University of California, San Diego

Making the National Farmer: Progressive Educational Reforms and Transformation of Rural Society in the United States (1902-1918) and Japan (1920-1945)

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Satisfaction of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

By

Rika Fabian

Committee in charge

Professor Hugh Mehan, Chair
Professor Richard Biernacki
Professor Paula Levin
Professor Gershon Shafir
Professor Stefan Tanaka

2008

The dissertation of Rika Fabian has been approved and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm.

(chair)

University of California, San Diego

2008

Table of Contents

Vita

EDUCATION

September 2001-March 2008
University of California, San Diego, Department of Sociology, Ph.D. program
Concentration: Historical Sociology, Sociology of Education, Sociology of Culture

April, 2001-August 2001
University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Education, Ph.D. Program
Concentration: Comparative Sociology of Education

April, 1998-March, 2001
University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Education, M.A. Program
Concentration: Comparative Sociology of Education

Sep. 1999-August 2000
Stanford University, School of Education, Stanford, M.A. program
Concentration: Language Learning and Policy (M.A. conferred in June, 2001)

April, 1994-March, 1998
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo, Japan
Concentration: Spanish (B.A. conferred in March 1998)

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Making the National Farmer: Progressive Educational Reforms and Transformation of Rural Society in the United States (1902-1918) and Japan (1920-1945)

By

Rika Fabian

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

Professor Hugh Mehan, Chair

University of California, San Diego, 2008

Comparing the cases of the 4-H Clubs in Ohio and the progressive educational reforms in rural Saitama, Japan in the early twentieth century, this project points out that pragmatism laid the "cultural infrastructure" for the integration of farmers and their wartime mobilization in the two societies. I demonstrate that the pragmatic ideas of action, experience, and subjectivity transformed the key constitutive element of the relationship between the farmer and everyday farm work, and remade the engagement in everyday farm labor into a site of manifestation of nationalist subjectivity for the rural populations.

I demonstrate that, in both the U.S. and Japan, pragmatic reconstitution of how people organized their everyday activities crystallized as the new "schema of practice"--a schema that farmers employed to construct, reflect, and imagine the structure and components of their everyday action and how they engaged in it.

By pointing out the common mechanism of mobilization through the "schema of practice," I challenge the conventional assumptions that distinguish "authoritarian" pre-war Japan and the "democratic" United States based on ideological permeation. I argue that the nature of political ideology and the alleged presence (or lack) of political subjectivity do not directly explain people's political behavior. I reject ideology as a causal factor of political mobilization. I contend that nationalistic conduct was instead embedded in the everyday schema of action and experience, unmediated by the ideological structure.

This project also illuminates the dissimilarities in the schemas of practice between two societies, and the resulting mechanisms of mobilization. In the United States, the subjectivity of the actor was defined as emergent through the objectification of action, in which the actor was externalized from his action. On the other hand, in Japan, the integrity of the rural subject was sought in the total immersion and unification of the actor and action—called "practicism" *(jissennshugi)*. The desirable image of a good farmer was sought in the state of the internalization of the actor in action.

Chapter 1: Introduction

The early twentieth century was a time of crises and drastic changes in rural societies both in the United States and Japan. While industrialization and urbanization progressed at an unprecedented pace, the relative decline of agriculture in comparison to the prominence of industry raised the awareness of "rural problems" among policy makers, local rural reformers, and farmers themselves. The declining economic significance of agriculture, the widening economic and cultural gap between the urban and rural, and the diminishing morale of agricultural community all jeopardized the integrity of rural society. It also presented a pressing issue for the nation-state as a whole: how to overcome this discontinuity between the rural and urban.

Amid this moment of crisis, rural educational reformers had an array of agendas; to reconstruct the social position of farmers in the industrializing society, find a new significance for farming as an occupation vis-à-vis wage labor, while updating farming methods to keep up with the raising demand for food as the population in cities grew.

The tactics that rural reformers employed in the United State and Japan were very similar—they turned to pragmatic education as a solution to these problems. They proposed "learning by doing," or learning through action, to build a more organic connection between education and personal experience as a way to fabricate an ideal farmer in the modern society. The newly constructed idea of education strongly reflected ideas of pragmatism, particularly that of John Dewey. Some of Dewey's key notions, expressed in such works as *Education and Experience*, advanced the idea of subjectivity as emergent in the succession of experiences in activities, rather than as derivative of

consciousness. Dewey contrasted “invalid” activity—or merely “doing things” without experience, to a “valid” activity in which a child’s experiences are threaded through by the subject of learning. In both societies, reformers aimed at nurturing this “experiencing subject.”

In both Japan and the U.S., the emergence of pragmatic educational reforms immediately preceded the incorporation of rural society into the nation-state. The pragmatic educational reforms of the 1900’s in the United States, exemplified by the 4-H clubs and other advocates of scientific farming founded across the country, were a prelude to the increasing centralization of rural America through the Farm Bureau, the University Extension, and County Agents to mobilize rural resources during World War I. The pragmatic educational reforms introduced in the 1920s and 30s in Japan, in a similar way, led to the increasing co-optation of the rural into the war regime through the Rural Revitalization Project, the state-led salvation project for the battered rural economy.

By drawing on rural pragmatic educational reforms, I demonstrate that, in both the U.S. and Japan, pragmatic reconstitution of how people organized their everyday activities crystallized as the new “schema of practice”-- a schema that farmers employed to construct, reflect, and imagine the structure and components of their everyday action and how they engaged in it. I argue that the new “schema of practice” worked as a cultural infrastructure to facilitate the wartime mobilization of farmers.

I employ the idea of cultural infrastructure to accentuate my hypothesis that change of the formal schema of practice is more important than change in value systems in determining the actual practice people carry out. Wartime mobilization often assumes

a direct link between ideology and political action. Here, I am using the term “ideology” as a vessel of *values* which people adhere to and which, accordingly, organizes their concrete actions. By focusing on the political consequences of the schema of practice, I argue that ideology cannot mobilize people on its own; in order to be consequential to political mobilization, nationalistic ideology has to be mediated and supported by change in the frame of practice. Instead of extrapolating the all-powerful “ideological state apparatus” (Althusser, 1971) as the determinant of people’s action, this project aims to demonstrate that the schema of action that pragmatism laid down, not the kind of values disseminated and propagated to people, was the necessary condition for encouraging farmers’ collaboration with the state-agenda.

In both the United States and Japan, pragmatic educational reforms were the first instance in which everyday practice became the site of reform. Contrary to the cliché often found in comparisons between the U.S. and Japan that the United States was the prototypical democratic society while pre-war Japan was an authoritarian war regime (Linz, 1997, Maruyama, 1965), the fundamental argument of the reformers was very similar across societies. This thesis illuminates the similarities between the United States and Japan in the logic and process of social reforms inspired by pragmatism.

As a means of reform, the reformers “discovered” the realm of unmediated, immediate experience in which the actor involved in physical or sensory activities. They utilized experience as the way to reach the interior of the child, or the “nodal point of intersection between public language and private subjectivity.” (Jay, 2005, p.17) By experience, educational reformers meant the physical work exerted in daily life. The new rural individual was imagined to be a subject who made of daily pieces of activities a

coherent whole, within this immediacy of experience. In both instances of reforms, everyday practices on the farm became the site of experiencing and acting—farming was recreated from a mere drudgery or a means of living, into a resourceful site for creating the national farmer, a citizen who would contribute to the whole society as a useful member.

Thus, the subjectivity of the modern farmer that reformers tried to cultivate was the subjectivity whose essence resided in action and practice, not in the coherence of consciousness around abstract ideas. To reflect this, the discourses of pragmatic reforms were set up around the antithesis between "action" and "thought" as the site of manifestation of the integrity of the individual. The idea of the practicing subject made a more accessible type of citizenship available to rural populations. Farmers could be citizens by becoming good practitioners on the farm—or, by being a "good farmer," without having to deal with an abstracted and refined consciousness as a political subject of the nation. Carrying out everyday-life activities on the farm made one a good farmer, and that at the same time meant to *act* as a contributing and useful member of the nation-state.

This project also illuminates the dissimilarities in the schemas of practice in the two societies. In the United States, the subjectivity of the actor was defined as emergent through the objectification of action. In this schema of practice, the actor is externalized from his action, so to speak, because the actor positions himself as the synthesizer of pieces of activities into a coherent, rounded experience. The schema of action in the American case, in other words, regarded action as composed of components. This externalized the actor from practice, because in this schema of practice, the actor resides

as an overseer of his own action. On the other hand, in Japan, the integrity of the rural subject was sought in the total immersion and unification of the actor and action—called "practicism" *(jissenshugi)* by Japanese farmers and reformers. Practicism presents a relationality between the actor and his/her action opposite to that theorized in the United States, because the subjectivity is the state of the internalization of the actor in action. In this schema of practice, action did not need an external goal—the aim of execution lies solely in completing the perfect unison between the actor and action, the state of immersion.

These two distinct schemas of practice led to two different mechanisms of political mobilization. For farmers in Ohio, mobilization for war agendas during World War I was a result of practicing scientific ways of farming, which constructed farming as a systematic and rational undertaking with the farmer making meaningful relationships and causality among tasks. Therefore, institutional venues such as the Corn Contest, which encouraged farmers to farm in efficient, profitable, and productive manner, became the immediate environment of mobilization. On the other hand, Japanese farmers whose schema of practice involved the unification of action and the inner self, did not need externalized "goals" such as profitability and productivity as criteria. In order to serve the state, farmers, rather than practicing profitable farming, polished the "attitude" and "forms" with which they engaged in farm work.

Ideology, Action, and Mobilization

This project focuses on the 4-H clubs, initially called the Boys' and Girls' Agricultural Clubs first launched in Ohio, and the practical agricultural education in

Saitama, Japan. By comparing two societies, this project challenges the conventional categorization of regimes based on “types” of ideology, the model of ideological diffusion by the state, and acceptance by society. Also, the comparison between Japan and the U.S. is useful to isolate pragmatism as a necessary cultural condition for rural transformation because these two rural societies have very different agricultural conditions, such as the types of crops grown, political organizations, and social climate.

This project also questions the view of institutional apparatus and its socializing or indoctrinating effects as the direct cause of political mobilization. In studies of political mobilization, it is often assumed that ideology is the direct and most powerful source that induces the masses to contribute to the state agenda. When it is not arguing that ideology is simply infused in people’s head and manipulates them like puppets, the scholarship on political mobilization busies itself with delineating institutional conduits of ideologies (Gluck, 1985), in an attempt to explain how ideology becomes “convincing” enough to serve as a guide for action. This tendency has been particularly accentuated in studies of totalitarian or authoritarian regimes such as pre-war Japan, in which “ideologues” and those who are “ideologized” are assumed (Gluck, 1985: 9), and religious, educational, and scientific institutions are depicted as spontaneously aiding the state by constructing the cohering idea of imperial ideology (Garon, 1997).

Rural educational reformers did not advance their pedagogical ideas as a tool for ideological permeation. Rather, I contend it was an unintended consequence that the schema of action that pragmatic educational permeated in the mobilization of everyday action of rural people. The motives of rural reformers lay in creating a more autonomous subjectivity of the rural person: a rural subject who exercised better control and

supervision of his or her actions, who actively reflected on his or her practice, and utilized the evaluation to improve. It was a concern for everyday practice on the farm, and it was not at first politically intended. Therefore, mobilization as a consequence is disconnected from ideological manipulation, design, and utilization of institutional venues of education.

