and courses, movement women were "educated for citizenship"; that is, they were trained to work politically alongside men, but with special responsiblity for issues in their own sphere, in constructing stable rural and national communities.(90)

Female agrarianism never emerged as an autonomous force in Manitoba. Influenced to a certain extent by independent women's organisations, it was primarily a product of the main body of the agrarian movement. The oppositional tone that did exist in the ideology of the movement was derived from those radical strains that survived in the male agrarianism of the later teens and twenties. More importantly, though, the dominant ideology that was being systematically produced and disseminated by the post-war years provided the main vocabulary of the movement. While the movement's relative autonomy ensured that dominant issues and categories were not simply reproduced in the women's section of the MGGA and in the UFWM, the weakness of the radical alternative and the social distance of urban feminism meant that movement women nonetheless accepted the central concepts in the dominant view as meaningful renditions of their social and economic existence.

By the 1920s, the radical potential of Patronism had been constrained and displaced in the Manitoba farm movement

by the emerging ideology of Brackenism. Political nonpartisanship gave way to business nonpartisanship as the oppositional elements in radicalism became less resistant and even accommodationist. After the election of 1922, the UFM moved slowly, but surely, into ideological alignment with the conservative mainstream of the provincial bourgeoisie. But the route from radicalism to conservatism was a complex one in which the movement's language was transformed.

---

1. It should be stressed that in this analysis, as we argued in chapter one, subjectivity is constituted through language and language is not a vehicle for the expression of subjectivity. In this chapter we delineate a series of discursive structures rather than the ideas of specific individuals or social groups.
2. "Farmers' Grievances," Manitoba Free Press 6 December 1883, p. 4; B. McCutcheon, "The Economic and Social Structure of Political Agrarianism in Manitoba, 1870-1900," PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1974, pp. 98-115; L.A. Wood, A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924 (Toronto, 1924; reprint 1975), pp. 123-129.
3. McCutcheon, "The Economic and Social Structure," chapter IV, chapter V, p. 272.
4. McCutcheon, "The Economic and Social Structure," pp. 275-278; "Successful Farmers' Elevator Companies," The Farmers' Advocate (TFA) 5 April 1898, p. 149.
5. R. Cook, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s," CHA Reports (1984); G. Kealey and B. Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900 (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 387-391; McCutcheon, "The Economic and Social Structure," pp. 279-289; Wood, A History, pp. 109-122; S.E.D. Shortt, "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: the Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896," in D. Swainson, ed., Oliver Mowat's Ontario (Toronto, 1972); S. Glazer, "The Patrons of Industry in Michigan," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 24(2) (1937). During 1894 the Patrons won a provincial bye-election in Beautiful Plains constituency, while in the provincial

general election of 1896 Patrons were nominated in seven constituencies and elected in two constituencies. In the federal election of 1896, meanwhile, two Patrons were nominated in Manitoba and one was nominated in the North West Territories, but none of the three was successful. Wood, A History, pp. 128, 143, 145.

6. The Patrons' Advocate (Advocate) 13 March 1895.
7. Although the term "physiocratic" is often used to describe this type of popular analysis, the term itself is problematic. As a system of thought, physiocracy more accurately belongs to the history of political economy. It may have entered and influenced popular agrarian discourse, but this itself should be a subject of investigation and analysis. On the history of physiocracy, see E. Fox Genovese, The Origins of Physiocracy (New York, 1976).
8. Advocate 3 October 1894. Henry Clay was the editor of The Patrons' Advocate from its formation in 1892 until 1895 when he was forced to resign over an editorial policy dispute with the executive board of the Patrons of Industry.
9. Advocate 10 April 1895.
10. Advocate 19 December 1894.
11. Advocate 5 December 1894.
12. Advocate 1 January 1896.
13. Advocate 5 December 1894.
14. "Brandon Convention," Advocate 16 January 1895.
15. "Who Owns Canada?," Advocate 14 November 1894.
16. Advocate 10 April 1895, 17 April 1895.
17. Advocate 4 December 1894.
18. "Report from W.C Paynter, Secretary, Beulah Patrons of Industry," Advocate 18 September 1895.
19. Advocate 13 March 1895, 27 June 1894.
20. Advocate 9 January 1895
21. Advocate 6 March 1895
22. Advocate 19 December 1894
23. Advocate 1 January 1896
24. Advocate 27 June 1894
25. "Wheat Grading," Advocate 9 October 1895.
26. "Commission on the Freight Rate," Advocate 24 October 1894.
27. Advocate 4 December 1894
28. Advocate 20 February 1895
29. Patrons' Sentinel (Sentinel) 1 April 1896.
30. Western Canadian 11 March 1899.
31. F. Howell, "What's In A Name," Advocate 27 February 1895; Advocate 5 December 1893.
32. TFA 5 February 1894; Advocate 8 January 1896.
33. Western Canadian 18 November 1897, 11 March 1899.
34. "Objections to Socialism," Advocate 24 July 1895.
35. "Our Labor Party Allies," Advocate 11 December 1895.

36. Advocate 18 December 1895; an update on the Harmony Industrial Association appeared in the Western Canadian 28 July 1898. W.C. Paynter was also the secretary of the Beulah Patrons of Industry.
37. Advocate July 1895.
38. "United Farmers of Manitoba President's Address," Grain Growers' Guide (Guide) 16 January 1924, p. 60; Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), United Farmers of Manitoba (UFM) Papers, Box 5, 1925 File, "Some Pertinent Facts About the UFM," p. 4.
39. J.S. Woodsworth, ed., Studies in Rural Citizenship (Winnipeg, 1914), p. 28; H. Moorhouse, Deep Furrows (Toronto, 1918), p. 248.
40. UFM Papers, Box 1, "For Inter-District Debate, 1923"; The Scoop Shovel 1(7) (January, 1925). It should be stressed that we are assessing the place of the term "co-operation" (and its variations) in specific languages or discourses; we are not claiming to reveal the "true" or "real" essence of co-operation in Manitoba. Hence, our theoretical focus is different from other analyses of agrarian co-operation in which the various strains of co-operative thought are delineated and the co-operative experience is described. See, for example, I. Macpherson, Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1979)
41. UFM Papers, Box 15, UFM 1921 Yearbook, "President's Address," pp. 21-23; UFM Papers, Box 15, "Canadian Financial Problems As Seen By The Organized Farmers, Joint Committee of Commerce and Agriculture, 7 March 1916," p. 51; see also Guide 9 January 1918, p. 51.
42. UFM Papers, Box 1, "For Inter-District Debate, 1923"; "Manitoba Grain Growers' Association," Guide 21 August 1918, p. 1791.
43. Guide 22 July 1914, p. 886, 21 October 1914, p. 1174; "President Poole's Address," 14 January 1925, p. 45; Woodsworth, ed., Rural Citizenship, pp. 31-32.
44. UFM Papers, Box 18, Programs and Handbooks File, "MGGA Pamphlet, 1918"; "The Organized Farmers Educating Themselves," Managra 14(5) (March, 1921), p. 12.
45. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1904, "Proceedings and Resolutions"; Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1916, "Director's Report"; Box 18, Programs and Handbooks File, "MGGA Pamphlet, 1918"; Box 15, MGGA Yearbook, 1918, p. 71.
46. UFM Papers, Box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work" (1920-21).
47. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Yearbook, 1918, p. 63.
48. UFM Papers, Box 15, Presidential Addresses, 1921 and 1918.
49. UFM Papers, Box 18, MGGA/UFM Pamphlets, "Let's Get It Together!"; Box 15, Joint Committee on Commerce and

Agriculture, 1 and 2 December 1916, "Minutes of Conference".

