

THE ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE STATE

Monographs in Economic Anthropology, No. 11

Edited by

Elizabeth M. Brumfiel

UNIVERSITY
PRESS OF
AMERICA



Lanham • New York • London

64 ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE STATE

- Shaanxi Provincial Bureau of Statistics
 1987 *Shaanxi Tongji Nianjian, 1987* (Statistical Yearbook of Shaanxi, 1987). Xi'an: SPBS.
- Shue, Vivienne
 1988 *The Reach of the State: Sketches of the Chinese Body Politic*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Siu, Helen F.
 1989 Socialist Peddlars and Princes in a Chinese Market Town. *American Ethnologist* 16:195-212.
- Skinner, G. William
 1971 Chinese Peasants and the Closed Community: An Open and Shut Case. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13:270-81.
- State Statistical Bureau
 1988 *Zhongguo Tongji Nianjian, 1988* (Statistical Yearbook of China, 1988). Beijing: Zhongguo Tongji Chubanshe.
- Wädekin, Karl-Eugen
 1982 *Agrarian Policies in Communist Europe: A Critical Introduction*. The Hague: Allenheld Osmun.
- Wilk, Richard R. and Robert McC. Netting
 1984 Households: Changing Forms and Functions. In R. McC. Netting, R.R. Wilk and E.J. Arnould, eds. *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*, pp. 1-28. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wolf, Arthur P. and Chieh-shan Huang
 1980 *Marriage and Adoption in China, 1845-1945*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Yang, Martin C.
 1945 *A Chinese Village: Taitou, Shantung Province*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yang, C.K.
 1959 *The Chinese Family in the Communist Revolution*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND THE CHANGING STRUCTURE OF FARM WOMEN'S LIVELIHOOD: A CASE FROM SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

Jane Adams
 Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

After World War II, farm life in the United States underwent a profound transformation. As farm families adopted new technologies they also reorganized their production systems in ways that severed functional ties between the farm enterprise and the household.¹ In the process most farm women adopted middle class urban standards in household architecture and consumption patterns and, within the home, accepted hegemonic definitions of their role as "homemakers". At the same time, many farm women retained a commitment to gainful employment, seeking to retain home-based enterprises or finding off-farm jobs. Two questions are raised by the this process: first, why did farm families not adopt urban standards of household organization for so long, and second, when they did "modernize", why did they not adopt core definitions of feminine domesticity?

The answer to the first question -- why farm women for so long did not accept the doctrine of separate spheres -- lies primarily in the different ways in which farm and urban middle-class women integrated themselves into the nineteenth-century industrial capitalist political economy. Urban middle class women found themselves largely removed from extra-household distribution circuits as their household manufactures were industrialized and their homes were redefined as spheres of private consumption. In contrast, nineteenth-century farm women became petty commodity producers. Their poultry and small-scale dairy (largely cream and butter) operations provisioned the growing urban working classes (Jensen 1986, Osterud 1991). Women produced feathers, flowers, dried fruits, corn husks for tamales and other products for market. In Southern Illinois, the site of this case study, women were deeply involved in horticultural production. Farm owning wives generally managed the packing process and participated in other phases of small fruit and vegetable production; non-owning women and youths worked for wages in the fields and packing sheds. Whereas nineteenth-century urban middle-class women managed servants, farm women managed their children and worked cooperatively with neighbors and relatives. When they managed wage