In order for the schema of everyday action to be conducive to the wholesale mobilization of rural human resources, I argue, it was necessary that the way people perceived and constituted their everyday action, and the core ingredients of the constitution of everyday practice be in parallel with the formal structure of patriotic action. I would like to emphasize that, therefore, mobilization is only one sort of application of the form of practice in a given direction, which could be political or a-political.

Revisiting Pragmatism

This project also is an evaluation of pragmatism and its impacts on social change. I use the philosophical ideas of John Dewey, the most pedagogically prominent pragmatist, whose idea inspired many educational reformers in the early twentieth century, as a guide to locate and capture the elements of pragmatism implemented in educational reforms in the two societies. Rather than attributing the unfolding of rural educational reforms to the conceptual influence of Dewey as a philosopher, I use Dewey's systematic thoughts as indices to discern the central features of the cultural inventions that rural educational reformers were carrying out in their villages.

This project evaluates the historical significance of pragmatic education from a perspective different from that of the existing educational research. Historical studies on "progressive" education—this is the synonymous term often used to refer to pragmatism in educational reforms—pay attention exclusively to those pedagogical ideas manifested in curricula, the concrete consequences of pragmatic education in society beyond school settings (Kliebard, 1994, Lagemann, 2000, Feffer, 1993, Katz, 1968). They look at educational reforms exclusively, utilizing only pedagogical terminologies. It inevitably prevents them from getting to the wider consequences of pragmatism. Examining the transformation of rural society as a derivative of pragmatist reforms is a useful strategy in this respect, because in rural society in the early twentieth century, education was not yet completely separated from other constitutive spheres of communities. This will help me avoid a too-narrow focus on the pre-fixed category of education, and help me explore the influences of pragmatism across a wider spectrum.

The contribution of this project is not only historical. This project prompts a re-examination of the notion of "experience" as an analytical tool in the contemporary sociology of culture. "Experience" is a benign and banal enough concept to escape our examination. When we say we "experience" something, we do not question the assumption that our experience is real and genuine. The category of experience, our encounter with the familiar world through our immediate sensory and physical faculties has been taken for granted in our intuitive understanding of how we engage in daily action. This project historicizes experience, in the context of rural change, asking what the historical context was in which experience and the experiencing self were called for,

how experience was constructed as a social category, and what the political implication was of this development in two societies.

There are parallels between the logic of the contemporary sociology of culture based on the presumed property of experience and the reformers of the early twentieth century; experience, as the realm of autonomy, immediacy, and primordiality, is used as a buffer against the abstract. In recent developments in the Sociology of Culture, "experience" of the agent, an a-priori entity with its own coherence, is used as an analytical counterpart against its foe, "structure," If we look back to modern history, "experience" appeared on the agenda of social and educational reformers when a new mode of the political subject who would stand against the abstraction of modernity was called for. What is missing here is a reflection on these traits which the category of experience is endowed with as its inherent features.

The dissertation is organized in the following way. Chapter 2 reviews the recent development of the Sociology of Culture in its utilization of the concept of experience. I will show that the relationship assumed between the category of "concrete" experience and the "abstract" social structure is parallel between the Sociology of Culture and the early twentieth century reforms. More specific literature reviews regarding the details of the historical contexts in the two rural societies are given in the four analysis chapters. Chapters 3 and 4 deal with the case of Ohio, while Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to the Japanese case. Chapters 3 and 5 examine the discourses and practices of pragmatic educational reforms in each society. Chapters 4 and 6 examine how the ideas of the experiencing self and the model of action changed the way farmers engaged in farm labor, and consequently, led to the mobilization of farmers in the time of national

emergency. The similarities and differences between the two cases are compared in Chapter 7.

Chapter 2: Experience as an Analytical Category

The aim of this chapter is to present a broad theoretical concern from which I approach the historical cases of pragmatic educational reforms, by reviewing the notion of experience in the Sociology of Culture. I will first demonstrate that qualities such as immediacy, coherence, and intimacy assumed of human experience are incorporated into sociological explanations as the "glue" of the structure-agent duality. This construction of the category of experience as a-priori self-sufficient and unmediated in the Sociology of Culture is the exact mirror of the agendas and consequences of pragmatic reforms in the early 20th century, in which the construction of the social category of "experience" as a sphere of reforms became a vital device to make an organic relationship between everyday practice and the totality of the nation state.

Second, I will review the existing literatures on specific cases of the United States and Japan on rural change and point out their problems. This second half of this chapter will be more topic-oriented: I will examine literatures on pragmatism and rurality as well as conceptual methodological problems of policy and curriculum analyses on pragmatism, in order to distinguish the approach and perspectives of this dissertation project from the existing ones.

Experience as an Analytical Assumption in Sociology

Experience is one of the most under-theorized, yet highly abused concepts in many systems of thought (Martin, 2005). The concept of experience is almost part of our everyday language, and for this, the term "experience" is used with such nonchalance—which certainly Sociology, and in particular, the Sociology of Culture is not exempt from.

It is surprising how often we encounter the term “experience” in major works of Sociology, Anthropology and Cultural Studies. Just to give a few examples: “If the theoretical task is to describe how culture is used, the varied way it enters and shapes experience” (Swidler, 2001:19), “Statement of the underlying regularities of human experience” (Geertz, 408), and “an enhanced experience of culture which implies forgetting of the acquisition” (Bourdieu, 1984: 3).

Interestingly enough, despite the frequent appearance of the term as well as the centrality that the concept occupies in theoretical explanations, “experience” has never been rigorously defined. The ambiguity, or the sheer lack of rigorous definition of this concept implies that certain qualities assumed of “experience” are serving as a hidden explanatory device in cultural sociology.

“Experience” has not only been championed in the crusade against structure-determinism, but also utilized as an expedient synthesizing device in the dualism between permanence versus contingency, structure versus action, and objectivism versus subjectivism by theorists who claim to establish a more interactive relationship between structure and social action.

The theorists who rely heavily on the concept of experience commonly assume attributions supposedly inherent in “experience;” such as spontaneity, immediacy, and wholeness. Problematically, the theorists at the same time utilize these assumed traits as an *analytical* device to counter the tyranny of the abstract, implicit and omnipresent—the system, structure, or the symbolic universe, or whatever they call it. Experience is seen *qua* experience, as if it is primordial, contingent, and therefore, “real.”

Experience has been utilized against the “formalizing premises” and the “essentializing premises” (Biernacki, 2000) rooted in social science. The “formalizing premises” see that the sign-system has self-contained meanings in their own right, independent from the contingency of action. In other words, signs are seen to have a “separate semiotic dimension” from action, and action makes sense only when it is interpreted against the internally complete system of meanings contained in the sign system (Biernacki, 2000). According to the “essentializing premise,” signs are placed on a different terrain from action and practice, as something a-historical and superior compared to action.

Saussure’s Linguistics and the Binary Model Assumption

These two premises are not found only in the school of sociology but rather as a fundamental premise in sociological epistemology. The pervasiveness of the problem is best portrayed in the dichotomy in the Saussurian model of *langue* as an immanent structure and *parole* as contingent happenings. In Saussurian linguistics, this dyad is omnipresent in multi-layered binaries: *langue*/*parole*, synchronity/dichronity, and permanence/ideosyncracy, where the two constituents are in a mutually binding and referring relationship (Hanks, 1996: 27). The two refer to each other in a manner in which *parole*, whose essence is spontaneous, ephemeral, and has infinite varieties and contingency, can only perform the exchange of “meanings” if the constancy and permanence of *langue* is shared by members and provides them with the shared schema of understandings and decoding of the infinite variations expected in the inherent improvisation of communication.

The relationship between langue and *parole* in Saussure has generally been understood as one in which the immanent (*langue*) subjugates the ephemeral (*parole*), at least when it comes to the problem of determining meaning (Bourdieu, 1988). Indeed, the subjugation of *parole*/action to *langue*/structure has been the main criticism leveled against Saussurian linguistics.

However, analyzing this relationship solely in terms of subjugation misses the point. I believe the real paradox of this binary relationship that Saussure presents is that the mutually referring relationship between *langue* and *parole* that enables communication actually relies on the absolute *insulation* and *inter-dependence* between the two entities.

Saussure's concept of communication harbors a hidden presumption of the incommensurability of ephemeral *parole* and permanent *langue*. *Parole* and *langue* never intersect, and never meet. And they exist on totally separate spheres of contingency and permanence. At the same time, the built-in feature of impossibly intermixing them insures the immanent presence of langue in each instance of production and decoding of *parole*. When Saussure says *langue* is always "behind and beyond" actual talk (Saussure, 26), and "collective by its very distribution" (28), this omnipresence of *langue* is only possible on the basis of its complete separation from *parole*.

What makes this synchronic insulation and alignment possible? This question does not concern Saussurian linguistics only; I believe this paradox of *parole* and *langue*—or the insulation between the contingent and the permanent— is a very fundamental problem of social science.

Saussure himself not only evades grappling with this underlying assumption but he even perpetuates this neglect. Saussure asks, why, given all the heterogeneity, individuality and contingency, is social reality possible? Saussure's question is only rhetorical because not only the coherence of structure/ langue but also the aleatoriness of *parole* is a given analytical presumption embedded in his theoretical binary, despite the fact that he presents *parole* as a-priori and inherently contingent, unstructured, and spontaneous. In other words, neither the immanence of *langue*, nor the aleatoriness of *parole* exists unless each is mediated by the very analytical duality in which they are placed regarding one another in Saussurian linguistics. The whole analytical duality in Saussure is constructed in such a way that the omnipresence/synchronity/ collectivity of *langue* and contingency/diachronity/ individuality of *parole* are defining and justifying each other as epistemological partners.

Experience as Aleatory and Primordial in the Sociology of Culture

This mode of duality is the most fundamental feature of the duality between structure and experience in the Sociology of Culture -the spontaneity of experience (or *parole* in Saussure) is a built-in analytical premise to uphold the abstract, implicit and omnipresent structure: However, experience appears as if it owned the property of spontaneity and contingency as its property *sui generis*, when this is actually an analytical presumption in the binary relationship with structure. In other words, experience has been co-opted by sociological analysis as a "check" against the over-determination of structure, as if it had an inherent property in order to challenge the immanence of the abstract system.

Let me make this clearer by examining some points of critique of Saussure. Many theorists have bombarded Saussure with criticism but they usually focus their criticism solely on the subordination of *parole* to *langue* and the dependence of performance on structure for its execution, while assuming that performance has some substance on its own. They miss the critical inter-dependence between the dual structure.

Bourdieu, for example, criticizes Saussure because he subordinates "the very substance of communication, which presents itself as the most visible and real aspect, to a pure construct of which there is no sense experience" (30). Geertz, in a very similar vein, refuses to see culture as an "overarching order of orders" (1973: 408) and, therefore, denies *langue* as an over-structuring system of signs.

In the attempt to reject the over-determination by structure, critics all try to recuperate the variability and spontaneity of action from the tyranny of the sign system. They do so by claiming the holistic experience of the individual actor, which they argue is unreduceable to the system.[1] In "Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali," for example, Geertz makes a big shift as to where he finds regularities in the social world; from the

---

[1] It is suggestive that Geerz starts his essay "Person, Time and Conduct in Bali" with a reference to Alfred Schutz's philosophy of everyday life. Geertz finds in the phenomenological notion of everyday experience in Schutlz the possibility of combining "structure" in the "paramount of reality in human experience." (365). Schutz's phenomenological approach uncovers meaningful structure appearing in the organizational categories that people at everyday level use in sorting out realities by time/space axes. The "underlying regularities of human experience" is probably the most persistent, yet unrecognized legacy of the phenomenology of the Sociology of Culture. Although Schultz's influence in Sociology is considered confined to Ethnomethodology in today's Sociology, its influence is actually quite broad.