50. UFM Papers, Box 18, Platform File, "UFM Draft Platform, 1921"; "The Tentative Draft Platform," Guide 18 May 1921, p. 816; Guide 23 August 1922, p. 942.
51. UFM Papers, Box 5, 1922 File, "UFM Memorandum".
52. PAM, Bracken Papers, Box MG 13 I1, Addresses and Radio Talks File, 1926-44, "A Legislative Review," pp. 2-4.
53. UFM Papers, Box 15, UFM Yearbook 1921, "Director's Report"; see also M.H. Staples, The Challenge of Agriculture, (Toronto, 1920), p. 44 for the significant role of education in the UFO, and UFM Papers, Box 1, letter from W.R. Wood to A.J.M. Poole, 10 October 1923, re. "Fundamentals of the Farmer Movement".
54. UFM Papers, Box 18, 1922-23 Pamphlets File, "Local Educational Programs"; "Education for Citizenship," Guide 25 December 1918; UFM Papers, Box 15, 1922 Yearbook, "UFM Political Platform".
55. Moorhouse, Deep Furrows, pp. 39-40, 58, 282, 277.
56. UFM Papers, Box 5, 1925 File, "Some Pertinent Facts About the UFM," p. 12; Box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work".
57. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1908, "Proceedings and Resolutions"; Guide 20 April 1910, pp. 13-14.
58. J.B. Parker, "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce," Guide 31 August 1910, p. 10.
59. Guide 12 January 1910; UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1908, "Provincial Ownership and Operation of a System of Line Elevators".
60. Guide 8 July 1914, p. 845; Guide 21 July 1920, p. 1630.
61. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Conventions, 1911, 1912, 1917, "Proceedings and Resolutions".
62. "The Grain Growers' Case," Guide 27 July 1910, pp. 7-8.
63. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1913, "President's Report"; "Wanted: Government for the People," Guide 9 March 1910; "Class Legislation," Guide 25 May 1910.
64. J.B. Parker, "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce," Guide 31 August 1910, p. 10; UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1912, "President's Address".
65. J. Kennedy, "Immediate Action Necessary," Guide 30 October 1918, p. 2288.
66. UFM Papers, Box 12, "Farm Problem Questionnaire Reports"; also Box 15, MGGA Convention, 1919, "President's Address"; "Immediate Action Necessary," Guide 30 October 1918, pp. 2288-2289; "Future of Organized Labor," Guide 3 September 1919, p. 1867.
67. TFA 20 March 1897.
68. TFA 12 April 1905.
69. TFA 21 June 1897: two letters.
70. TFA 12 April 1905.
71. TFA 29 March 1905.
72. TFA 20 April 1897.

73. M.P. McCallum, "Women and Special Privilege," Guide 2 July 1919, pp. 1370, 1444; PAM, Canadian Council of Agriculture (CCA) Papers, Box 3, McCallum, "Tariff Changes Hit Large Families"; "Manitoba Farm Women Convene," Guide 15 January 1919, p. 112; "That Iniquitous Tariff," Guide 14 May 1919, p. 1205. Mary McCallum succeeded Francis Marion Beynon as the editor of the women's section of the Guide in 1917. In 1921 she left the Guide to become assistant secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. McCallum was actively involved in the prairie farm women's movement. Guide 13 April 1921, p. 611.
74. UFM Papers, Box 5, 1920 File, "Statement Submitted to the Tariff Commission by a Member of the Executive of the UFWM, 13 October 1920". See also M. Kinnear, "'Do you want your daughter to marry a farmer?': Women's Work on the Farm, 1922," in D.H. Akenson, ed., Canadian Papers in Rural History VI (Gananoque, Ont., 1988).
75. UFM Papers, Box 5, 1919 File, "The Women's Section of the MGGA".
76. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Yearbook 1919, "The MGGA and the Women's Section--Their Mutual Relationship"; "Manitoba Farm Women Convene," Guide 15 January 1919, p. 127.
77. "Class Party, Not Sex," Guide 13 November 1918, p. 2385; "The New Woman's Party," Guide 16 October 1918, p. 2195; "Woman's Party Organ," Guide 27 November 1918, p. 2478.
78. See, for example, UFM Papers, Box 5, 1925 File, "Service Rendered by the UFWM"; Box 15, MGGA Yearbook 1919, "Women's Section Secretary's Report"; Box 15, MGGA Convention 1918, "Constitution of Women's Section"; Box 15, UFM Yearbook 1921, "UFWM--Board of Director's Report".
79. UFM Papers, Box 5, 1923 File, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Annual Convention"; "Mrs. Elliott's Address," Guide 14 January 1925, p. 43.
80. "Women and the Land Problem," Guide 17 July 1918, p. 1588.
81. UFM Papers, Box 5, "1921 UFWM Marketing Report"; 1923 File, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Convention".
82. The Scoop Shovel 1(7) (January, 1925).
83. "Manitoba Farm Women Organize," Guide 16 January 1918, p. 93; UFM Papers, Box 5, 1925 File, "Services Rendered by the UFWM".
84. S. Richardson, "Community Betterment," Guide 24 January 1917, p. 159; UFM Papers, Box 5, 1919 File, "Women's Section of the MGGA".
85. UFM Papers, Box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work," p. 9; Box 15, 1916 Convention, Mrs. J.S. Wood, "The Responsibilities and Privileges of Farmers' Wives in the Development of the Grain Growers' Movement".

86. Woodsworth, ed., Rural Citizenship, p. 9; UFM Papers, Box 15, 1916 Convention, Mrs. W.H. English, "The Privileges and Responsibilities of Farmers' Wives".
87. "Farmers Can't Afford Comforts," Guide 23 February 1916, p. 294; "Co-operation at Home," 31 December 1924, p. 1505; "Homes as a Socializing Force," Guide 20 February 1924, p. 225.
88. UFM Papers, Box 15, MGGA Convention 1918, "Constitution of the Women's Section"; Box 5, 1921 File, "UFWM Education Committee Report"; for a parallel prairie experience see L.J. Wilson, "Educational Role of the United Farm Women of Alberta," in D. Jones, N. Sheehan and R. Stamp, eds., Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West (Calgary, 1979).
89. UFM Papers, Box 5, UFWM Reports on Young People's Work, 1920 and 1921.
90. Mrs. A. McGregor, "The Woman's Part," Guide 5 July 1916, p. 1084; M. Finch, "Women and Service" and W. Wood, "Women in the New Time," Guide 27 November 1918, p. 2450; "Wanted: A Sense of Responsibility," Guide 25 April 1917, p. 738; "Politics and the Home," Guide 30 November 1921, p. 1517; UFM Papers, Box 5, 1923 File, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Annual Convention," p. 1.

CONCLUSION

The institutions of agricultural education that developed in Manitoba before 1925 were part of a broader North American pattern in agricultural education, education generally, and state structures. In a thirty-five year period the field of agricultural and domestic knowledge was systematised and professionalised through the emergence of specific disciplines at the college level, the tightening of central direction and control at the extension level, and the addition of agricultural and home economics subjects to school curricula. In the area of social knowledge, which has been the particular concern of this study, disciplinary apparatuses emerged in Manitoba to parallel broader North American developments, with agricultural economics, rural sociology, and home economics employing the theoretical categories and methodological approaches of "American" domestic and rural social science. Below this formal organisation of knowledge, the disciplinary boundaries receded as the practical interpellation of subjects proceeded and social identities were shaped.