hostess and as symbol of her husband's status. As the household lost its centrality in social production to factories and distant offices, middle- and upper-class women's productive functions were eliminated or lost their social valuation. But even as middle-class urban women's domestic sphere became ever more privatized, these women opened new avenues of public action and organization. Utilizing the ideology of domesticity and morality as women's "natural" venue, they organized against slavery, for women's suffrage, temperance, labor reforms, international peace, and a variety of other progressive programs. They also organized to elevate the domestic sphere to one co-equal with men's public sphere through the domestic science movement (Taylor 1961, Welter 1966, Lerner 1969, Sklar 1973, Morantz 1977, Bloch 1978, Cott 1978, Degler 1980, Bordin 1981, Hartman 1981, Mathaei 1982, Ryan 1982, Zaretsky's 1986, Matthews 1987). As Home Economics developed in the nineteenth century its creators were so concerned with legitimating women's domestic functions that they completely relinquished the world of commerce and social production to men. In trying to defend women's traditional productive activities they became complicit in creating a conception of the home as abstracted from production, as a site solely of consumption and the development of private life. Because of their commitment to this definition of the home, even those home economists who tried to redefine women's domestic work as important productive activities could not incorporate women's income-producing activities into their analytic frameworks (see, e.g., Reid 1934).

Two phases in the home economics movement can be distinguished. The first arose in mid-nineteenth-century and was rooted in notions of Victorian domesticity. It centered on the image of the Mother who embodied piety, purity, and submissiveness (Ryan 1982). The home was a "haven in a heartless world" (Lasch 1979); like the women who cared for it the Victorian home was associated with nature, linked to the polluting world of industrial production and commerce only through consumption. Prescriptive writing in this period focused on the moral and aesthetic virtues with which women enriched their families and enabled their husbands to make the proper public impression (East 1980, Wright 1980).

By the late nineteenth century science became the hegemonic standard for evaluating worth, and those who sought to elevate the status of women and of housekeeping adopted the language and forms of science. Isabel Bevier, the founder of the University of Illinois department of home economics, like Cornell University's Ellen Richards and the "founder" of Home Economics, was a chemist and assiduously stressed the professional and research aspects of the fledgling discipline. With others she sought status as a peer with other scientific disciplines. While "science" became the hegemonic framework through which all activity was valued, "efficien-

cy" became the means through which scientific practices were institutionalized in productive life. "Taylorization" -- the efficient organization of the assembly line, time and motion studies, and so forth -- became the fundamental principle of business management. Domestic scientists, who met in an important series of annual conferences at Lake Placid, New York, between 1899 and 1908, largely accepted these as defining conditions for their new discipline (East 1980:36; Elbert 1988:253, also Bruere and Bruere 1912, Pattison 1915, Gilbreth 1927, Wright 1980). These women tended to stress the important productive functions that occurred in the house. These included cooking, laundry, furnishing and cleaning the house, and perhaps sewing; the cultivation of the family's moral and aesthetic sensibilities, including providing clothing and inculcating manners appropriate to the family's social class; and responsibility for good sanitation and nutrition (e.g., Parloa 1910, Pattison 1915, Frederick 1920, Gilbreth 1927, Balderston 1936). The need for housewives to be discerning and educated consumers became increasingly important; by the 1930s consumer education became a greater focus of home economics education, but it did not become a specific course of study until the 1960s. By the 1930s child care was also elevated to a specific area of concern (East 1980:54; see also Kyrk 1933, and Reid 1934, esp. pp. 14-5, 376-7).

The founders of home economics were associated with the Country Life Movement which, with other participants in the Progressive movements of the early twentieth century, understood social problems in evolutionary terms. They associated modernity, progress, and civilization as lived by the upper and middle classes as the future for all humanity, mapping class relations as temporal transformation (Danbom 1979, Fabian 1983). They saw their role as raising "backward" people, including farmers, to their level. This entailed, in part, promoting a "rational" division of labor that required, as Elbert notes in her study of early home extension to New York farm women, "a functional gender separation of spheres" (Elbert 1988:250-1).

There is little indication that farm women nationally related to these prescriptions nor, initially, did the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1913 the Secretary of Agriculture addressed a letter to the wives of the Department's crop correspondents, asking how the Department of Agriculture could better meet the needs of farm housewives (USDA 1915; see also Bowers 1974, Danbom 1979, Elbert 1988, Knowles 1988). Despite the fact that the respondents would have been among the more prosperous and educated, and therefore in class terms corresponded to the middle-class urban women who increasingly defined themselves through the ideology of domesticity, their complaints centered on the drudgery their lives entailed. Further, their labor was highly valued. An Iowa correspondent, writing for his wife, wrote that "The country club for women has not bettered the

goods. In 1911, unlike the previous year, no women addressed the farmers attending the Institute on agricultural issues.