"logical world [of culture] on its own" to the sphere of its "use." The pattern of congruency such as the absence of climax in the Balinese society should be discerned, Geertz argues, not in the tight, self-sufficient whole system, but in the "underlying regularities of human experience (408)."[2] Swidler's notion of "tool kit" is also heavily dependent on the assumption of these "regularities of human experience," as the purpose for which the tool kit is used.

This assumption of the realm of contingency is also apparent in the recent development of the Sociology of Culture. Swidler, in *Talk of Love*, argues that people do not choose their actions because they have a-priori set of values and norms toward which conduct is directed. The appearance of coherence in human action is actually an a-

---

[2] The relationship between the implicit change in structure and explicit appearance of an event, almost in the signifying-signified relationship, presents resemblance to Geertz's notion of culture as the context background against which description of events is done (Geertz, 1973:14). "Thick description" is morethan a primary methodological claim, a system in which culture immanently emerges as the reference and insinuated entity whenever description of a concrete event takes place. In the same way, Sewell's notion of event needs structure as the referent, as the background, which makes sense and brings consequences. If this analogy is correct, the problem of the Geertzian system of description that inherently assumes the wholeness of culture as the presumption of "interpretation" of culture (since the notion of interpretation necessarily assumes the a-priori existent coherence and relationality of the whole waiting to be deciphered) can be applied to Sewell, another sociologist of culture who replicates this dual structure. Structure precedes events, and events are the entry point of the unobservable structural changes. For this critique, Abbott's "general linear reality" (2001) is fundamental in pointing out the general analytical relation between the structure as the signified and event as signifier, when the relationship between the two is held constant, or "linear" either cross-sectionally or diachronically. Sewell's criticism falls short.

posteriori construction, a result of the agent's attempt to salvage the sense of "wholeness" of his experience and the acting self. It is attached afterwards, rather than existing before. For Swidler, coherence of social action and coherence of the self of the agent who carries out action has to be achieved only in order to attain the congruency of the practicing agent. This means that Swidler also claims the congruency of the actor's immediate experience as warranted in its own right, that the actor's integrity is maintained not for the security of the system but for his or her intimacy with involvement in action. For her, "experience" is nothing but this very process, in which the congruency of the self and action is achieved. [3]

Geertz and Swidler, to be sure, differ when it comes to the degree in which they theorize the coherence of experience vis-à-vis the sign system. Swilder seems more rigorous in conceptualizing the components that "experience" includes. She at least points out the "hierarchy of means and end" (Sahlins 1990: 279) as a preferred alternative

[3] The posteriority of motive expressed in Swidler, however, is not identical to what ethnomethodology calls reflexivity. The latter takes the coherence of social reality as constructed and IS called upon only when needed by analysis, in cases of failure of performance of practice, for example. Swidler's notion of a-posteriori constructed coherence takes the individual as a unit of coherence in her theory of individual action. On the other hand, ethnomethodological reflexivity refers to the nature of shared and incessantly constructed reality, which does not take the coherence of individual action as the primary concern of the issue of post-constructed integrity.

to semantic coherence, while Geertz simply resorts to the possibility of the lived social world.[4]

Nonetheless, what is striking here are the similarities that these two important critics of Saussure share. First, they both juxtapose structure and experience, where the latter is incorporated as a de-facto source of coherence of the social action. Second, this binary is made so that the primordiality of experience is a built-in feature of their explanation to support the coherence of the object of analyses—the social world. Third—this is especially the case with Swidler's argument—the assumed coherence of experience incessantly replenishes the "wholeness" of the self of the agent.[5]

---

[4] I do not think Bourdieu's analysis of everyday experience is as interesting as Swidler's or Geertz's in developing my re-examination of experience. In *Distinction*, he elucidates how banal consumption, choice and judgment of taste—or the culmination of experience in the realm of everyday life—is actually conditioned by the differentiated positions of an agent in the economic sphere. Here, Bourdieu does refuse to see everyday experience as primordial, proximate, and unmediated, but points out that the taste expressed in everyday life conduct, choices, and patterns of consumption in turn reconstructs one's position in the universe of social and economic distinction. Bourdieu thus claims to demonstrate the intertwining between the "externality" of capitalist structure and the "internality" of taste. Here, I think Bourdieu deals with only one aspect of experience related to class distinction. On the other hand, he does not explain at all—where the sense of "immediacy", as an essential character of everyday experience—comes from. However, he does explain its effect, which is to produce false-consciousness and resignation of the proletariat.

[5] I suspect that this problem partially stems from the question that she posed when initiating her analysis: "What is love?" By prompting people's reaction to this style of questioning, she narrows down the range of (re)action people would take to a typical Initiation-Response sequence. Her problem here is that, she blurs

Subjectification of Structure: Ethnomethodology and Bourdieu

It is not true that Sociology has lacked any attempts to incorporate "experience" as a more rigorous part of its epistemology. Ethnomethodology urges us to change what we sociologists regard as the object of analysis, from sociologically reified categories in formal analysis to the "working of immortal, ordinary society" (Garfinkel, 2002:119) which is performed and lived incessantly by social agents. [6] Why postulate the dyad

---

that the practical goal that she believes she is observing in people's reaction to her question, "what is love?" is the goal to successfully provide an holistic answer, or to preserve the sense of oneself who is "making sense" in this topic? The trick here of defining experience as a means-end connection is that this means-end connection is not of a developing or unfolding nature. The connection never fails to be made and therefore always successfully replenishes and reconstructs the "wholeness" of the integrity of the self. Any experience is to be achieved. Due to the overly fail-proof connection between means and end, Swidler repeats Geertz' problem of not explaining" how culture shapes experience" (21).

[6] Neo-institutionalism indeed took advantage of this "de-coupling" between structure and experience to make it its central theoretical feature (such as Mayer, 1992). They point to what is left out by a rational and calculative model of action by drawing attention to the "pre-conscious processes and schema" activated by actors who enter into routine activities in institutional settings. This "preconscious process," provides an underlying possibility of institutional behavior by framing what is the shared goal of collective practice, what is regarded acceptable as a legitimate means to achieve that end, and the institutional form that interaction is expected to have in order to be perceived as "successful." Neo-institutionalism comes close to my argument in that it argues that rationality is indeed 'false-consciousness," so to speak, and the possibility of action is circumscribed in advance due to the frame unconsciously shared by members. However, neo-institutionalism preserves the triad formed by goal, means and evaluation of action. It contextualizes action as institutionally determined but does not have insight into why institutional action is seen as composed by these three components.

structure of social structure and acting agents only to fight over which is superior to the other? Ethnomethodology disregards this question as epistemological nonsense. From the ethnomethodological perspective, agents are practicing structure in the working of ordinary society, in the "local endogenous production and natural accountability" (124) of immortal, familiar, and on-going achievement of social order in people's practice of constituting the everyday world.

The ethnomethodological program contends that social structure and practice are unified as "social facts" in the way people carry on with their everyday performance of social interaction. What sociologists call structure is a collection of rules of communication and interpretation shared by actors, which are acted out and performed, and therefore realized as emerging products of real-time interaction. Structure gives the individual a frame that "permits speakers and auditors to hear, and in other ways to witness, the objective production and objective display of commonsense knowledge" (Garfinkel and Sacks. 1970: 342). Structure defined this way appears in front of us incessantly as the "properties of uniformity, reproducibility, repetitiveness, standardization" (Garfinkel 1970) in the form of the structure of conversation, turn-taking and exchange of gestures.

By claiming the sharedness and performability of structure in everyday action, ethnomethodology undermines the artificially set division between structure and actor by embodying structure in the performance of everyday communication. Hence the attention to the most mundane instances of interaction by ethnomethodologists, because they believe that "the phenomena of order consists of lived, immediate, unmediated

congregational practices of production, display, witness, recognition, intelligibility, and accountability of immortal ordinary society" (Garfinkel, 2002, 93).

In this program of ethnomethodology, the notion of experience is essential. With the subjective feeling shared by everyday people regarding communicative rules, role-taking, and accountable actions, and the inevitability of successful communication (after all we all make sense to each other), actors— in their execution of social interaction—as competent executers of communication, are also as the subjects of action. In other words, experience in ethnomethodology is the key to the ethnomethodological reality—the ever-emerging structure through the execution of communication.

The construction of the ever-emerging structure in ethnomethodology finds resonance in the *habitus* concept in Bourdieu. Although he claims to be a critic of ethnomethodology, Bourdieu's theory of practice relies on the same theoretical assumption of experience in his attempt to mediate the duality between structure and action. In *Logic of Practice*, he proposes intervening the opposition in the epistemology of human science: subjectivism and objectivism, the two modes of knowledge whose relationship is marked with discontinuity and deep division. Bourdieu distinguishes two notions of experience: on one hand, the phenomenological notion which stands for "the primary relationship of familiarity with the familiar environment" and which "remains perfectly certain, qua experience" (both p.26) on the side of subjectivism; on the other hand, the objectivist neglect of experience that takes for granted the objective structure, independently of the particularity of the individual's experience.

Bourdieu points out the problems of both ideas of experience. While the subjectivist notion cannot go beyond the realm of intuitive familiarity with the world,

objectivism forgets to account for what makes the objective structure possible, and what naturalizes the structure of collective as well as individual perception. His famous notion of *habitus* was designed to mediate these two opposing ideas of experience, to answer the "question of the conditions of possibility of this experience, namely, the coincidence of the objective structure and the internalized structures, which provides the illusion of immediate understanding, characteristic of practical experience of the familiar universe" (26-27).

According to Bourdieu, *habitus* are "systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures…as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them." (53) The notion of habitus that he develops in *Distinction,* therefore, is a subjectified structure, which homogenizes the practice of everyday life, making the question of intentionality involved in these practices redundant.

In this attempt to build a bridge that connects the discontinuity between objectivism and subjectivism, Bourdieu imagines a static and idealized class society where people's "subjective" motivations, perception, and desires match the structural constraints and conditions. Bourdieu seems to escape the problem of essentializing experience, because, unlike other theorists mentioned above, he rejects the idea that experience is unmediated and absolutely spontaneous, attributing such an assumption to the realm of subjectivist lacuna.

However, Bourdieu's problem lies somewhere else. He actually builds the immediacy of experience into his theory of structured experience. He preserves the immediacy and spontaneity of experience as part of an explanatory device. Why does structure work? Because structure is lived and practiced in the realm of the immediate. People believe in the world of immediacy while it is only a structured experience. In this sense, habitus is experience, but only false-consciousness of the people "living it" themselves.

Ethnomethodology and Bourdiue seem to represent the problem of Sociology when it is incorporated into the core structure of logic; they both reify the property of experience. They both throw experience into the realm of the essential constituting element of the immortality of the social order, be it everyday communication or the accepted feelings of distinction, and as a result, reifies experience as a-priori unmediated, immediate, and essential. In other words, only by postulating experience as unmediated, they can explain the ceaseless emergence of the world as structured, but at the same time intimately subjective.[7] Meanwhile, both ethnomethodology and Bourdieu evade the question, "Is experience really unmediated, and immediate?"

---

[7] Since ethnomethodological experience as "lived and unmediated" is also not warranted, and an analytical postulation, I believe that ethnomethodology itself is not designed to speak for such elements as spontaneity, agency, or resistance as some interpretations of ethnomethodology argue. For example, Mehan and Wood (1975) unfold the moral and political possibility of ethnomethodology, arguing that the ethnomethodological perception of social life is "essentially practical," (216) and therefore categories such as "social class" and "dominating relationship" exist only as far as people practice communication in situ

Revisiting Experience

Historicizing this notion of experience in the actual instance of social reform is one of the goals of this project, not only because of my interest in historical sociology, but also because I strongly believe that putting this tricky concept in a historical context is one important way not to reify it as an analytical tool.