There were two sides to the identities thus formed. As we argued in chapter one, there are two components of human knowledge: knowledge as a part of labour power (material) and knowledge as a region of ideology where meaning is constituted (ideal). Productive knowledge in agricultural and domestic labour was organised in terms of the indirect

subordination of farm households to capital. The whole range of scientific and technical knowledge necessary for sustained and efficient market production, while not appropriated from producers according to the formal capitalist model, was nonetheless marshalled for the purposes of capitalist exchange. If capital was to generate the largest possible surplus through its control of the factors market, the distribution market, and the system of credit, it had to ensure that agricultural labour power was being applied as intensively as possible. Similarly, if labour power was to be efficiently applied and, more importantly, if capital's ability to extract surplus was to extend as deeply into the household as possible, it had to ensure that domestic labour was applied intensively as well. To a large extent this proceeded through market mechanisms--notably the price system--whereby farm households became so entrapped in the circuits of capital that they had to continually reproduce their conditions of existence through capitalist institutions. But it was reinforced through an educational state structure in which the natural and technical elements in agricultural and domestic production were linked to specific social relations.

Meaning was constituted on the foundation of productive knowledge, and social identities were built upon the contradictory elements in the work experience of farm people. But sustainable identities were difficult to

construct in farming since farmers owned their own instruments of production and controlled the production process, but were nonetheless effectively subordinated to capital through the mechanism of exchange. In one light they appeared to be workers; in another light they took on the characteristics of capitalists. The dominant ideology played on this vagueness to construct a bourgeois identity. Through marginalist economics, for example, the farm household acquired an equal standing with the capitalist firm in the marketplace. Both the farm manager and the household manager participated as entrepreneurs in the market, co-ordinating factors of production and consumption in response to demand and supply. And the rural component of academic sociology envisioned an ideological community linking farmers with other occupational groups (especially business groups) in defiance of factors which divided them. The radical vision of co-operation and community lost its cutting edge as it was generalised to embrace the enemies of old in the pursuit of social stability.

This bourgeois identity was cemented with the ideology of professionalism. Farm folk were encouraged to see themselves as possessing a status equal to that of a traditional professional such as a doctor or a new professional such as a teacher. Professionalism represented a claim on middle class identity, close to the respectable elements in society and at a distance from the working

class. With a professional status to complement their bourgeois identity, farm people became technically proficient, socially integrated participants in a marginalist economy.(1) Politics and questions of power became a separate domain subordinate to this particular rendering of society and economy.

By the 1920s, with a state structure and a dominant ideology in place, the mainstream of the Manitoba farm movement was safely in agreement with capital as to the fundamental premises of the social and economic system. There was nothing inherently inevitable about this, however, and one would have been foolhardy to have predicted such a development in the 1890s. The dominant ideology had to confront and transform a subordinate ideology built with radical categories. The radical inheritance, which fuelled so many nineteenth century popular movements, contained an analysis of the place of farming under capitalism which made sense of the comparable place of farmers and workers in the order of things. The emphasis on political corruption, political oppression, and the political determination of social reality seemed an accurate depiction of life for Manitoba farmers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Patrons of Industry engaged in both "economic" and "political" activities, but, really, the economic did not exist as a discrete entity in their analysis; the political--the exercise of state power--was

always paramount. Radicalism continued to have a strong presence in the early years of the MGGA, but the language of the organisation became more economic, and then social, as it increasingly incorporated the categories of rural social science into its outlook. Ane when the WGGA was formed in the later teens there was little oppositional tradition for women to draw upon. The subordinate ideology available to them was a radicalism sanitised by the dominant categories and a gender analysis weakened by its appropriation and transformation by middle class women. By the time the MGGA/WGGA became the UFM/UFWM and entered politics, the political vision of the organisation was defined primarily in terms of the economic, social, and educational categories of the dominant ideology.

The profound social and economic changes of the period severely tested the inherited explanations of power relationships, especially in the face of well reasoned, systematic analyses which seemed better equipped to make sense of the changes. More importantly perhaps, this new language gave farm people a comfortable vocabulary with which to claim a place in the emerging order. Class oppression, while in many ways more prevalent in the new century than in the old one, was less comprehensible in terms of political corruption. The market was an apparently permanent reality. The main activities in the lives of men were better understood through economic categories. And, as

the instruments of domestic production were increasingly commodified and the private was connected to the public realm, the lives of women made more sense in social and economic terms. Furthermore, when a social approach was presented it was clear that rural life did have a social element, and there were identifiable problems in rural society which required resolution. The young and the educational system, in particular, took on a new and at times disturbing significance when viewed in social terms. Politics became the means through which the conditions of ideological community and full market participation were achieved. In this new world, it seemed reasonable to discard the notion of class domination and replace it with an image of discrete socio-economic groups that, while having different interests, could unite to ensure the health of the market or the stability of the community.

Radicalism, although it did have the power to mobilise massive constituencies in town and country, was a limited and doomed analysis. While it is true that the disciplinary boundaries and ideological categories of bourgeois social science produced a distorted view of economy and society, they did identify areas of social reality which required analysis, explanation, and intervention. With its overriding emphasis on the political, radicalism was discursively quiet or derivative about these areas, thereby allowing the dominant analysis to take hold and flourish.

The proto-socialist, post-radical analyses of agriculture, which developed in other areas of North America during the same period, built upon radicalism by devising a specifically politico-economic analysis that rejected the dominant image of the economy. But these ideas had little impact in Manitoba at the time, primarily because there were no socialist or other working class based organisations doing work in the countryside. In the absence of an alternative, institutionalised analysis that moved beyond radicalism's political categories to assess rural political economy and society through the lens of conflict and exploitation, then, the dominant view was destined to establish its hegemony in Manitoba.

There has been little mention of populism and the petite bourgeoisie in the preceding pages. Unfortunately, these guiding categories in the recent analysis of rural prairie society have become virtually unredeemable due to the reductionist use made of them over the past thirty years. In a sense, this study has been an extended plea for a break with that reductionism.(2) In the only test which ultimately matters, such approaches leave little room for the mobilisation of rural people as a constituency within mass movements or coalitions. Regardless of its other failings, radicalism was able to do that. Interpreting the countryside with reductionist categories has the

debilitating effect of rendering primary food production peripheral to progressive politics--at least until such time as agriculture is proletarianised. What often happens, since farmers have been and continue to be active in progressive movements, is that a disjuncture appears between theoretical and practical perspectives on agriculture. John Conway's populist-socialist political commentary in Briarpatch, for example, bears little relationship to his academic characterisation of all prairie farm politics--from the first Grange to current struggles--as petit bourgeois responses to capitalist industrialisation. But what is perhaps most disappointing in the recent history of prairie scholarship is that feminism, the most creative and significant challenge to class reductionism in some time, has failed to transform or even engage with farm politics or the analysis of rural society in a meaningful way. One would have thought that the especially firm hold of familialism in the country would have attracted attention but, alas, the received Marxist images have been strong enough to render such questions relatively insignificant for socialist feminists.

In formulating a theoretical approach for this study, we tried to understand the construction of ideologies as semi-autonomous activities not reducible to social position. But such an exercise soon drew us into considerations of the social base. Besides being reductionist, previous analyses

had not adequately theorised the social relations of production in prairie farming. It was necessary, then, to make some preliminary sense of agricultural production--being careful to delineate both its sides--before attempting to discuss ideology. After a brief foray into political economy and the domestic labour debate, we turned to culturalist historiography for guidance in assessing the relationship between being and identity. But it too was limited by reductionism; culturalist historians considered ideas and identity to be direct expressions of class culture and experience. It soon became clear that such a perspective on prairie agriculture could not break substantially with the received interpretations. So we ventured into structuralism, but with a great deal of trepidation since the advice of E.P. Thompson and his many disciples was being rejected. It was apparent, however, that an adequate analysis of ideology in agriculture had to be sufficiently structuralist to hold social being in abeyance, reconstruct the various levels of ideology, and then connect those levels with an expanded conception of production relations.