Home economists increasingly took over the role of linking farm women to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The 1940 *Yearbook of Agriculture* is indicative of the shift in USDA thinking. In describing "patterns of living of farm families," home economist Monroe (USDA 1940:867) focuses virtually all her attention on consumption patterns, noting only in passing, and only in reference to farmers' relative ability to withstand the economic depression, that "a considerable degree of self-sufficiency is another characteristic of the patterns of living of farm families.Food and fuel are produced....Many elements in farm living reflect this tendency to carry on production for household use" (United States Department of Agriculture 1940:848-69).

For a brief period during World War II, when large numbers of men left the civilian labor force for the armed forces, government and industry encouraged women to assume many jobs that men had formerly held. After World War II, however, the "cult of domesticity" was given a new impetus. Men returning from the war needed jobs, and many women, exhausted from holding down full-time jobs and full-time housekeeping responsibilities, were willing to retreat to the domestic sphere (Friedan 1963).

By the time Union County women established Home Extension in 1948, it was completely under the sway of home economics and had abandoned all connection to agricultural production, to remunerative activities, or to any other form of economic activity such as cooperative canneries, laundries, etc. Farm and Home Extension, while generally linked through shared office space and a close collaborative relationship on county-level issues such as school consolidation and health insurance, programmatically shared little regarding farm and household. Farm extension dealt with the technical aspects of agricultural production and marketing and with farm management; home extension dealt with "home-making," a job that could be placed in any farm or non-farm setting.

Union County Home Extension Service/Home Bureau

Union County is a relatively small county located in the Shawnee Hills of extreme southern Illinois. Fruit and vegetable growing historically predominated in the central uplands, served since the 1850s by the Illinois Central Railroad, while grain and livestock farming predominated in the Mississippi Bottoms to the west and in the eastern uplands. Early nineteenth-century southern Illinois farm households were largely patriarchal in organization, with the male head of household the authority over all other household members (wife, children, apprentices, servants and laborers).

Women did not organize nor, except for church membership, join organizations in their own right. In contrast, leading Union County men were active in contemporary commercial and political trends. As early as the 1840s some farmers organized a shipping association, and the county was among the first to institute a state-sponsored county fair in 1859. After the Civil War, county farmers organized in professional associations and, beginning in 1873, they participated in the agrarian and cooperative movements of the period. The organization of a Farm Bureau and hiring a county extension agent in 1918 was, therefore, based on a long history of organizing (Adams 1992a, 1992b, 1986).

Congruent with national trends, town women developed various church- and community-based organizations in the late nineteenth century, and Women's Clubs organized in the early twentieth century (Perrin 1883:379, Miller n.d.). Unlike their urban counterparts, farm women became increasingly involved in commodity production, particularly of poultry and dairy products (Adams 1993). Many Union County farm women also developed new roles in relation to fruit and vegetable production, both as wage workers in the fields and packing sheds and as "bosses" in these fields and sheds. By the 1890s women also began to serve on local school boards and to act as reporters from their communities to the county newspapers, and a number of farm women joined the Rebekahs, the women's sodality associated with the International Order of Odd Fellows (IOOF) that had several chapters around the county. This pattern, established by at least 1890, lasted, with some modifications (and impoverishment), until after World War II.

Fruit and vegetable production is very labor intensive; medium to large growers depended on resident laborers. The seven farms I have studied intensively all had resident laborers, both in the house and in separate small dwellings. Larger farms approached plantation conditions; one farm studied had, through the 1930s, seven dwellings for tenants plus other residential facilities for seasonal labor. During the 'teens, when the Farm Bureau was organized in the county and Home Extension begun nationally, farmers intensified production of a wide variety of agricultural commodities, most of which required women's labor and, in the case of farm-owners, their managerial skills.