Admittedly, the time period this project is going to examine, the early twentieth century, is not the first time the idea of experience as the ground of immediacy appeared in intellectual discourses. Martin Jay, in his thorough reexamination of the historical genesis of experience, demonstrates the discursive and intellectual position that the notion of experience has occupied, especially as a shifting nodal point between the Subject and the world he finds himself in. (2005)

This project is much more limited in terms of the temporal scope, but I believe the early twentieth century needs special attention in the archeology of this elusive but long-standing idea of experience. Pragmatic reforms present the first instance of a political attempt to construct the mass subjectivity through the notion of the immediacy of experience, particularly experience coupled with its context—everyday physical work, mundane activities in quotidian contexts of everyday life. Therefore, in contrast to Jay's methodology that he described as examination of "adjectival variants of experience" (p.16) as a musical theme and variations, I hope this project can provide a narrower, but more grounded political consequences of experience as a social category.

While effective as a criticism of formal analysts, the problem here is that experiencing power and domination, I believe, does not automatically lead to the concept of agents of social change.

I will pin point the construction of experiential subject among rural populations from two perspectives. First, the notion of experience assumes that there are two separate spheres, action and structure. They are seen as relatively autonomous from one another, where the presumed holisticity and immediacy of "experience" ensures some space for spontaneity of action which keeps the dominance of structure in check—hence the idea of the "autonomous subject" in everyday practice. At the same time, this relative separation of each sphere secretly serves to support the interdependence between action and structure, without giving structure overwhelming power and rendering action subordinate to the system—which is the model of the national subject. When experience is opposed to structure, the assumed immediacy and spontaneity of experience is in effect.

The features of experience—the assumed immediacy, spontaneity, and unmediatedness—are unspoken assumptions, but theorists in Cultural Sociology nor rural reformers took them as a constructed feature, even when they are assumptions to hold the dyadic relationship basic to the sociological analysis. This was exactly the quality of experience that they turned to as a breakwater to structured abstractness that they regarded was the ill of modern society. The dyadic relationship between the abstract and concrete that pragmatic reforms tried to reformulate by the use of experience, ultimately, is the goal of this project.

Explanations on Mass Mobilization

This project will demonstrate that experience, as a realm of immediacy and whole-ness of the actor, secured in the binary relationship between the individual/concrete and the system/abstract, can be observed in the rural transformation in the early 20th century. In other words, the binary relationship in Sociology reflects the

conditions of social change that the invention of the realm of experience attempted a hundred years ago.

In this dissertation project, I show the historical process in which experience was constructed to create the space of practice in which farmers made citizens out of themselves in the developing stage of the nation state. When requirement for desirable citizenship resides in capacity for action—the space of assumed autonomy and intimacy to the individual, this logic of spontaneity became essential in making "autonomous citizen" out of farmers.

My hypothesis from which this project takes off, questions conventional knowledge about the politicization of the subject, especially in political mobilization. For example, if participation in political action stems from the reorganization of action, what happens to the function of ideology in political mobilization?

Recent critics in cultural sociology and historical studies have accumulated insights into the mechanism of political mobilization in totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. Inquiries of political mobilization center around two main themes; the presence or absence of political subjectivity of the individual, and the mode of acceptance of the values that the regime presents (or imposes) on people.

The problems of political subjectivity and constraints of ideology are deeply intertwined with the categorization of political regimes. The traditional categorization depicts totalitarian and "democratic" regimes as positioned at the opposite ends of the spectrum of the degree of autonomy of society vis-à-vis the state (Linz and Stefan, 1996, Linz, 2000, Dahl, 1971). Most work in political science focuses on the autonomy of society from the state—or "healthy" political subjectivity nurtured by autonomous civil

society—as the measurement of the maturity of democracy. It reflects the assumption that the autonomous, self-governing individual is premature, suppressed, appropriated, or commingling with primordial community in non-democratic societies and therefore lacks relevance as an object of analysis (Maruyama, 1969, Dower, 1993, and its critic, Berezin, 1997).

Political action in a non-democratic society is seen virtually pre-figured by the goals provided and values imposed by the regime. As a result, how people in authoritarian regimes organize their actions has not been treated as a sociologically valid question: there is not much space left for individual creativity in organizing their politically weighed action.[8] This view leads to a persistent image that democratic and non-democratic regimes are composed of very distinct human-types and models of political action, depending on the degree of ideology permeation and to what extent social action is influenced by it. The long-held assumption argues that the maturity of a (democratic) society is measurable by the degree in which this imagined element of subjectivity is autonomous from the regime.[9] As Nikolas Rose (1989) argues:

> Subjectivity…appears as an essential datum; societies are to be evaluated according to the extent to which they repress it or respect it…How has subjectivity itself become, in its different guises and conceptions, the measure of political systems and power relations? (p.4)

---

[8] This democratic/authoritarian line is even more pronounced when combined with the west/non-west cultural determinism. The tendency is even more apparent in studies that analyze military practices in World War II (Hanson, 2002, Dower, 1987), in which inherent cultural codes such as collectivism, implusiveness, and even feudal legacy of bushido codes bind the behavioral norms that soldiers follow.

[9] Hence the fascination and obsession with the issue of subjectivity both in post-war Germany and Japan, as in Koschmann (1996), Maruyama (1969).

Searching the Space of Autonomy: Critics of Ideological Mobilization

There are critics of this view, but they themselves are also prone to reiterating the same logic. Countering the view that evaluates societies according to the extent to which they preserve the autonomy of private lives (Diamond, 1999), critics have tried hard to excavate the space of "autonomy" in society (vis-à-vis state) which they imagine is free from the unilateral control of the regime.

There are two approaches in the attempt to save the space of autonomy. One is to point out "instrumental rationality" in people's action with political consequence. When critics want to refute the view that immense structural constraints, such as ideological manipulation or punishment to insubordination, made it practically improbable that actors to freely plan their own action, they draw attention to the interaction and possible discrepancy between the value structure and personal incentives constrained by specificity of social context of action.[10] This argument emphasizes the incentive system directly driving self-interest rather than overarching values. This means that how the individual acts in the context depends on the overt or covert system of rewards and penalties and career and profit prospects.

These studies (Hirota, 1996, Berezin, 1994) point to the possible distance and incongruence between the larger, formal value structure and the more immediate

---

[10] Interestingly, scholarship on both Germany and Japan has taken the same path in putting forth this line of argument, which brings "subjectivity" on the side of people back into action (Koschmann, 1996). This argument, however, might be reactionary in that the problem of the lack of subjectivity in German as well as Japanese people in the regime is "overcompensated" in the critique.

conditions for the apparent action taken. As Berezin puts it, the “feeling of participation” nurtured in the formal settings of fascist congregations does not necessarily mean that fascist ideology drove people to attend these congregations. This view argues that the seeming “willingness” to cooperate with the regimes could stem from calculative instrumental rationality, which is, for its pure instrumentality, out of reach of regime power, despite the façade that ideological beliefs presented by the regime seems to be causing mass behavior.

The second way to claim the space of autonomy in totalitarian/authoritarian regimes, especially preceding World War II, is to argue that totalitarianism, contrary to the irrationality of a savage being, was a result of over-rationalization. This school of re-rationalization of totalitarianism argues that a strong impetus for social re-integration was the need to counter the chaos of self-interested and instrumental, goal-oriented conduct generated by capitalism and liberal politics and accelerated by the breakdown of traditional values (Harootunian, 2000). Individualism and self-interested rationality bring conflict and contradiction among parties who want to play their own games to achieve their goals to saturation point (Koschmann et al. 1999). These theorists argue that totalitarianism—more specifically their focus is on fascism—emerges to overcome the *anomie* of the masses and re-knit the disintegration of the traditional ties the modernization process caused, by offering a centrifugal force that propagates national identity, thereby giving everybody a social function to pursue through which they

contribute to the larger society.[11] Berezin (1997), for example, depicts Italian fascism as a result of an inherent crisis due to an excess of liberalism and the lost integration of identity of the "self." This crisis, to different degrees in different societies, is to be overcome by the emergence of the higher totality, the state, to which the individual devotes a piece of him/herself. In this somewhat Hegelian explanation, Berezin goes even further to point out:

> If we conceptualize fascism as a political ideal that denies the separation of the public and private self, then we can think of totalitarian states as the organizational form of that destroyed boundary. To the extent that all nation–states need to create citizens who will sacrifice some parts of their private selves to the state, whether their income in taxes or their bodies in war, then the terms "totalitarian" and "liberal-democratic" as demarcation of state forms start to appear as only differences of degree. (25)

These two arguments commonly try to regain some kind of rationality in our understandings of authoritarian/totalitarian regimes. The rational-choice explanation

---

[11] Many Sociologists of Culture either intentionally or unwittingly follow this logic when disarming the centrality of ideological content as a substantial socializing and mobilizing conduit in totalitarian regimes. For example, Berezin (1997) criticizes the neglect of the self or equivalent notion of subjectivity in studies of totalitarian regimes and argues, "community, public/private self, identity, and citizenship are commonly involved to discuss democratic practice but rarely to discuss fascism" (p.19). But in doing so, Berezin also proposes to grasp the ideological essence of fascism in terms of its anti-liberalism impulses. Liberal democracy, with its basis in the historically peculiar split between the bifurcated selves, turns out to be quite an unstable system for social integration. Liberalism allows people's identities multiple possibilities (political, social, national, gender etc.), and leaves "an empty symbolic space" (p.18) which integrates this multiple (and therefore unstable) center of meanings (this is similar to Zizek's ideological "sewing"). Berezin contends that fascism filled this emptiness in the split self with communitarian hyper-nationalistic ideals through various political rituals.

resurrects rational instrumentality as the "real" mechanism of seemingly ideologically-driven political mobilization, while the over-rationalization argument presents the totalitarian reorganization of society as a result of "too much" rationalization.

I believe that searching for the mechanism of mobilization in the absence, presence, or excess of rationality is a futile effort. They all stand on the assumption that the conduct of the masses is value-driven, motivated by an external goal outside of the internal logic of action itself. This is why the presence of rationality is such a central question to all of them.

This dissertation project examines the forgotten side of mobilization--the reforms based on the notion of experience as the reorganization of a schema of *action*. I will demonstrate that this newly structured model of action actually made the external values and goals redundant as a component of political participation.

Mobilization and the "Modern Self"

The examination of the category of experience that I intend to pursue in this dissertation is inspired by the collection of research on "modern subjectivity" or the "modern self" and how it entailed the political potential to feed into the modern political subject.

These studies point to the emergence of the realm of the private as a new politically potent device: where did the "expertise of subjectivity" (Rose, 1969) come from? Some describe the "expertise on subjectivity"—such as psychology and education— not as a direct and simple appropriation of human subjectivity by the state for its political aim, but rather as a "way of striving to reach social and political ends by acting in a calculated manner upon the forces, activities, and relations of the individuals

that constitute a population" (Rose, 1969: 4). Here a somewhat collaborative relationship between the political agenda and the scientific formation of the realm of the private, intimate sphere of the human soul is hinted at.

A more rigorous approach to why the objectified sphere of self was conductive to the construction of the political self focuses on the development of practice working on the individual as the object of improvement. Kharkhordin (1999) shows that the emergence of the sphere of the private and individual was concomitant with the process of forging the political subject in Soviet Russia. He points out that the system of collectivism and the molding of the individualized self came along with the establishment of the totalitarian regime in communist Russia, where the individual was molded into the object to work on, act on, and fashion. He argues that the communist agenda of the collective required the delineation of the sphere of the individual first as the object of ongoing communist practices of self-improvement and self-fashioning for the revolutionary self. He points out that carving out this sphere was the first task of the Russian Revolution to shore up the "freeing space" (p.229) of the individual.