This study is but a modest contribution to such an analysis. Its empirical component is limited to a brief investigation of educational state structures and the language of the farm movement in Manitoba which tests the theoretical and historiographical approach developed in the

first two chapters. There are at least three areas where future studies will undoubtedly modify some of our conclusions. While state structures were central to the organisation of productive knowledge and the constitution of class and gender identities, capital itself played a significant role here through advertising and the encouragement of production. At a greater ideological distance, ethnicity and religion intersected with the dominant and popular identities constructed in and around the production process. It is certainly significant, for example, that many intellectuals in the farm movement, as well as academics such as Murchie, were trained as clergy. Rather than religion providing the philosophy of the farm movement as Richard Allen has argued, however, it seems more reasonable to suggest that the religious--like the political in radicalism--was subsumed by the social scientific in the period.(3) Finally, moving back to the social base, our musings on political economy, while serving to clarify the place of farm households under capitalism, are merely a tentative introduction to a real post-dependency analysis of Canadian agriculture. But, with that said, it is hoped that our reading of the interplay of theory, historiography, and empirical reality sheds some light on the history of ideologies in Manitoba agriculture.

---

1. For a discussion of marginalism, see pp. 168-170.
2. For a definition of reductionism, see p. 55n.

3. R. Allen, The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28 (Toronto, 1973), chapter 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Collections

Provinicial Archives of Manitoba

John Bracken Papers

Canadian Council of Agriculture Papers

4-H Papers

Manitoba Home Economics Association Papers

Manitoba Women's Institute Papers

United Farmers of Manitoba Papers

Valentine Winkler Papers

University of Manitoba Archives

Manitoba Agricultural College Papers

Mary Speechly Collection

University of Manitoba, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory

Government Documents

Canada. Commission of Conservation, "Agricultural Work in Ontario," by C.C. James (1911).

Canada. Commission of Conservation, Reports (1911-1917).

Canada. Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, Report (1913-1914).

Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1886 (Ottawa, 1887).

Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1896 (Ottawa, 1897).

Canada. Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1901 (Ottawa, 1902).

Canada. Statutes, "The Experimental Farm Station Act" (1886).

Canada. Statutes, "The Agricultural Aid Act" (1912).

Canada. Statutes, "The Agricultural Instruction Act" (1913).

Manitoba. Manitoba Agricultural College, Bulletin Number 15, "Boys' and Girls' Clubs" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Reports (1890-1925).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 6, "Home Economics Handbook" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 8, "Sending the College to the Country" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 36, "Agricultural Fairs" (1919).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 39, "Books for Farm and Home" (1919).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 57, "Financing the Farm Home" (1921).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 80, "Co-operative Marketing in Manitoba" (1925).

Manitoba. Department of Education, Reports (1890-1925).

Manitoba. Royal Commission on the Establishment of the Agricultural College, Report (1903).

Manitoba. Royal Commission to Enquire Into and Report Upon the University, Report (1910).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Agriculture and Immigration Act" (1872).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Farmers' Institutes Act" (1890).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Agricultural Societies Act" (1890).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Agriculture and Immigration Act" (1890).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Agricultural Societies Act" (1900).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The Agricultural College Act" (1904).

Manitoba. Statutes, "Home Economics Societies Act" (1910).

Manitoba. Statutes, "The University Amendment Act" (1924).

Newspapers And Periodicals

The Farmers' Advocate

Grain Growers' Guide

MAC Gazette/Managra

Manitoba Agricultural Extension News

Manitoba Free Press

The Patrons' Advocate

The Patrons' Sentinel

The Scoop Shovel

The Western Canadian

Contemporary Books and Articles

Bailey, L.H., The Nature Study Idea (New York, 1903).

_____, The Outlook of Nature (New York, 1905).

Bevier, I. and S. Usher, The Home Economics Movement (Boston, 1906).

Bracken, J., Crop Production in Western Canada (Winnipeg, 1920).

_____, Dry Farming in Western Canada (Winnipeg, 1921).

Bruere, M.B. and R.W. Bruere, Increasing Home Efficiency (New York, 1912).

Commission on Country Life, Report of the Commission on Country Life (New York, 1911).

Carver, T.N., Principles of Rural Economics (Boston, 1911).

Clark, J.B., The Distribution of Wealth (New York, 1924).

Cubberly, E.P., Rural Life and Education (Boston, 1914).

Ellwood, C.A., Sociology and Modern Social Problems (New York, 1910).

Ely, R. and G.R. Wicker, Elementary Principles of Economics (New York, 1904).

Fiske, G.W., The Challenge of the Country (New York, 1916).

Foght, H.W., The American Rural School (New York, 1910).

Foote Crowe, M., The American Country Girl (New York, 1915; reprint 1974).

Frederick, C., The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management (New York, 1912).

_____, Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home (Chicago, 1915).

Galpin, C.J., Rural Life (New York, 1918).

Gillette, J., Constructive Rural Sociology (New York, 1913).

_____, "Nature of the Rural Social Problem," Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota 2 (April, 1912).

Grant, H.C., "Review of D.A. McGibbon, The Canadian Grain Trade," Journal of Farm Economics 14(4) (October, 1932).

Hibbard, B.H., Marketing Agricultural Products (New York, 1923).

Leake, A.H., The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education (New York, 1915).

MacDougall, J., Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks (Toronto, 1913).

Mavor, J., "Agricultural Development in the North-west of Canada, 1905-1909," Report of the 79th Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (London, 1910).

Miller, J.C., Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision (New York, 1913).

Moorhouse, H., Deep Furrows (Toronto, 1918).

Murchie, R.W., and H.C. Grant, Unused Lands of Manitoba (Winnipeg, 1926).

Nesbitt, F., Household Management (New York, 1918).

Partridge, E.A., Manifesto of the No-Party League of Western Canada (Winnipeg, 1913).

Richards, E., The Cost of Living (New York, 1899).

_____, The Cost of Food (New York, 1901).

_____, The Cost of Shelter (New York, 1905).

Robertson, J.W., Education for Rural Life in Canada (Chattanooga, 1906).

_____, The Satisfaction of Country Life (New York, 1913).

Simons, A.M., The American Farmer (New York, 1902).

Spillman, W.J., "The Farmer's Income," in T.N. Carver, ed., Selected Readings in Rural Economics (New York, 1916).

Staples, M., The Challenge of Agriculture (Toronto, 1920).

Swan River: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life (Winnipeg, 1914).

Taylor, H.C., Principles of Agricultural Economics (New York, 1919).

_____, "Review of T.N. Carver, Principles of Rural Economics," American Economic Review 2 (September, 1912).

Thomson, E.H., "Profits That Farmers Receive," in T.N. Carver, Selected Readings in Rural Economics (New York, 1916).

Turtle Mountain: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life (Winnipeg, 1914).

Warren, G.F., Farm Management (Cornell, 1911).

Wheeler, S., Seager Wheeler's Book on Profitable Grain Growing (Winnipeg, 1919).

Woodsworth, J.S., ed., Studies in Rural Citizenship (Winnipeg, 1914).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Aglietta, M., A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience (London, 1979).