After World War II the farm economy changed radically, greatly stimulated by government policies. Rural electrification (a government program), begun in the late 1930s but arrested by the war, reached virtually all farm houses in Union County by the mid-1950s (94.9% by the 1954 Census of Agriculture). Farm to market roads began to be improved by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and Works Projects Administration

*These expenditures are comparable to those tabulated in 1964. Expenditures per farm tabulated in 1969 equalled \$7,387 per farm.

*On the 50% of commercial farms.

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, County Table 4; for expenditure data, County Table 5.

*Source for 1954 and 1959, U.S. Bureau of the Census 1961, County Table 5; for expenditure data, County Table 4.

*Source for 1944 and 1949: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1952, County Table 4.

Year	1944*	1949	1954*	1959	1964*	1969
Value of farm products sold-County:	\$4,565,513	\$3,489,117	\$4,411,878	\$4,960,252	\$5,774,450	\$7,639,649
Value per farm	2,713	2,273	3,689	4,317	6,059	8,811
Expenditures	---	1,123	1,171	3,347*	2,383	4,362*
Est. per farm net farm income	---	1,150	2,518	870	3,686	4,449

TABLE 1. GROSS FARM INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

TABLE 2. 1964 INCOME OF ALL PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FARM OPERATED*

Income source	Households		Gross amt.	Amt. per farm
	No.	%		
All farm households	953	100.0	---	---
All sources	808	84.8	\$3,108,036	\$3,841.83
Wages & salaries	582	61.0	2,466,411	4,237.82
Non-farm business or profession	99	9.9	183,709	2,777.12
Social Security, pension, Vet. benefits, welfare	248	26.0	183,709	740.76
Rent, interest, dividends	246	25.8	274,626	1,116.36
Income of members of farm operator's household (excluding operator) from sources other than farm operated	416	43.7	816,210	1,962.04

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1967, County Table 7.

Minor Lessons:

- 2 first aid
- 2 better English
- 3 garnishes -- meats, salads, desserts
- 2 meringues
- 3 spot and stain removers
- 1 or 2 know your fabrics
- leather tooling
- glass etching
- clothing construction

These lessons dealt with clothing construction and care (8), cooking (5), household design, upholstery, and landscaping (5), legal advice (1), etiquette and personal development (4), health (2), crafts (3), and recreation (1). While the 1949 program includes more projects than became usual, the distribution of topics represents the annual selection through the 1950s and '60s. They ranged from utilitarian, as in choosing small appliances and mending tips (1955), to decorative, as in decorating cakes (1954).

These programs were part and parcel of the process through which farm women transformed their homes from production sites to foci of consumption and "homemaking". As among urban middle- and upper-class families in the nineteenth century, farm women's daily life, stripped of its integral role in agricultural production, was newly privatized and isolated. Like their nineteenth century counterparts, many farm women turned to involvement in civic affairs that were congruent with their roles as mothers, particularly education, health care, and community betterment.

The Home Bureau served as a vehicle for farm women to exercise civic influence on a county-wide basis. It was involved in community-wide health programs, including bringing in a mobile X-ray unit and forming a County Health Organization. This program may have arisen out of an Infantile Paralysis Board that was organized in 1951 (HES Minutes 2/8/49, 2/9/53; 1/7/1952; and 10/30/51, 12/3/51) and out of work on obtaining a health insurance carrier for Home and Farm Bureau members in 1952 (HES Minutes 10/5/48, 1/7/52; Farm Adviser letter 4/11/52 in HES, Minutes 5/9/52, 5/22/52; 8/4/52; Union County Farm Bureau Annual Meeting Proceedings 1959, in FES records). The organizing drive for a county health department does not appear prominently in the farm and home adviser's records or in the Home Bureau minutes. However, oral recollections from participants in this project suggest it took a great deal of time, skill, and perseverance to get the county health department organized. According to these accounts, most men who could have been instrumental

in creating such a department were indifferent to or, in the case of doctors, often actively opposed its formation. Elderly women looked back with pride at their accomplishment in the face of this perceived male resistance.