All the above authors point to the fact that political totalization and mobilization could not be performed without carving out some kind of individual space as an ingredient. My exploration on the schema of practice with daily experience as its main ingredient as a mobilizing sphere shares this point. The focus on a totalitarian regime and the practice of self-fashioning in Kharkhordin is particularly informative in developing my conceptual frame for examining how the emergence of the realm of individual as the object of improving practice shapes the relationship between people and the regime.

On Rurality and Modernization: Two Positions of Rural in the Modern Society

While urban cities were the predecessors of the implementation of pragmatic educational reforms, as in Dewey's experimental endeavor in Chicago (Lagemann, 2000, Kliebard, 1995), political and social consequences of the emergence of the category of experience in educational discourse is easiest to observe in the rural context. In early twentieth century rural society in the United States and Japan, the logic of "education" became the dominant logic of reforms for the reconstruction of the entire rural society. Here education as a method of reform was not confined to the narrow and isolated context of school education and the realm of children. Reformers used education as a panacea for the problems of socialization of the members of rural communities, the organization of farmers who were socially disconnected from the rest of society, and the re-establishment of farm labor as an occupation.

There is one thing we have to bear in mind when comparing the rural between two societies. There is a large discrepancy in how academia has seen the rural in the United States and in Japan. American rural scholars tend to pay disproportionate attention to the nineteenth century, and they are often trapped in their appraisal of the Jeffersonian democratic tradition which they regard as the backbone of rural virtues (Fuller, 1982, Scott, 1971). American scholars also tend to capture rural change in terms of the clash between the romanticized resilience of farmers and various attempts by the state of centralization and undermine their autonomy on the farmland. These studies depict the early twentieth century as the period of increasing centralization of rural social structures and invasion of the state in rural community (Theobald, 1995).

On the other hand, in the Japanese academic tradition, the rural has occupied a completely different position and prominence. Rural change has been given a special place in historical and sociological studies. This is due to a mixture of reasons. Partially, this tendency is attributed to the peculiar influence of Marxist historical perspectives, combined with modernization theory, held over Japanese scholarship. The Marxist tradition in Japanese social science has attached a special meaning to the rural as the cradle of mass "mentality" that constantly sought authority to cringe to subordinate itself to. This tradition also attributes Japan's "thwarted" path of modernization to the late development of Japanese capitalism compared to Western societies—and Japan's allegedly "unique" path of modernization to the rapid disintegration of rural excess labor into uprooted urban populations.[12] Since Japan did not develop a healthy civil society to counterbalance the devastating effect of discharging the excess labor power from agricultural population, the power of civil society remained relatively weak, according to the "Western" normative ideal. This historical process made Japan especially vulnerable to the rise of the military authoritarian regime.

Needless to say, these very different prominence and position given to rural society are direct reflections on the regime categorization that political scientists, sociologists, and historians have created collaboratively. Indeed, how the rural is imagined and referred to reflect the deep sub-consciousness, in the self-reflexive mode, of how we imagine modernity of the contemporary society. In this case, reflection on the

---

[12] Maruyama Masao is the most prominent figure of this school, whose basic view has been inherited by Japanese academia.

rural again reveals the cliché that Japan's path to modernization has been "unique" but "thwarted" because of the "unhealthy" route of the development of capitalism, which was not harnessed by the healthy maturation of civil society as in the United States.[13]

This dissertation project started with frustration with such a view, which not only replicates the assumptive position of civil society and political subjectivity in the categorization of political regimes, but also keeps replicating the same stereotype of rural society, and consequently, modernity of each society. One of the goals of this project is to reexamine how the rural itself interpreted modernization and dealt with it, and through that, to undermine the dyad in the regime categorization between the United States and Japan.

Pragmatism as a Cultural Force: On Conceptual Methodology

This project examines the educational reforms inspired by pragmatism as the site of constructing the realm of experience, and transformation of the schema of practice in rural societies. Whereas pragmatism has been depicted as a driver of educational reform, it has not attracted much attention as a driving force of social change, not to mention political mobilization. This is regrettable, because pragmatism was the first philosophical attempt to situate action as an integral part of theory of subjectivity and theory of action through its argument on the continuity of personal experience. In other words, experience

---

[13] Indeed, this assumption that Japan as a late, and therefore a unique example of modernization, is often assumed even in the discourses of the rural elites whose writings I analyzed. In general, this self-evaluation of Japanese elites that Japan is a unique counter example of the West is abundant among rural reformers since the Meiji Restoration (Pyle, 1973).

was invented by pragmatists as a category for modern reform. Dewey transforms the subject from the a-priori set of perception and cognition—or the subject of consciousness—to what emerges as a result of the continuing personal experiences, in which "every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in the quality of those which come after" (1938, 27). The subject in Dewey's pragmatism is a progressively appearing product of the accumulation of individual experiences.

Dewey attached educational value to the continuation of experience in physical activities. Experience-based education for Dewey is fruitful not only because it makes the object of learning accessible for the learner in the first-hand contact with the environment, but also because it accommodates freedom and social control in voluntary action. In contrast to the "old" education that ignored the intimate process of accumulating experiences in the child and sought the source of authority in power external to the child, he proposes that the beneficial elements in new education are the nurturing freedom and autonomy of the actor. Dewey found social control embedded in the execution of physical work or task that the actor engaged in: in the course of pursuing tasks, participants spontaneously followed the collective social control exercised in their very involvement in the work and task.

Although recent developments in Cultural Sociology saw the revival of pragmatism (Swidler, 2001, Sommers, 1998) as a theoretical inspiration, the scope of its application is still quite limited to the content vs. meaning debate in action theory. This debate over social action puts the Weberian model of action that argues a coherent set of ideas dictates action that manifests itself in particularistic contexts under attack. They

question Weberian theory of action that ideas guide action by drawing on pragmatism's "negation" of consciousness as the substance of acting ego.

This is quite a limited interpretation of pragmatism. For example, the erasure of consciousness and its replacement by instrumentality that the recent cultural sociologists see as the central feature of pragmatism, has left out many important sociological parameters from analysis (Joas, 1995). Among them are questions such as how such instrumental action accounts for social collectivity, and how action thus imagined can be understood in relation to values, and political ideology.

In order to elevate the significance of pragmatism, I think it is important not to uproot pragmatism from the actual historical context in which it was first applied. The revival of pragmatism in a condensed and reified form as a theory has its limit because its essence is deformed in the light of the contemporary problems. The analytical strength and weakness of a social theory is best demonstrated when taken into consideration with the background of the time in which the thought was born.

In consideration of the social influences of pragmatism, there is a methodological problem to be cleared. How do we study the social consequences of a social thought? This is especially a problem when dealing with a relatively elusive school of thought such as pragmatism. To compensate for the diffused nature of the object, the biography of the theorist usually plays a large part in the analysis. In the case of the analysis of

pragmatism, such a method typically stays within the discourse of Dewey, on his pedagogical, psychological and philosophical narratives.[14]

Feffer, (1993) for example, demonstrates an interesting dissection of the reorganization of the management-labor relationship by pragmatists in the early twentieth century. He examines the involvement of two major pragmatists, John Dewey and G. H. Mead in labor disputes. Despite the fact that Feffer attempts to decipher the social consequences of pragmatism, his analysis ends up being another account of intellectual history, a review of the early twentieth century American liberalists' thoughts, as in Menand (2000). Feffer stresses that the aim of his work is an examination of how the key ideas of Dewey, such as "industrial democracy" or "self-activity," would be contextualized in the specific historical context. However, his analysis never escapes the duality between Dewey's texts and their alleged "influences" on social processes, and never elucidates how these two intersected.

Feffer's approach reveals a common methodological problem. First, the key components of pragmatism are identified, then, the author seeks similarities between these core elements, and the actual change in people's practices and social organization. This method is more abused in a macro-level analysis such as Karier (1972), where he points out that progressive reforms in the first half of the twentieth century in the United States worked in synchrony with the interests of the "new" liberalism that "espoused controlled economy, state planning, group thought, and managed change" (60).

---

[14] Studies on pragmatism and educational reforms tend to replicate the problem, such as that by Kliebard (1995).

What are the problems of this approach? First, these theorists essentialize pragmatism by forging the intentionality of historical actors. Then, they try to explain how the intention for change was materialized in society. For example, progressive reforms were initiated to counter the crises wrought by the corporate mass technological society, characterized by rugged self-interest and individualism. American progressive reformers were keenly feeling the limitations of traditional liberalism which took individual freedom as its central core and was devoid of a sublime end. They saw in totalitarian society the ideal organic relationship between individual freedom and totality where freedom had positive meaning only when it was congruent with the larger end of the state and the community. The researcher claims that this group of progressive reformers, including Dewey tried to produce orderly, and carefully controlled social change from the chaos triggered by the old-fashioned liberalism: they were "bent…on rationalizing and stabilizing the system. Stability, predictability, and security were the expected consequences of a controlled rational process of social change.

But is it true that the pragmatists' planned reforms were implemented in such a straightforward manner? As it is obvious in Krier, who calls Dewey a "corporate management welfare state" advocate, this method stresses the direct link between the thinker, pragmatic ideas, and the direction of social change. For example, take Dewey's notion of freedom. Pointing out that "positive freedom" in Dewey is conceptualized only as nested within the control of the collective, and that his contribution to education was to subordinate it to the state, rendering education in compliance with the compulsory power of the state. Krier insinuates that Dewey's ideas were so influential that the hidden

repressiveness of pragmatic education had tangible social consequences, such as the realization of corporate society.[15]

In the view of this body of research, the limit of pragmatism as a body of thought is the limit of social change itself. For the same reason, any change in society is forcefully attributed to the content of the thought. While I agree with Karier that pragmatism gave away to the circumscribed form of individual freedom, and gravitated toward the vision of the management state, I believe it is insufficient to point out only the general correspondence between ideas and direction of social change, as if the ideas automatically triggered the social change, skipping the analysis of mid-level practice.

In order to avoid this problem, I employ two strategies. First, I focus on how pragmatism crystallized in the new schema of practices of rural people, rather than how pragmatic ideas supposedly affected policies. I do not go out of my way to find the link between Dewey and rural reformers on the basis of evidence of personal correspondence and acquaintance as many historians of ideas do. Instead, I focus on what pragmatic rural reformers envisioned about the new education and agriculture, and how they tried to

---

[15] Particularly salient in research on progressive education is the focus on personal connections as a conduit of ideas, from Dewey to practitioners through various institutional channels such as written works, curriculum, and method of teaching (Kliebard, 1995, Lagemann, 2000).[15] Besides, this research often romanticizes pragmatism-influenced pedagogy by stressing only one side of the ideas such as child-centrism and hands-on activities. These tend to limit their focus exclusively to the institutional implications in classrooms and schools, therefore missing out the broader social consequences of pragmatism as an idea. (Cuban, 1984)

carry out the new vision by changing the components of learning and farming. This focus enables to find more rigorous evidence of pragmatic change within practice.

Second, I reverse the arrow of explanation. Rather than starting from pragmatism as the independent variable to identify an essentialized set of ideas, I looked at the ideas and practices of rural reformers first, then refer back to pragmatism to identify, label, and categorize what is in the reforms. This way, I believe, I can capture more precisely the wide range of connection between pragmatism and actual reforms that carried out pragmatism in practice. Pragmatism here works as a compass, so to speak, to efficiently pinpoint the common elements in social change in Japan and the United States.