Allen, R., The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28 (Toronto, 1971).

Althusser, L., For Marx (London, 1969)

Anderson, P., Considerations On Western Marxism (London, 1976).

_____, Arguments Within English Marxism (London, 1980).

Anstey, T.H., One Hundred Harvests: Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, 1886-1986 (Ottawa, 1986).

Axelrod, P., Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980 (Toronto, 1982).

Bacchi, C.L., Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918 (Toronto, 1983).

Barrett, M., Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis (London, 1980).

_____ and M. McIntosh, The Anti-Social Family (London, 1982).

Benton, T., The Rise and Fall of Structural Marxism (London, 1984).

Berger, C., The Writing of Canadian History (Toronto, 1976).

Bledstein, B., The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America (New York, 1976).

Boggs, C., Gramsci's Marxism (London, 1976).

Bottomore, T., ed., A Dictionary of Marxist Thought (London, 1983).

Bourdieu, P., and J.C. Passeron, Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (London, 1977).

Britnell, G.E., The Wheat Economy (Toronto, 1939).

Browm, R.C. and R. Cook, Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed (Toronto, 1974).

Brunner, E. deS., Farmers of the World: The Development of Agricultural Extension (New York, 1945).

_____, The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States (New York, 1957).

Buhle, M.J., Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920 (Urbana, 1981).

Burbank, G., When Farmers Voted Red (Greenwood, 1976).

Butts, R.F. and L. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York, 1953).

Callinicos, A., Althusser's Marxism (London, 1976).

_____, Is There A Future For Marxism? (London, 1982).

_____, Marxism and Philosophy (Oxford, 1983).

Canada Agriculture: The First One Hundred Years (Ottawa, 1967).

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, On Ideology (London, 1978).

_____, Making Histories: Studies in history-writing and politics (London, 1982).

Chandler, A., The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

Cohen, G.A., Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence (Princeton, 1978).

Comprehensive Dissertation Index (Ann Arbor, 1973).

Coontz, S. and P. Henderson, eds., Women's Work, Men's Property: The Origins of Gender and Class (London, 1986).

Coward, R. and J. Ellis, Language and Materialism (London, 1977).

Cremin, L., The Transformation of the School (New York, 1961).

Danbom, D., The Resisted Revolution (Ames, 1979).

Dawley, A., Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

Dubofsky, M., Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920 (New York, 1975).

Dyson, L.K., Red Harvest: The Communist Party and American Farmers (Lincoln, 1982).

Easterbrook, W.T., Farm Credit in Canada (Toronto, 1938).

_____ and H.J.C. Aitken, Canadian Economic History (Toronto, 1956).

Eddy, E.D., Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education (New York, 1957).

Ellis, J.H., The Ministry of Agriculture in Manitoba, 1870-1970 (Winnipeg, 1970).

Entwistle, H., Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics (London, 1979).

Fine, B., Economic Theory and Ideology (London, 1980).

Fine, S., Laissez Faire and the General Welfare State (Ann Arbor, 1964).

Fink, L., Workingmen's Democracy: The Knights of Labor and American Politics (Chicago, 1983).

Fite, G., American Farmers: The New Minority (Bloomington, 1981).

Fletcher, E., History of the Manitoba Women's Institute, 1919-1975 (Winnipeg, 1976).

Foucault, M., The Archaeology of Knowledge (London, 1972).

_____, The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction (New York, 1980).

Fowke, V.C., Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern (Toronto, 1947).

_____, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy (Toronto, 1957).

Fox-Genovese, E., The Origins of Physiocracy (New York, 1976).

Francis, R.D., Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur (Toronto, 1986).

Friesen, G.A., The Canadian Prairies: A History (Toronto, 1984).

Furner, M., Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington, 1975).

Gillis, J., Youth and History (New York, 1974).

Goodman, D. and M. Redclift, From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions (Oxford, 1981).

Goodwin, C.D.W., Canadian Economic Thought: The Political Economy of a Developing Nation, 1814-1914 (Durham, 1961).

Goodwyn, L., Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America (New York, 1978).

Gordon, D., R. Edwards and M. Reich, Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Gramsci, A., Selections from the Prison Notebooks (London, 1971).

Green, J., Grass Roots Socialism: Radical Movements in the Southwest, 1895-1943 (Baton Rouge, 1978).

Grob, G., Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement (Chicago, 1961).

Hall S. and T. Jefferson, eds., Resistance Through Rituals (London, 1976).

Hann, R., Farmers Confront Industrialism: Some Historical Perspectives on Ontario Agrarian Movements (Toronto, 1975).

Haskell, T., The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana, 1977).

Hayden, M., Seeking A Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982 (Vancouver, 1983).

Hiller, H.H., Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology (Toronto, 1982).

Hollis, P., The Pauper Press: A Study in Working Class Radicalism of the 1830s (Oxford, 1970).

Hunter, W.C., Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College (Fargo, 1961).

Johns, W.H., A History of the University of Alberta, 1908-1969 (Edmonton, 1981).

Katz, M., M. Doucet and M. Stern, The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism (Toronto, 1982).

Kealey, G., Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892 (Toronto, 1980).

Kealey, G. and B. Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900 (Cambridge, 1982).

Kendle, J., John Bracken: A Political Biography (Toronto, 1979).

Kett, J., Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present (New York, 1977).

Kish Sklar, K., Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity (New Haven, 1973).

Kolko, G., Main Currents in Modern American History (New York, 1976).

Lipset, S.M., Agrarian Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan; A Study in Political Sociology (Berkeley, 1950; reprint 1971).

Luxton, M., More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home (Toronto, 1980).

MacGibbon, D.A., The Canadian Grain Trade (Toronto, 1932).

Mackintosh, W.A., Economic Problems of the Prairie Provinces (Toronto, 1935).

Macpherson, C.B., Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System (Toronto, 1962).

Macpherson, I., Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1979).

Madill, A.J., History of Agricultural Education in Ontario (Toronto, 1937).

Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, History of Manitoba Agricultural Staff, 1913-1970 (Winnipeg, 1974).

Marx, K., Capital, Volumes I and III (Moscow, 1978).

McCormack, A.R., Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919 (Toronto, 1977).

Miliband, R., The State in Capitalist Society (London, 1969).

_____, Marxism and Politics (London, 1977).

Mitchell, D., The Politics of Food (Toronto, 1975).

Montgomery, D., Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1867-1872 (New York, 1967).

Morlan, R., Political Prairie Fire (Minneapolis, 1955).

Morton, A.S., Saskatchewan: The Making of a University (Toronto, 1959).

Morton, W.L., The Progressive Party in Canada (Toronto, 1950).

_____, One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952 (Toronto, 1957).

_____, Manitoba: A History (Toronto, 1957).

Murchie, R.W., Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier (Toronto, 1936).

Naylor, R.T., The History of Canadian Business (Toronto, 1975).

Nelson, L., Rural Sociology: Its Origins and Growth in the United States (Minneapolis, 1969).

Noble, D., America By Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism (New York, 1977).

Owram, D., The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945 (Toronto, 1986).

Palmer, B., Man Over Money: The Southern Populist Critique of American Capitalism (Chapel Hill, 1980).

Palmer, B.D., Working Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980 (Toronto, 1983).

Panitch, L., ed., The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power (Toronto, 1977).

Patton, H.S., Grain Growers' Co-operation in Western Canada (Cambridge, Mass., 1928).

Penner, N., The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis (Toronto, 1977).

Pentland, H.C., Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1850 (Toronto, 1981).