Some Home Advisers tried to extend programs into ones concerned with broader issues, as in the 1957 program "What's Your Prejudice." The Home Adviser wrote in the Farm Extension Service Annual Report that "The lesson was chosen because of the prevalence of racial and religious prejudice in the county.... It is hoped that this lesson will pave the way for desirable relationships if and when negroes [sic] begin living in the county" (Home Adviser's Report in FESR Annual Report 1957:24).³ Such programs around social issues were infrequent.

The Home Bureau also took an active interest in education, both in regard to the public schools and to 4-H clubs. Home Bureau women promoted school consolidation; on a local level they were active in various community development activities. The organization was directly involved in 4-H clubs, and it was common for active Home Bureau and Farm Bureau members to be 4-H club leaders (e.g., FES Annual Report 1956:14, 1957:5, 1960:3). 4-H, organized by project, was theoretically open to both sexes but in practice tended to be boys' clubs and girls' clubs. Records of club project participation appear for the first time in 1940. Projects that year were corn, soybeans, home gardens, dairy cattle, poultry, and clothing. Only corn (with 21 boys), soybeans (with one boy) and clothing (with 12 girls) were gender specific. Poultry was evenly split with 6 boys and 6 girls, while in home gardening and dairy cattle one girl and 4 boys participated in each (FES Annual Report 1940). The number and kind of projects varied widely in the ensuing years, but some patterns emerge: no girl ever participated in corn or soybean projects and no boy ever participated in clothing, food, or home beautification projects. However, other projects, although biased toward one or the other gender, were not exclusive. In addition to the projects mentioned, beef cattle, swine, rabbits, sheep, horses and mules, agricultural engineering and shop, and dogs were predominantly boys' project, while more girls than boys participated in crafts and beautification of home grounds (Adams 1987a:394-96). Young peoples' participation in 4-H projects indicates that row crops were the exclusive domain of men; cooking, sewing, and home decoration were the exclusive domain of women. A wide range of agricultural and other productive activities were not so firmly associated with either male or female spheres.

The home economics program, which was predicated on the assumption that a woman's sphere was in the home or, in public, related to "feminine" concerns of morality and the expressive and aesthetic side of life, was only partially successful in converting farm women to its vision of

catering. In some cases, these enterprises reproduced strong reciprocal relationships between husband and wife: a seamstress' husband assisted her in altering patterns and cutting out the fabrics; she owned her own tractor (a birthday gift from her husband) with which she did field work.

Farm women were among the last to experience the structural separation of domestic space and social production and they were among the first property-owning classes to experience the common mid- to late-twentieth century phenomena of a man's income being insufficient to support the entire family. Further, because they abruptly lost their ability to sell their agricultural products and to participate autonomously in the farm enterprise, the challenge to standards of hard work and partial economic autonomy which undergirded farm women's self-valuation was jarring. At the same time the 1950s, a period of unprecedented prosperity in which the "cult of domesticity" could appear as a viable form of family life for urban Americans was difficult for middle-level farmers. They lost economic security and, although they were able to live better than they had during the Depression years, their relative standard of living could not keep pace with either their parents at the turn of the century, or with their urban counterparts. Farm women's entry into the labor market can therefore be attributed both to their attempt to retain an inherited class status and to retain a form of autonomy based on independent access to cash income. In the process, they accepted Home Extension education to learn the forms of urban middle-class living, replacing earlier domestic arrangements but, anticipating developments of the next decades, failed to internalize the restrictive boundaries of "bourgeois domesticity". They not only acted as leaders in civic organizations oriented to "domestic" concerns, particularly health and education, but they entered the non-farm labor force in large numbers. Structurally removed from the farm they, like the other farm laborers displaced by new technologies, became members of the working classes.