Two-Society Comparison and Cases

My research compares Japan and the United States regarding the major social categories that pragmatic educational reforms permeated: everyday activities as experiential processes. I believe these two countries constitute an ideal comparative pair to tease out the mechanism through which pragmatism functioned as a vital cultural infrastructure for social changes in modernizing societies in the first half of the 20th century. In both Japan and the United States, pragmatism exercised considerable influences on educational reforms which crystallized into common historical consequences. Pragmatic educational reforms immediately preceded the integration of rural communities into the state system as a constituent part of society.

Japan and the United States, which have been regarded as representing two very different regime types provides a good comparative framework for pinpointing pragmatism as a common mediating factor between ideology and mass mobilization across societies. My comparative method, therefore, is a blend of the methods of

difference and similarity. I point to certain elements in pragmatic educational reforms as the common cultural conditions in the two cases, and demonstrate the parallel results of political mobilization deriving from this variable. The goal of exploring the argument on similarity is to undermine the conventional categorization of political regimes in political science that bases the distinction of regimes on the type of ideological beliefs and the form of permeation (Linz and Stefan, 1997). Using pragmatism as a common index of cultural change in two societies is effective because these pragmatic educational reforms in two societies were not reforms of ideas, but reforms on "how-to" in action. Furthermore, it was exactly these reforms of the form of practice—not of ideas—that was conducive to mass mobilization. By arguing thus, I aim to undermine the conventional view that ideology is responsible for political mobilization, and that regime types can be established according to the "content" of the dominant ideology.

This does not mean that I disregard difference and variations between the two cases. The comparison demonstrates the unique context in each society in which the category of experience was connected to the way people perceived everyday practices of farming. Instead of locating the source of difference in the cliché of "rational" American society and irrational traditional Japanese society, I argue that, if there is a difference between the mechanisms of popular mobilization in Japan and the U.S., it must be located in the formal relationship in which the actor situates him/herself vis-a-vis practice, or, in other words, how everyday action is devised, designed, and reflected.

To explore the above questions, this project turns to the 4-H clubs in Ohio in the United States and to educational reforms in Saitama Prefecture in Japan. The 4-H club was initially called the Boys' Corn Growing Club, and later the Boys' and Girls'

Agricultural Clubs. There were certainly variations in names of the organization. However, for the sake of consistency, this project employs the uniform label of the "4-H Club."

My choice of Ohio as the case to represent the United States is due to the fact that the first agricultural club for rural youths in the United States was established there in 1902 (Wessel, 1982). Because it was one of the very early instances of pragmatic rural reform, it allows me to observe the processes of rural change before and after the advent of the reform. The relatively rich volume of data on the nascent stage of the clubs, especially writings of Albert Graham, the founder of the Ohio 4-H Clubs, makes a practical reason to focus on Ohio. The University Archive of the Ohio State University, together with the Ohio Historical Association store an immense volume of writing by Albert Graham and other related documents on agricultural educational reforms. This archive even helped me to extend my attention beyond the 4-H Clubs, and investigate how pragmatic ideas changed the rural community and farming practices in general, through the University Extension and other agricultural agents.

Japan entails as much diversity as the United States when it comes to the situation the rural communities found themselves during the early twentieth century. Saitama was the best choice to observe the influence of pragmatism in rural change in Japan. Compared to other prefectures in northern Japan where the weight of reforms was shifted toward Marxist philosophy due to the prominence of some leftist teachers' movement, Saitama preserved the original direction of pragmatic educational reforms that spread throughout Japan in the 1920's. Furthermore, in Saitama, due to the strong leadership of the prefecture government and its support for pragmatic agricultural education reforms,

the range of influence of the reforms is pervasive. Therefore, the case of Saitama provides rich information on educational reforms and their consequences on non-educational spheres such as economy, communities, and discourses of practices.

Data Sources

The aim of this project is to explore the importance of mediating practice cultivated by pragmatism as the link between nationalistic ideology and actual mobilizing practice. In order to achieve this goal, ideally, it would be essential to examine how the actual practices of rural people changed as a result of pragmatic educational reforms, and how the new ways of doing things on the farm and household were fed into the "mobilized" practice.

However, it was difficult to collect data that would directly speak to how farmers were indeed performing their everyday activities on the farm. Agricultural publications that I consulted "describe" farming activities as the "new" and "desirable" methods of farming, and how the farmer should have been engaging in daily work; however, "ethnographic" data on detailed and concrete activities actually done by farmers were scarce. Therefore, I relied on two alternative sources of information from which I try to elicit what farmers were doing on the farm and how. First, I turn to first-hand accounts by farmers in the form of diaries, written contributions to newspapers and magazines, and farm accounts. The shortcomings of these sources is that while they tell how practices were *reflected on* and imagined by farmers themselves, not enough is said about the actual procedures of farming that they were engaged in. It is highly possible that the way actors reflected on their practice does not truly represent the actual procedures of

practice. However, in the treatment of data, I searched for the way to best approximate the reflection to the actual details of practice.

Second, I also explored the "proxies" of practice. This included discourses and plans of reforms that showed how reformers were envisioning the "new" rural communities and farmers, and specifically what aspects of farming reformers were trying to change. There are plenty of sources with this information, such as local agricultural serial publications that would provide accounts on how the agents of local agricultural reforms designed, implemented, and defined the "new" form of farming practice, local educational journals in which visions of agricultural education is expressed, and in Japanese cases, writings by rural youths themselves on how they should have been attempting to improve rural Japan.

In the case of Ohio, the Albert Graham Collection stored in the archive of Ohio State University was a valuable source of information on the proxies. This collection includes a large volume of letters of correspondence, writings and memoirs by Albert Graham. The collection also contains samples of activity logs of the early 4-H club activities, name lists of students enrolled, and guidelines that club members followed to organize the club activities. Graham actively contributed to teachers' journals such as *Ohio Teacher* and various journals published by the Ohio State University Extension on the significant effect that the 4-H clubs would have on rural reforms. I will use these sources to analyze the pragmatic formation of the proxies of how farming practice changed after the reforms.

In order to examine the transformation of rural society as a consequence of educational reforms, I examine agricultural serials such as the *Ohio Farmer*. This is the

farm newspaper most widely distributed in rural Ohio and other Mid-western states in the early twentieth century. It is dedicated to disseminating among farmers what were regarded as the central elements of scientific farming. Monthly publications by the Ohio State University Experimental Station and University Extension were also useful sources of evidence that show what the reconstitution of the practice and concept of farm labor involved. There is a wide array of experimental station publications that I consulted, *Ohio Experimental Station News*, *Agricultural Student,* and *Circular*. Indeed, the 1900's and the 1910's in rural America was the time when these leaflets containing suggestions and technical ideas of farming started being published to a high degree in order to "educate" farmers. I also examined annual reports by the Board of Agriculture in Ohio from the 1850's through 1920. These were particularly helpful in comparing the uniqueness of the development of rural Ohio in 1900's to that of 1800's. Although first-hand writing by farmers themselves was hard to come by, I collected minutes of Grange meetings in different counties when available, to gain insight into how ordinary farmers were reacting to the institutional changes in rural Ohio.

For the Japanese case, I examined *Kyoiku Saitama* between 1930-45 to explore the development of educational discourses. *Kyoiku Saitama* is an educational journal widely read by teachers and principals in Saitama prefecture. This magazine has articles contributed by rural teachers that reported their practice of pragmatic curricula and agricultural training in elementary and middle schools. Another major source of information on rural change in Saitama is *Kosei Saitama,* (1932-45), published by the Agricultural Bureau in the Saitama Prefecture. This was the official serial magazine dedicated to giving information about the plan and spreading the spirit of the Agricultural

Revitalization Plan in the prefecture, the nation-wide rural reform plan that was crucial in co-opting the rural into the war regime in the 1940s. *Kosei Saitama* was a particularly rich source of information, because the Revitalization Plan incorporated rural education as one of the central vessels of reform. As to other publications regarding the Agricultural Revitalization Plan, I also look into detailed data on the implementation of the Revitalization Plan in individual villages in Saitama, meeting minutes of the local government Revitalization Committee, and rural surveys administered as part of the Revitalization Plan.

Japanese farmers seem to have had more readiness to record their everyday practice and their thoughts, compared to Ohio farmers, for the reason I go into in depth in Chapter 6. I was able to find a more satisfying volume of first-hand accounts by rural youths themselves and farmers in village monthly publications. In monthly magazines published by village youth groups, young men in the village wrote freely of their visions of rural reforms, education, and practice of self-improvement in their own hand-writing and language. This allowed me to explore the methods and frame of reflection by farmers and village youths on everyday practices.

Chapter 3: Making Farming "Rounded Experience": Scientific Farming and Remaking of Farming in Ohio

This chapter analyzes the logic of reforms in which the 4-H Clubs in Ohio carved out farming as the construction site of "rounded experience." The 4-H club resonated with John Dewey's concepts of experience, activity, and resulting emergence of the "acting subject." After reviewing the historical contexts in which the rural educational reform was ushered in, I examine the reshaping of farming by the 4-H clubs from mere "drudgery" and "mindless activities" to a "whole experience" that nurtures the subjectivity of the actor. I delineate how pragmatic concepts fabricated the new schema of practice in the activities of the 4-H clubs and advocates of scientific farming education for adult farmers to encounter the rural crises and educational problems. This chapter lays a foundation for the following chapter in which I analyze the political consequences of the fundamental reorganization of the principles of practice in scientific agriculture.

Rural Crises in Ohio

The sense of crisis was in the air in rural America in the early 20th century. To live in the countryside in 1900's was to "have the sense that the nation was passing you by, leaving you behind, ignoring you at best and derogating you at worst." (Dandom, 2006: 134) Along with administrative problems such as the centralization of rural township schools, this sense of urgency was felt particularly keenly among rural educators who found the very principle on which rural education had been built

problematic. The existing rural education was under fierce attack by pedagogues and rural reformers in Ohio as outrage upon the life of rural children.

The education before the advent of pragmatic educational reforms was characterized by the one room school, where one teacher teaches all subjects to students at different ages. The one room school was a spontaneously erected environment by farmers themselves for their own children. Parents established their own one-room schools where they agreed with other community members to provide their children with basic education. They chose when the school terms started, and selected the teacher, and even had power over what to be taught (Fuller, 1982). Rural reformers as well as urban progressives who looked into the state of rural education in the early 20th century saw rural schools' fragmentation as inefficient and defective, as well as the lack of "basic" conditions that were considered as norms in urban schools, such as qualified teachers, sufficient and appropriate equipment for all students, and hygiene.[1]

Even more than the organizational insufficiency,[2] rural educational reformers condemned the existing state of rural education for wasting possibilities of the child in

---

[1] *Farmers Institute*, 1905

[2] As in the case of urban progressive movement, there are two directions identified to sum up the directions of educational reforms in rural America in the early twentieth century. One is represented by the centralization movement of dispersed one-room schools to systematize, standardize, bureaucratize and increase efficiency of existing rural education. The other direction, which this project focuses on, is the "pedagogic" reforms, so to speak, to change the definition of what counted as knowledge, and the valid form of learning. The agents of these two directions of reforms, however, were often the same. For example, Graham, the founder of 4-H clubs, was also an advocate of school consolidation movement and

dull instruction methods in classroom, and tarnishing "those precious years when the child is all ear and eye, when its eager spirit with insatiable curiosity hungers and thirsts to know what and the why of the world and its wonderful furniture."[3] The existing education was regarded as crucially detrimental to child's development. keeping "a little child sitting in silence in vain attempt to hold its mind to the words of a printed page for six hours a day"[4]with teachers only pouring "the mass of words and sentences which he is compelled to memorize."[5]

The purely pedagogic rationale is not sufficient to explain the motivation behind the rural educational reforms, though. The "scientification" of agriculture, reformers argued, called for reforms toward more practical education. The tighter connection between farming and school education was emphasized on the ground that farming was

---

he contributed many articles on the beautification of rural schools, while he advanced the movement to make rural education practical.