Pessen, E., Most Uncommon Jacksonians: The Radical Leaders of the Early Labor Movement (Albany, 1967).

Pollack, N., The Populist Response to Industrial America (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

_____, ed., The Populist Mind (New York, 1967).

Prentice, A., The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada (Toronto, 1977).

Reaman, G.E., A History of Agriculture in Ontario (Toronto, 1970).

Reck, F.M., The 4-H Story: A History of 4-H Club Work (Ames, 1951).

Richards, J. and L. Pratt, Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West (Toronto, 1979).

Roll, E., A History of Economic Thought (Englewood Cliffs, 1956).

Rowles, E.C., Home Economics in Canada: The Early History of Six College Programmes (Saskatoon, 1966).

Rude, G., The Crowd in History (New York, 1964).

_____, Ideology and Popular Protest (New York, 1980).

Ryerson, S., Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873 (Toronto, 1975).

Saloutos, T. and J. Hicks, Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939 (Madison, 1951).

Schwartz Cowan, R., More Work For Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave (New York, 1983).

Schwendinger, H. and J. Schwendinger, The Sociologists of the Chair (New York, 1974).

Scott, R., The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914 (Urbana, 1970).

Sheridan, A., Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth (London, 1980).

Shore, M., The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origin of Social Research in Canada (Toronto, 1987).

Snell, J., Macdonald College of McGill University: A History from 1904 to 1955 (Montreal, 1963).

Speechly, H.M., A Story of the Women's Institutes of Manitoba, 1910-1934 (Winnipeg, 1934).

Strasser, S., Never Done: A History of American Housework (New York, 1982).

Sutherland, N., Children in English Canadian Society, 1880-1920 (Toronto, 1976).

Taylor, H.C. and A.D. Taylor, The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932 (Ames, 1952).

Taylor, B., Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1983).

Taylor, J., From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of the Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment (Atlantic Highlands, 1979).

Therborn, G., Science, Class and Society (London, 1976).

_____, The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology (London, 1980).

Thompson, E.P., The Making of the English Working Class (London, 1963).

_____, The Poverty of Theory (London, 1978).

Thompson, J.H., with A. Seager, Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord (Toronto, 1985)

_____, The Harvests of War: The Prairie West, 1914-1918 (Toronto, 1978).

Tolson, A., The Limits of Masculinity (London, 1977).

Torr, D., Tom Mann and His Times (London, 1956).

Tribe, K., Land, Labour and Economic Discourse (London, 1978).

True, A.C., A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925 (Washington, 1929).

Veysey, L., The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1965).

Vogel, L., Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory (New Brunswick, N.J., 1983).

Weeks, J., Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800 (London, 1981).

_____, Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities (London, 1985).

Willis, P., Learning to Labour: how working class kids get working class jobs (Farnborough, 1977).

Wilson, J.G., A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966 (Winnipeg, 1969).

Wood, L.A., A History of the Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924 (Toronto, 1924; reprinted 1975).

Articles and Papers

Althusser, L., "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (London, 1971).

Barrett, M. and M. McIntosh, "The `Family Wage': Some Problems for Socialists and Feminists," Capital and Class 11 (1980).

Brass, T., "Permanent Transition or Permanent Revolution: Peasants, Proletarians and Politics," Journal of Peasant Studies 11(3) (April, 1984).

Brenner, R., "The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism," New Left Review 104 (1977).

Beito, G., "`I am a Farmer's Wife, not a Farmerette': Letters to the Nonpartisan Leader, 1917-1920," Plainswoman: An Anthology of Rural Women, March 1981-April 1983 (Grands Forks, 1983).

Blocker, J.S., "The Politics of Reform: Populists, Prohibition, and Woman Suffrage, 1891-1892," Historian 34(4) (1972).

Blumenfeld, E. and S. Mann, "Domestic Labour and the Reproduction of Labour Power: Towards an Analysis of Women, the Family and Class," in B. Fox, ed., Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism (Toronto, 1980).

Chevalier, J., "There is Nothing Simple About Simple Commodity Production," Studies in Political Economy 7 (Winter, 1982).

Claeys, G., "Language, Class and Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth Century England," Economy and Society 14(2) (1985).

Conway, J., "Populism in the United States, Russia, and Canada: Explaining the Roots of Canada's Third Parties," Canadian Journal of Political Science 11(1) (1978).

_____, "The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy," Journal of Canadian Studies 14 (Fall, 1979).

_____, "Agrarian Petit-Bourgeois Responses to Capitalist Industrialization: the Case of Canada," in F. Bechoffer and B. Elliot, eds., The Petite Bourgeoisie: Comparative Studies of the Uneasy Stratum (London, 1981).

Cook, R., "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism," in C. Berger and R. Cook, eds., The West

and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton (Toronto, 1976).

_____, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s," Canadian Historical Association Reports (1984).

Coward, R., "Rethinking Marxism," m/f, number 2 (1978).

Curtis, B., "Preconditions of the Canadian State: Educational Reform and the Contruction of a Public in Upper Canada, 1837-1846," Studies in Political Economy 10 (Spring, 1983).

_____, "Schoolbooks and the Myth of Curricular Republicanism: The State and Curriculum in Canada West, 1820-1850," Histoire Sociale/Social History 16(31) (November, 1983).

_____, "'Littery Merrit', 'Useful Knowledge', and the Organization of Township Libraries in Canada West, 1840-1860," Ontario History 78(4) (December, 1986).

Crowley, T., "Madonnas Before Magdalenes: Adelaide Hoodless and the Making of the Canadian Gibson Girl," Canadian Historical Review 67(4) (December, 1986).

Danylewycz, M., B. Light and A. Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching: A Nineteenth Century Ontario and Quebec Case Study," Histoire Sociale/Social History 16(30) (May, 1983).

_____ and A. Prentice, "Teacher's Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Central Canada," Labour/Le Travail 17 (Spring, 1986).

Davin, A., "Imperialism and Motherhood," History Workshop Journal 5 (Spring 1978).

_____, "'Mind That You Do As You Are Told': Reading Books for Board School Girls, 1870-1902," Feminist Review 3 (1979).

Decarie, G., "Something Old, Something New...: Aspects of Prohibitionism in Ontario in the 1880s," in D. Swainson, ed., Oliver Mowat's Ontario (Toronto, 1972).

Denis, W., "Capital and Agriculture: A Review of Marxian Problematics," Studies in Political Economy 7 (Winter, 1982).

Dentith, S., "Political Economy, fiction and the language of practical ideology in nineteenth century England," Social History 8(2) (May, 1983).

Destler, C., "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins," in Destler, American Radicalism, 1865-1901 (Chicago, 1946).

Dews, P., "The `Nouvelle Philosophie' and Foucault," Economy and Society 8(2) (May, 1979).

_____, "The `new philosophers' and the End of Leftism," Radical Philosophy 24 (Spring, 1980).

Dorfman, J., "The Role of the German Historical School in American Economic Thought," American Historical Association, Proceedings (1955).

Duncan, O., "Rural Sociology Coming of Age," Rural Sociology 19(1) (March, 1954).

Foster, J., "The Declassing of Language," New Left Review 150 (1985).

Foster Carter, A., "The Modes of Production Controversy," New Left Review 107 (1978).

Fox Genovese, E., and E.D. Genovese, "The Political Crisis of Social History," Journal of Social History 10(2) (Winter, 1976).

_____, "Placing Women's History in History," New Left Review 133 (1982).

_____, "The Ideological Bases of Domestic Economy," in E. Fox Genovese and E. Genovese, The Fruits of Merchant Capital (Oxford, 1982).