It is not possible to re-write history but it is possible to imagine a different historical trajectory in which adult education for farm women could have helped them recreate their working lives as partners, not assistants, with their husbands in the farm operation. It is ironic that expert advice to farmers struggling through the farm crisis of the 1980s included enlisting the wife as a partner in the farm operation. Her ideal role, they advised (in addition to "go-fer" and general pinch-hitter), was to take care of the books and other aspects of the increasingly complicated managerial aspects of the farm. After a half century of viewing the farm as men's domain in which women were, at best, marginalized assistants, the joint phenomena of economic crisis and women's liberation may restore a vital role to women in some farm operations.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Home Advisers Ruby Lingle and Judy Wagner, Extension Secretary Joann Leadbetter, early Home Bureau members Clara Davidson (dec.), Lulu Dillow (dec.), Helen Kimber, Maud Kinder, Clara Bell Miller (dec.), Edith Rendleman, Elaine Rushing, Arilla Spiller (dec.), Ruby Weaver (dec.), and other Union County men and women who shared their memories with me. Thanks also for editorial comments by Peggy Bartlett.

Notes

1. A number of groups followed a different route, from the Huteries who adopted new technologies but developed alternate labor systems, to the Amish who rejected both technologies and social organization, and other smaller enclaves who more-or-less explicitly rejected "modernization". Such groups include intentional "utopian" communities, many rural African-American communities, and "conservative" ethnic settlements and individuals. On the latter, see Salamon 1992.
2. The growing body of research on farm women's lives suggests that symbolic representations of and restrictions on women's appropriate sphere varied considerably from region to region and/or ethnic group to ethnic group. In the southern Illinois hill region, most farm women interviewed defined themselves as workers engaged in various forms of agricultural production and appear to have had greater flexibility in work roles (e.g., plowing and doing other field work) than women in many other parts of the country, (see Bush 1982, 1987; Jensen 1985; Fink 1986; Osterud 1987, 1991; Adams 1988; Elbert 1988; Flora 1988; Bartlett 1993).

3. This figure was derived by calculating that females made up 47.7% of farm population, calculating that the number of people on farms between 15 and 65 was 2023, estimating that 965 (2023 x .477) were female, and dividing the 278 females reported working off the farm during the year by total estimated females -- 965.

- Bowers, William L.
1974 *The Country Life Movement in America 1900-1920*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Bruere, Martha B. and Robert W. Bruere
1912 *Increasing Home Efficiency*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Bush, Corlann G.
1982 *The Barn is His, The House is Mine: Agricultural Technology and Sex Roles*. In G.H. Daniels and M.H. Rose, eds., *Energy and Transport*, pp.235-59. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- 1987 "He Isn't Half So Cranky as He Used to Be": Agricultural Mechanization, Comparable Worth, and the Changing Farm Family. In C. Groneman and M.B. Norton, eds., *"To Toil the Livelong Day"*, pp.213-36. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cott, Nancy F.
1978 *Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1790-1850*. *Signs* 4(2):219-36.
- Cowan, Ruth Schwartz
1983 *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- 1974 *A Case Study of Technological and Social Change: The Washing Machine and the Working Wife*. In M.S. Hartman and L. Banner, eds., *Clio's Consciousness Raised* pp.245-53. New York: Harper Torchbook.
- Danborn, David B.
1979 *The Resisted Revolution: Urban American and the Industrialization of Agriculture, 1900-1930*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Degler, Carl
1980 *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- East, Marjorie
1980 *Home Economics: Past, Present, and Future*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Elbert, Sarah
1988 *Women and Farming: Changing Structures, Changing Roles*. In W. Haney and J.B. Knowles, eds., *Women and Farming*, pp.245-64. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Fabian, Johannes
1983 *Of Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fink, Deborah
1986 *Open Country, Iowa*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- 1992 *Agrarian Women: Wives and Mothers in Rural Nebraska, 1880-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Flora, Cornelia Butler
1988 *Public Policy and Women in Agricultural Production: A Comparative and Historical Analysis*. In W. Haney and J.B. Knowles, eds., *Women and Farming*, pp.265-80. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Frederick, Mrs. Christine
1920 *Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home. A Correspondence Course*.... Chicago: American School of Home Economics.
- Friedan, Betty
1963 *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell.
- Gilbreth, Lillian
1927 *The Homemaker and Her Job*. New York: D. Appleton-Century.
- Hartman, Heidi
1981 *The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework*. *Signs* 6(3):366-94.
- Illinois Farmers' Institute
1910 *Fifteenth Annual Report. For the Year Ending June 30, 1910*. Springfield: Illinois State Journal Co.
- 1911 *Sixteenth Annual Report*. Springfield: Illinois State Journal Co.
- Jensen, Joan M.
1986 *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Knowles, Jane B.
1988 "It's Our Turn Now": Rural American Women Speak Out, 1900-1920. In W. Haney and J.B. Knowles, eds., *Women and Farming*, pp.303-18. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kyrk, Hazel
1933 *Economic Problems of the Family*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