[3] *Ohio Teacher*, (1902) Vol.23, no.8

[4] ibid.

[5] While in the urban context, the child-centered approach was applied in the curriculum as desirable on its own right, in the rural context it demonstrated a different pattern of application. Not only was the celebration of childhood a much less prominent part in rural reforms, it had influences on curriculum changes in tandem with agrarianism. The innocence of the child was wed with the celebration of the country life as the place where the untarnished essence of human life, now destroyed by urbanization, could be preserved. However, I regard this as a general process of modern reforms as Tanaka (2004) shows in which the generation of social categories— the category of children, for example, appears as the object of education and means of social improvement vis-à-vis their purity. In this case of rural reforms also, the category of childhood provided a language in which the discourse of social change was formulated.

not any more an unorganized and unmethodical undertaking that anyone who happened to be born in countryside could take part in. School education was called for as a necessary institutional means to teach the methodical and systematic farming, the function informal means of passing on knowledge to children could not perform.

The early 1900's was the time when farm magazines and newspapers, such as *Ohio Farmer*, enthusiastically spread the new concept of farming: farming required specialized knowledge, organized and planned efforts, efficiency, and expertise. Farm papers were particularly passionate in advancing this point: "The boy who is to be a farmer will not see so readily the advantages of a trained mind in the solution of farm problems… There is no calling that needs educated trained men more urgently then farming."[6] All the skills to persevere in the modern world, such as shrewdness, adaptability, and business-mind were listed as qualities in demand that would help a country boy succeed in farming. Farming came to be seen as an entrepreneurial business, a comprehensive project where the individual had to multi-task like the combination of a "manager, laborer, artisan and business man."[7] Schooling became a social institution that labels farming as "calling" that requires training and preparation as any other occupation, where schooled socialization and certification signals the aptitude for chance at success.

The "new" concept of farming was bolstered by the economic argument that teaching updated technology to farmers would minimize the cost of running the farm and increase profit. Interestingly, in the case of rural America, the efficiency argument was at

---

[6] *Ohio Farmer*, 1902 Sept18

[7] *Farmers Institute* (1904, p.591

the same time the argument for self-reliance of individual farmers. It allowed them to run the farm as independently as possible from hired labor, which was often a costly but necessary evil under the circumstances of shortage of labor. The University Extension argued the importance of educating farmers in the farm management methods: "The men who undertake to carry on the farm today by his own muscular labor alone is worth about a dollar and a half a day. The management of that farm involves an outlay several times that amount. You cannot employ a man to do intellectual work for you for less than from five to ten or twenty dollar a day."[8] The economic argument that quantified and calculated wage for farm work in farm newspapers endeavored to convince farmers to get educated to make more profit. The best way to keep cost down and increase farm profits is to educate domestically existent laborers. Educating farmers themselves and their family members was the only way to do that.

Last but not least important, the call for a new education was also driven by the idea of social and moral improvement. The country school was considered "one of the main factors in dispelling the clouds of discontent and bringing about correct ideas to country boys and girls."[9] This call for social improvement also addresses the problem of the exodus of young people from the countryside to cities. Educators calling for reforms in rural education regarded school education disconnected from reality of the country life as useless to keep the youth on the farm. Agricultural education was expected to instill

---

[8] *Annual Report, Board of Agriculture of Ohio*, 1903.

[9] *Ohio Farmer*, 1904 p.598

the sense of pride in rural children, to teach them the beauty and virtue of country life, and elevate farming to a worthy occupation.[10]

It is important to remember that the reformers' idea of education for citizenship was not aimed at revisiting the existing vision of rural citizenship, which had been already taken on by the traditionally existing rural organizations such as Grange. [11] Ohio Granges, for example, added a new "juvenile" chapters in the late 19th century to better permeate the Grange ideals such as "leadership and poise" among younger community members.

The vision of Grange on education, however, stayed within the argument informed by the traditional producer Republicanism. For example, while the Grange promoted "organization" of farmers against the invading industrialism, its emphasis was on preserving the community ties of traditional rural identity to bolster the independence of farmers.[12] Furthermore, the educational enterprise by the Grange focused on the classical literacy training as a cultivation method of virtues such as discipline and responsibility, as apparent in the following remark by the Grange master:

> ..it should be borne in mind that the real object of literary work in the grange is to mutual discipline and development received by those contributing to the exercises.

---

[10] *Rural School Agriculture*, Price.

[11]Grange, or the Order of Patrons of Husbandry, is considered the oldest rural organization, which had functioned as the socializing as well as educative agent for rural Americans since the mid-19th century. It had taken up the central issues such as the control over agricultural product prices, food laws, mail and road issues, and the fight against the unfair share taken by middlemen in shipping and marketing.

[12] *Ohio Farmer* (1905) March 25

> There is nothing equal to the literacy work in the grange, in giving opportunity to the boys and girls on the farm. Here the latent ability of the boys is awakened and hope engendered until we see him develop into a fuller and more complete man.[13]

Rural reformers in Ohio, although they did not come into conflict with Grange as to the vision of education, were looking for an alternative to the traditional republicanism and the independence of farmers as insulation from the rest of society. In this sense, educational reformers were seeking a path to defining the rural in an updated way in relation to the rapidly industrializing American society.

Views on Educational Reforms in Rural America

Researchers have often treated rural educational reforms as an "off-shoot" of the urban middle-class progressive social reforms (Kliebard, 1995).[14] Probably the biggest reason for this is that urban progressives and rural reformers were sharing the common sense of crises and often working pursuing the parallel cause. They both mounted a human capital argument—as farming advanced technically and the demand of more foodstuff grew, farmers were now required to know everything that would yield more

---

[13] On the role of the Grange Deputy State Master Ralph Waller.

[14] The difference between urban vocational training and agricultural education has been only pointed out in a cursory manner by Kliebard (1995) as the discrepancy between a "future-oriented" training program in the urban context and a project program in rural areas in which children could participate in real-time labor on their family farm. In any case, historical studies on curriculum reforms in the United States have remained as descriptive, not analytical.

crops and improve the soil.[15] Education was also called upon as a means to nurture good citizenship in the changing orders of rapidly industrializing society,[16] just like the urban middle-class advocated vocational training for working-class children in order to domesticate and contain them (Kliebard, 1999). Furthermore, rural education has been often analyzed borrowing the words of urban educational reformers, such as Country Life Commission and the National Educational Committee (Fuller, 1985). As a result, rural educational reforms have been deprived of chance to be analyzed on its own terms.

Research that focuses on rural education itself, on the other hand, seems to have reduced the dynamism of rural educational reforms to mere functionalism. The same goes for accounts on progressive educational reforms in rural America. The 4-H Clubs that popped up across countryside in the United States in the beginning of the 20th century have been portrayed instrumentally as an "institution at hand to train and educate young people in the best techniques available for successful agriculture" (Wessel et al., 1982, p.2), or as a socializing organization to raise the morale of rural communities. Others describe the motivation of rural progressives promoting the 4-H clubs primarily instrumental, as "improving agricultural production and food preservation" (Wessel, p.xiv) and to promote more agricultural production at lower cost (Moore, 2001). This framework drags on the stereotype that American farmers were defiant, for good or bad,

---

[15] One of the foci of the history of rural America is technological advancement in farming methods, and its effects on the general practice of agriculture. Naturally, this placement of focus advances technological development as the causal force of changing agrarian communities, leaving little possibility that cultural has an independent effect on rural change.

[16] *Farmers Institute* 1907 (1)

against industrialization and new form of farming technology, while excessively individualist and independent (Scott, 1970). Therefore, the 4-H clubs are portrayed as the transmitter of new agricultural technology to their parents.

Agricultural history, by contrast, attributes only a minor significance to educational reforms, while focusing their attention to the growing organization and centralization of rural communities through state and federal organizations such as the University Extension, Farm Bureau, and Agricultural Colleges (Scott, 1970, McConnell, 1959). The underlying tone is the same. Agricultural history depicts how the excesses of independence and autonomy of American farmers were compromised and contained when state agencies grew in its power to control and organize these resilient farmers.

The existing scholarship on rural change in the United States is quite unsatisfactory, precisely because it adheres to the story that the State institutions changed the "resilient" farmers in a matter of ten years or so, immediately preceding World War I, to somehow integrate them into the modern capitalist system. I believe that these historical accounts of education and rural change miss the pressing sense of urgency with which rural society itself encountered social changes. Rural reforms, in other words, were not only imposed from the University Extensions and local elites, but progressed on the other ground in the form of change in the ways in which farmers practiced, organized, and perceived everyday farming.

To what extent pragmatism was responsible to the transformation of daily practice is a hard question to answer. Davies (2002), for example, suggests that we look at progressive educational reforms, at least in the contemporary context, as a loose cultural "frame" to invoke sentimental and strategic resonance among partaking parties with

potentially divergent interests.[17] In this particular case of rural educational reform, however, I regard the pragmatic theme in the reform wrought a substantial cultural change rather than just a "perspective" frame to bind people's strategy together. Pragmatism was incorporated into the rural educational reforms as an alternative theory of action, rather than just an interpretive frame of current issues and future visions. More specifically, pragmatism, by being applied in the education through farm work, actually changed the way farming was perceived, and practiced by rural members.

Many accounts of pragmatic educational curricula reduce pragmatism to an alternative model of psychological learning process.[18] Progressive curriculum is often

---

[17] Researchers who apply frame analysis to the study of educational reforms inspired by social movement theory, for example, argue that social movements are driven by a creative manipulation of the way problems, solutions and goals are identified, presented, and disseminated to participants. (Davies, 2002, Snow, 1986) Frame analysis suggests that ideological causes proposed by educational reformers are not so much concrete ideological creed that binds participants' action as a loose umbrella under which different parties come together with diverse interests. It is an attractive proposal that the disparity exists in the motives of reform participants, and the disparity is muffled for the practicality of the execution of practice. Frame analysis sees social change through movement as a result of the converging *interpretive* frames of participants. Therefore, it ends up arguing that whether change actually happened or not is an irrelevant question. Thus, I see this approach unsatisfactory when examining the rural educational reforms we have at hand.

[18] Probably part of the reason for this understanding of synthesis is the literal interpretation of early works of Dewey, when he still had strong inclination to Hegelian dialectics. Dewey organized his theory of action to synthesize between particular elements of action, fragmented in psychology as stimulus and response,

understood as a pedagogic method of scaffolding to facilitate learning by the use of the learner's experiences of the concrete world and build it up to the higher, more generalized concepts. This has been the most common understanding of the "synthesis" of the concrete and the abstract by pragmatic pedagogy in most accounts (Kliebard, 1995), a method to "move along from one defining point, the immediate, chaotic, but accessible in the familiar surroundings of the child, to the other point, the logically organized, abstract, and classified experience of the mature adult" (Kliebard, 1995:72).

This view underestimates the more significant consequence of pragmatism precisely because it diminishes experience as a mere instrument to reach the abstract. Analyzing rural reforms reveals that pragmatic ideas indeed were a reform of practice, not psychology.