Friedmann, H., "World Market, State, and Family Farm: Social Basis of Household Production in the Era of Wage Labour," Comparative Studies in Society and History 20(4) (October, 1978).

_____, "Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains," Journal of Peasant Studies 6(1) (October, 1978).

_____, "Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations," Journal of Peasant Studies 7(2) (January, 1980).

Friesen, G.A., "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement," Labour/Le Travailleur 1 (1976).

Gidney, R. and D. Lawr, "Community or Bureaucracy?: The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," Journal of Social History 13(3) (1980).

Glazer, S., "The Patrons of Industry in Michigan," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 24(2) (1937).

Godelier, M., "The Origins of Male Domination," New Left Review 127 (1981).

Goodwin, C.D.W., "Marginalism Moves to the New World," in R. Black, A.W. Coats and C.D.W. Goodwin, The Marginal Revolution in Economics (Durham, 1973).

Goodwyn, L., "The 'Co-operative Commonwealth' and Other Abstractions," Marxist Perspectives 10 (Summer, 1980).

Gorham, D., "Flora Mcdonald Denison: Canadian Feminist," in L. Kealey, ed., Not An Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s (Toronto, 1979).

Gray, R., "The Deconstructing of the English Working Class," Social History 11(3) (October, 1986).

Green, J., "Populism, Socialism and the Promise of Democracy," Radical History Review 24 (Fall, 1980).

Hall, S., "Marxism and Culture," Radical History Review 18 (Fall, 1978).

_____, "Some Problems with the Ideology/Subject Couplet," Ideology and Consciousness 3 (1978).

_____, "Schooling, State and Society," in R. Dale et. al., eds., Education and the State, Volume I: Schooling and the National Interest (Sussex, 1981).

Hann, R., "Brainworkers and the Knights of Labor: E.E. Sheppard, Phillips Thompson, and the Toronto News, 1883-1887," in G. Kealey and P. Warrian, eds., Essays in Canadian Working Class History (Toronto, 1976).

Hartmann, H., "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," in L. Sargent, ed., Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism (Montreal, 1981).

Hedley, M., "Independent Commodity Production and the Dynamics of Tradition," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 13(4) (November, 1976).

_____, "Reproduction and Evolving Patterns of Co-operation and Resource Transfer Among Domestic Producers," Canadian Journal of Anthropology 1(2) (Winter, 1980).

_____, "Relations of Production of the 'Family Farm': Canadian Prairies," Journal of Peasant Studies 9(1) (October, 1981).

Heron, C., "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," Labour/Le Travail 13 (Spring, 1984).

_____ and R. Storey, "On the Job in Canada," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job in Canada: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada (Montreal, 1986).

_____, "Work and Struggle in the Canadian Steel Industry, 1900-1950," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job.

Hill, C., "The Norman Yoke," in J. Saville, ed., Democracy and the Labour Movement: Essays in Honour of Dona Torr (London, 1954).

Holmes, C., "Farm Management," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences I (1930-35).

Jeffrey, J.R., "Women in the Southern Farmers' Alliance: A Reconstruction of the Role and Status of Women in the Late Nineteenth Century South," Feminist Studies 3 (Fall, 1975).

Jenkins, W.D., "Housewifery and Motherhood: The Question of Role Change in the Progressive Era," in M. Kelley, ed., Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History (Boston, 1979).

Johnson, R., "Educational Policy and Social Control in Early Victorian England," Past and Present 49 (1970).

_____, "Culture and the Historians," in J. Clarke, C. Critcher and R. Johnson, eds., Working Class Culture: studies in history and theory (London, 1979).

_____, "'Really Useful Knowledge': Radical Education and Working Class Culture, 1790-1848," in Clarke et. al., eds., Working Class Culture.

_____, "Three Problematics: Elements of a Theory of Working Class Culture," in Clarke et. al., eds., Working Class Culture.

Judt, T., "A Clown in Regal Purple: Social History and the Historians," History Workshop Journal 7 (Spring, 1979)

Kealey, G., "The Structure of Canadian Working Class History," in W.J.C. Cherwinski and G. Kealey, eds., Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working Class History (St. John's, 1985).

Kealey, L., "Canadian Socialism and the Woman Question, 1900-1914," Labour/Le Travial 13 (Spring, 1984).

Kechnie, M., "The United Farm Women of Ontario: Developing a Political Consciousness," Ontario History 78(4) (December, 1985).

Kinnear, M., "`Do you want your daughter to marry a farmer?": Women's Work on the Farm, 1922," in D.H. Akenson, ed., Canadian Papers in Rural History VI (Gananoque, Ont., 1988).

Klein, A., and W. Roberts, "Besieged Innocence: The `Problem' and Problems of Working Women--Toronto, 1896-1914," in J. Acton, P. Goldsmith and B. Shepard, eds., Women at Work, 1850-1930 (Toronto, 1974).

Laclau, E., "Towards a Theory of Populism," in Laclau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory (London, 1979).

_____, "Populist Rupture and Discourse," Screen Education 34 (Spring, 1980).

"Language and History," History Workshop Journal 10 (Autumn, 1980).

Lazonick, W., "Class Relations and the Capitalist Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of Marxian Economic Theory," unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1983.

Lecourt, D., "On Archaeology and Knowledge," in Lecourt, Marxism and Epistemology (London, 1975).

Lecuyer, B. and A. Oberschall, "Sociology: Early History of Social Research," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York, 1968).

Lenin, V.I., "Capitalism and Agriculture in the United States of America," in Collected Works 22 (Moscow, 1964)

Lloyd, W.A., "Agricultural Extension Work," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 6 (1930-35).

Mahood, S., "The Women's Suffrage Movement in Canada and Saskatchewan," in J. Acton et. al., eds., Women Unite! An Anthology of the Canadian Women's Movement (Toronto, 1972).

Mann, A.R., "Agricultural Education," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 1 (1930-35).

Mann, S.A. and J.M. Dickinson, "Obstacles to the Development of a Capitalist Agriculture," Journal of Peasant Studies 5(4) (July, 1978).

_____, "The State and Agriculture," in F. Buttel and H. Newby, eds., The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies (Montclair, N.J., 1980).

Mardle, G., "Power, tradition and change: educational implications of the thought of Antonio Gramsci," in D. Gleeson, ed., Identity and Structure: issues in the sociology of education (Driffield, 1977).

Matthews, J., "Education for Femininity: Domestic Arts Education in South Australia," Labour History 45 (November, 1983).

McDean, H.C., "Professionalism, Policy and Farm Economists in the Early Bureau of Agricultural Economics," Agricultural History 57(1) (1983).

_____, "Professionalism in the Rural Social Sciences, 1896-1919," Agricultural History 58(3) (1984).

McDonough, R. and R. Harrison, "Patriarchy and Relations of Production," in A. Kuhn and A.M. Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism (London, 1978).

McIntosh, M., "The State and the Oppression of Women," in Kuhn and Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism.

McKillop, A.B., "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto," in McKillop, Contours of Canadian Thought (Toronto, 1987).

McLennan, G., "Philosophy and history: some issues in recent marxist theory," in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Making Histories: Studies in history-writing and politics (London, 1982).

_____, "E.P. Thompson and the discipline of historical context," in CCCS, Making Histories.

Menzies, J., "Votes for Saskatchewan Women," in N. Ward and D. Spafford, eds., Politics in Saskatchewan (Toronto, 1968).