- 1952 *Census of Agriculture, 1950. Volume I, Counties and State Economic Areas, Part 5, Illinois.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1953 *Census of Population, 1950. Volume II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 13, Illinois.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1961 *Census of Agriculture, 1959. Volume I, Counties and State Economic Areas, Part 12, Illinois.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1963 *Census of Population, 1960. Volume I, Characteristics of the Population, Part 15, Illinois.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1967 *Census of Agriculture, 1964. Statistics for the State and Counties. Part 12, Illinois.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1972 *Census of Agriculture, 1969. Volume I, Area Reports, Part 12, Illinois, Section 2, County Reports.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Department of Agriculture
1915 *Social and Labor Needs of Farm Women, Report No. 103.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- 1940 *Yearbook of Agriculture: Farmers In a Changing World.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weaver, Leon H.
1944 *School Consolidation and State Aid in Illinois.* Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.
- Welter, Barbara
1966 *The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860.* *American Quarterly* XVIII(2, pt. 1):151-74.
- Wright, Gwendolyn
1980 *Moralism and the Model Home.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zaretsky, Eli
1986 *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life.* New York: Harper and Row.

HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY IN EARLY STATE SOCIETY: MATERIAL VALUE, PRODUCTIVE CONTEXT AND SPHERES OF EXCHANGE

Patricia Wattenmaker
University of Virginia

Textual and archaeological data reveal that ancient Near Eastern political elites derived their strength, in part, from agricultural and pastoral resources extracted from the rural sector (e.g., Archi 1981; Helzer 1976; Stein and Wattenmaker 1990; Wright 1984:56; Zeder 1988: 9-11; 48-49). However, little is known about the impact of political centralization or increased tributary demands on production and consumption patterns among non-elite households producing the surpluses. This paper examines household economies during a period of political centralization, using data from mid-late third millennium B.C. houses excavated at the site of Kurban Höyük, in southeast Turkey. Previous analysis has revealed that non-elite households at Kurban became increasingly reliant on specialists for craft goods during this period of state development (Wattenmaker in press). To investigate the relationship between political centralization and economic specialization, this study considers: 1) evidence for a tributary economy during a period of early state development, 2) consumption patterns among non-elite households at Kurban, and 3) factors guiding production organization and consumption among both the non-elite and political elite. The spatial distributions of artifacts from Kurban provide insights into the organization of production and consumption. Evidence for a tributary economy is examined through a study of faunal remains. Chipped stone, ceramics and spindle whorls inform about the production and use of craft goods. Archives from the royal palace at the site of Ebla, 180 km. to the southwest of Kurban provide additional information on the organization of craft production. Establishing those categories of goods produced by households and those produced by specialists provides insight into why households became increasingly reliant on specialists as state societies developed.

Increasing sociopolitical complexity is closely associated with intensified economic specialization and exchange in early state societies (e.g., Brumfiel and Earle 1987:1-4; Clark and Parry 1990:320), but the nature of