Mitchinson, W., "The WCTU: `For God, Home and Native Land': A Study of Nineteenth Century Feminism," in L. Kealey, ed., A Not Unreasonable Claim.

Monod, D., "Rethinking Prairie Communism," Histoire Sociale/Social History 18(35) (May, 1985).

Murray, S.M., "James B. Power: The Second President of North Dakota Agricultural College," North Dakota Quarterly 42 (Autumn, 1974).

Naylor, R.T., "The Ideological Foundations of Social Democracy and Social Credit," in Gary Teeple, ed., Capitalism and the National Question in Canada (Toronto, 1972).

Nelson, L., "The Rise of Rural Sociology: The Pre-Purnell Period," Rural Sociology 30(4) (December, 1965).

_____, "Constructing Rural Sociology," Rural Sociology 9 (September, 1944).

Nourse, E.G., "Agricultural Economics," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 1 (1930-35).

Oberschall, A., "The Institutionalization of American Sociology," in Oberschall, ed., The Establishment of Empirical Sociology (New York, 1972).

Phillips, P., "The Hinterland Perspective: The Political Economy of Vernon Fowke," Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory 2(2) (Spring, 1978).

_____, "Staples, Surplus and Exchange: The Commercial-Industrial Question in the National Policy Period," in D. Cameron, ed., Explorations in Canadian Economic History: Essays in Honour of Irene M. Spry (Ottawa, 1985).

_____, "Manitoba in the Agrarian Period, 1870-1940," unpublished paper, University of Manitoba, undated.

Pitsula, J., "The Emergence of Social Work in Toronto," Journal of Canadian Studies 14(1) (Spring, 1979).

Post, C., "The American Road to Capitalism," New Left Review 133 (1982).

Reed, M., "The Peasantry of Nineteenth Century England: A Neglected Class?," History Workshop Journal 18 (Autumn, 1984).

Regehr, T., "Bankers and Farmers in Western Canada, 1900-1939," in J.E. Foster, ed., The Developing West: Essays in Honour of Lewis H. Thomas (Edmonton, 1983).

Roberts, W., "`Rocking the Cradle for the World': The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto 1877-1914," in Kealey, ed., Not An Unreasonable Claim.

Rossiter, M., "The Organization of the Agricultural Sciences," in A. Oleson and J. Voss, eds., The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920 (Baltimore, 1979).

Rowthorn, B., "Neo-Classicism, Neo-Ricardianism and Marxism," New Left Review 86 (1974).

Samuel, R., "British Marxist Historians, I," New Left Review 120 (1980).

Schwarz, B., "`The people' in history: the Communist Party Historians' Group, 1946-56," in CCCS, Making Histories.

Seccombe, W., "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism," New Left Review 83 (1974).

_____, "The Expanded Reproduction Cycle of Labour Power in Twentieth Century Capitalism," in Fox, ed., Hidden in the Household.

_____, "Patriarchy stabilized: the construction of the male breadwinner norm in nineteenth century Britain," Social History 11(1) (January, 1986).

Sheehan, N., "The WCTU and Educational Strategies on the Canadian Prairies," in Sheehan, J.D. Wilson and D. Jones, eds., Schools in the West: Essays in Canadian Educational History (Calgary, 1986).

Shortt, S.E.D., "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: the Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896," in D. Swainson, ed., Oliver Mowat's Ontario (Toronto, 1972)

Sinclair, P., "Class Structure and Populist Protest: The Case of Western Canada," Canadian Journal of Sociology 1 (1975-76).

Smith, C.A., "Forms of Production in Practice: Fresh Approaches to Simple Commodity Production," Journal of Peasant Studies 11(3) (April, 1984).

Smith, C.B., "The Origins of Farm Economics Extension," Journal of Farm Economics 14 (January, 1932).

Smith, T.L., "Rural Sociology: A Trend Report," Current Sociology 6(1) (1957).

Sonenscher, M., "The sans-culottes of the Year II: rethinking the language of labour in pre-revolutionary France," Social History 9(3) (October, 1984).

Spafford, D., "The Left-Wing, 1921-1931," in N. Ward and D. Spafford, eds., Politics in Saskatchewan.

_____, "The Origins of the Farmers' Union of Canada," in D. Swainson, ed., Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces (Toronto, 1970).

Stamp, R., "Evolving Patterns of Education: English Canada from the 1870s to 1914," in D. Wilson, R. Stamp and R. Audet, eds., Canadian Education: A History (Scarborough, 1970).

_____, "Vocational Objectives in Canadian Education: An Historical Overview," in S. Ostry, ed., Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies (Ottawa, 1972).

_____, "Teaching Girls Their `God Given Place in Life': The Introduction of Home Economics in the Schools," Atlantis 2(2), Part I (Spring, 1977).

Steedman, C., "`The Mother Made Conscious': The Historical Development of a Primary School Pedagogy," History Workshop Journal 20 (Autumn, 1985).

Stedman Jones, G., "Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution," in Stedman Jones, Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982 (Cambridge, 1983).

_____, "Rethinking Chartism," in Stedman Jones, Languages of Class.

Strong Boag, V., "Intruders in the Nursery: Childcare Professionals Reshape the Years One to Five," in J. Parr, ed., Childhood and Family in Canadian History (Toronto, 1982).

_____, "Pulling in Double Harness or Hauling a Double Load: Women, Work and Feminism on the Canadian Prairie," Journal of Canadian Studies 21(3) (Fall, 1986).

_____, "Keeping House in God's Country: Canadian Women at Work in the Home," in Heron and Storey, eds., On the Job.

Swierenga, R.P., "Theoretical Perspectives on the New Rural History: From Environmentalism to Modernization," Agricultural History 56(1) (January, 1982).

Thompson, E.P., "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," Past and Present 50 (1971).

Warren, G.F., "The Origin and Development of Farm Economics in the United States," Journal of Farm Economics 14 (January, 1932).

Weeks, J., "Foucault for Historians," History Workshop Journal 14 (Autumn, 1982).

Wilson, L.J., "Educational Role of the United Farm Women of Alberta," in D. Jones, N. Sheehan and R. Stamp, eds., Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West (Calgary, 1979).

Wolpe, A.M., "Education and the Sexual Division of Labour," in Kuhn and Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism.

_____, "The Official Ideology of Education for Girls," in R. Dale et. al., eds., Education and the State, Volume II: Politics, Patriarchy and Practice (Sussex, 1981).

Wrigley, E.S., "It Might Have Been Euthenics: The Lake Placid Conferences and the Home Economics Movement," American Quarterly 26 (March, 1974).

Zimmerman, C.C., "Rural Society," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 13 (1930-35).

Theses And Dissertations

Conway, J., "'To Seek A Goodly Heritage': The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy," PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1979.

Friedmann, H., "The Transformation of Wheat Production in the Era of the World Market: A Global Analysis of

Production and Exchange," PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.

Houston, S., "The Impetus to Reform: Urban Crime, Poverty, and Ignorance in Ontario, 1850-1875," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1974.

Jones, D., "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929," PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978.

Lawr, D., "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972.

Laycock, D., "Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies, 1910-1945," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1985.

McCutcheon, B., "The Economic and Social Structure of Political Agrarianism in Manitoba, 1870-1900," PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1974.

Panting, G., "A Study of the United Farmers of Manitoba to 1928: An Agricultural Association During a Period of Transition," MA Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1954.

Putman, J., "The Socialist Party of North Dakota, 1902-1918," MA Thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956.

Seccombe, W., "The Reproduction of Labour Power: A Comparative Study," PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1983.

Wilson, K., "The Development of Education in Manitoba," PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.