Carving out Practical Education in Ohio

Despite the wide range of problems that reformers identified, rural educational reforms had one point of consensus: Education had to be practical and should incorporate agriculture as a core subject, although there was dissent among parties as to how to teach agriculture at the very early stage of the reform. For example, in *Ohio Teacher*, schoolteachers expressed their concern that teaching agriculture at school would diminish school education to mere vocational training.[19]

---

and the totality of action, or the reflex circle. Since Dewey in his early career was motivated by his criticism toward psychology, it was inevitable his work itself became psychological in its scope.

[19] *Farmers Institute*, (1905) no.2

The struggle of reformers at the early stage to set the direction of pragmatic education is also evident in the short-lived introduction of Nature Study as a pedagogic idea. Although the impact of Nature Study in rural communities was fairly small, and the 4-H Clubs completely surpassed Nature Study as the guiding principle of reform by the mid-1900's,[20] the transition from Nature Study to the 4-H Clubs illuminates how the definition of practical education was carved out.[21]

The Nature Study, originally designed for urban middle- to upper- class children, was geared to developing reasoning skills and scientific investigation of the natural environment. Original proponents of Nature Study, who themselves were urbanites, claimed that school knowledge was fragmented and alienated from the natural context from which it was elicited. "Definition and aims of the nature study," the *Ohio Teacher* argued, "is learning those things in nature that are best worth knowing, to the end of doing those things that make life most worth the living…to give a knowledge of

---

[20] Up until 1913, teachers' magazines such as the *Ohio Teacher* had articles both on Nature Study curriculum and practical agricultural education such as the 4-H. After 1913, Nature Study entirely disappeared from these magazines and the direction of rural reforms was set to a single direction, and the 4-H Clubs became the leading and central force of educational reforms.

[21] The Nature Study was the brainchild of Liberty Bailey who was professor at Cornell University. Bailey and Albert Graham, the founder of Ohio 4-H clubs, then the superintendent of Springfield Township, were in close contact as to the direction agricultural education should have taken. Therefore, the two movements should not be regarded as oppositional but initially shared the similar pedagogic motivation.

environment; to awaken an interest in and sympathy for all forms of life; to develop esthetic, ethical and spiritual natures; to obtain in reasoning from cause to effect."[22]

In Nature Study, children and their teacher would go into the forest and observe vegetation. If they collected wild flowers, the curriculum warned the teacher against bombarding children with scientific names of flowers in an attempt to teach systematic botany. Instead, the teacher should lead children to "love the flower as a perfect whole." Proponents of nature study also suggest that students not dissect and pull flowers to pieces. [23] The pedagogy encouraged students to grasp the object of learning as a whole, in its original environment.

Nature Study was in fact the first curriculum that rural teachers turned to as a way of reforming the existing education. Nature Study was initially appealing to rural educators because it introduced the pedagogical method to put the child in direct contact with the object of learning. However, Nature Study was not quite sufficiently removed from traditional pedagogy because it positioned nature as an object of knowledge, a stimulant for the growth of mental capacities, and the source from which the good character of the child was to be drawn. In Nature Study, nature and the child still found each other in the subject-object relationship of knowledge where the child is the subject of knowing, and nature exists externalized from the child, to be reached in direct contact such as observation and collection of specimens.

---

[22] *Ohio Teacher* Vol. 114 No.12

[23] *Nature Study Idea*, Liberty Bailey (1909)

The attempt by the proponents of Nature Study to incorporate nature into learning processes, however, was quickly surpassed as the guiding principle of the rural reform when the 4-H clubs came onto the stage. [24] Teachers expressed concerns that Nature Study paid scarce attention to real agriculture, and did not educate children with the business operation of farms, and scientific agriculture necessary for that purpose.[25] Ohio teachers were ready for the 4-H Club.

The Birth and Growth of the 4-H Clubs: Head, Heart, Hand and Health.

There are two elements that distinguished the 4-H Club and other competing discourses of educational reforms such as Nature Study. First, the 4-H Clubs' pedagogical principles were centered on an explicit reformulation of components and structure of activities. Second, the 4-H Club's reform attempts were carried out in tandem with the agricultural educational reforms at the wider scale. As a result, it integrated everyday farm work, not the aesthetic appreciation of the natural environment, into learning processes.

---

[24] The uniformity in which rural reforms were carried out is indeed surprising, considering how meaning-laden the notion of "practical education" could possibly have been, as well as the potential conflict between pre-existing organizations such as the Grange and Farmers Institute, which had identified themselves as educational organizations for farmers. This is another point that makes rural educational reforms unique compared to its counterpart of the urban middle-class or working class schools, where the contestations between the unions and employers over the definition and aims of vocational training at schools (Kliebard, 1995).

[25] *Ohio Teacher*, 1910, 31(4)

The name "4 H" stands for Head, Heart, Hand and Health; "the head for a wealth of information and knowledge, the heart for moral and spiritual strength, and the hand for manual dexterity and skill."[26] To this, health is added within a few years. The four elements which the Clubs aimed at nurturing—the 4-H Club actively sought to integrate manual activities and quotidian practices into the process of education. The magnitude of influence of the 4-H Clubs, therefore, cannot be reduced to their emphasis on the vocational aspect of agricultural education, but was a comprehensive redefinition of the object of education.

The year 1902 is marked as the birth year of the 4-H clubs in Ohio, when A. B. Graham, Superintendent of Springfield Township called the first meeting of the boys' corn growing club at the basement of the township school building.

As a township Superintendent, Graham's early years of profession seems to have centered on the common issues of rural schools such as tardiness and absenteeism of many farm children.[27] Later, he grew to be "one of the most progressive men of his profession of the State."[28] He took interest in Nature Study, as well as the work of a teacher in Champaign County, Ohio, who organized manual work training using tools at school. However, Graham always held a firm belief that "something of agriculture was

---

[26] *Report of Springfield Township Schools*, 1904.

[27] This is evidenced in the school diary by Graham himself that he kept during his early years of teaching, serving as a township school instructor from 1890, stored in the Historical Society in Springfield.

[28] *Press Republic*, January 26, 1903. Springfield, Ohio.

the natural manual work for boys and girls of the rural district."[29] Not only just agriculture, "scientific farming," or experimental work in farming must be incorporated in education. Graham wrote: "Elementary agriculture as a science puts the pupil in possession of scientific facts pertaining to the soil, water, plant, and insect, friends and foes, and cultivation, drainage, domestic animals, etc. Traditional practices of the art must run the gauntlet of scientific test."[30] He heard about the attempt of corn growing experiment in a school in Illinois that tested four different kinds of new varieties. After he took office as Superintendent in Springfield, Clark County, he put his belief in practice.

Thirty boys of the age between ten and fifteen attended the first meeting of the 4-H Club. This small gathering of boys grew in size at an amazing pace. By the end of the school year, the membership of the Club increased to more than 85, attracting students from nearby townships, even including four girls on the membership list.

Boys in the Club were provided with seeds for two or three square rods of ground, and brought them back home to grow them the best they could. These were the same types of corn that their fathers planted on their family farm, and boys were asked to compare the result of their corn yields and that of their fathers. Children also learned to design their own vegetable gardens, of the size in 5 x 16 feet plots. They were taught to draw the diagram showing the size of the plots and hills to the row.[31]

---

[29] *Rural School Agriculture; The Boys' and Girls' Experiment Club and the Agricultural Student Union of Ohio*, 1904. p.6.

[30] *Report of Spring Field Township Schools*, 1904, p.38.

[31] *Report of Springfield Township Schools*, 1904.

At monthly meetings, children reported on the growth of their corn plants, and studied the textbooks of elementary agriculture together. Graham provided textbooks to teach the boys some of the experimental methods of corn growing, such as soil testing, rainfalls, how to identify different kinds of weed and pest. Before the establishment of the Club, township schools kept few copies of agricultural textbooks, if they had any. Introduction of experimental agriculture to children, therefore, was a new attempt by the 4-H.

Teachers from nearby townships heard about the Club and showed interest. Graham personally delivered seeds to schools nearby. Graham sometimes encountered misunderstanding of people about the intention of the club. Superintendents in other counties trying to establish a club complained that many students tried to take advantage of the opportunity to get "free" seeds of flower and vegetables, which were more expensive to come by than corn seeds[32]

Despite some difficulties at the beginning, the clubs kept expanding. Teachers from nearby townships personally wrote to Graham for instructions for organizing clubs in their townships, who to contact to obtain textbooks and seeds, how to carry out activities. Parents were fascinated at the club work too, according to Graham, and having their children's name on the membership list of the 4-H Club became a source of pride for parents.

As the Club grew, the meeting venue was soon moved from the basement to the County Building to accommodate the number of members. As the Club developed,

---

[32] A.B. Graham Collection (1906) 40-8-1-22

Graham attempted to strengthen its organization by asking help from the Ohio State University Extensions as well as the Ohio Agricultural Student Union.

The Extensions and Agricultural Union were the most prominent proponents of experimental agriculture in Ohio. Their mission was very clearly laid out from the beginning: to disseminate knowledge of "scientific agriculture" to make farming more profitable.[33] Agricultural Student Union, for example, is an association of graduates of the College of Agriculture in Ohio State University, dedicated to administering a number of agricultural experiments from testing of different varieties of seeds, soils, and breeds of living stock.

Graham asked the Extension and Agricultural Union to furnish the Club with materials and expert knowledge. The Extensions sympathized with Graham. The Director shared the belief with the 4-H Club in agricultural education for children.

> The education of the majority of these children will end with the rural school and a very large part of them will remain in the country to make the agriculture of the future. They will have to deal with the farm crops, the farm animals, the weeds, the birds, the insects, every day of their lives; and the object of the College of Agriculture is to get them interested in these things; to teach them about them.[34]

Graham gained powerful support from the Extensions and Union to expand the Club work. The Director of the Extension services provided the Club with seeds of the four new varieties of corn that the Agricultural Union was testing, so that the 4-H Club

---

[33] *Agriculture Student* (7) 1906.

[34] *Agricultural Clubs in Rural Schools: Some Suggestions for Organizing Agricultural Clubs in the Rural Schools for the Study of Agriculture under the Direction of the College of Agriculture of the Ohio State Universitu*, 1904. p.3.

members could carry out the same experiment on their own. Furthermore, the Director even planned to plan a set of graded experiments suitable for the children to try.[35]

From then on, the 4-H Club and the Extension Services allied to reform rural Ohio under the banner of scientific farming. This means that the educational reforms were taken up in tandem with the broader agricultural reforms that—to disseminate scientific farming methods to enhance the yields and profitability of farming in Ohio. Educational reforms, therefore, were by no means contained in schools and to children: they proceeded along with the broader reforms in farming and farming practices.

With the help of the Extensions, the Club experimental work started including more elaborate projects to further pursue scientific farming. The contents of the Club work was organized around the issues that the University Extensions saw as the important tasks to be overcome in the existing methods of farming.

For example, dissemination of the use of lime was on the top agenda for the University Extension, and for this reason, the Extension was spending great efforts to teach farmers the procedures of soil testing. The 4-H Club tested soils of their family farms for acid and alkali, using litmus paper, and recorded the result with samples of the litmus papers on the soil conditions of their family farm. This experiment was carried out in parallel with the Extension outreach to educate adult farmers of the procedure to test the acidity of the soil, and collect the results from them to determine the condition of the entire township.

---

[35] *Rural School Agriculture*, 1903, p.5

The Extension also provided the Club with seeds of new varieties of corn to plant two shocks of them, in order to compare the result with the old varieties. With the aids from the Extension, the "experimental" method of learning agriculture was furthered. The teacher instructed children how to count the rows, and plant the corn in an appropriate method so that when the shocks of corn were cut, they will stand in the row with other corns to be compared, rather than using a marker on the field.[36]

With the supervision of the University Extensions, the Club became systematic in its organization too. In order that "pupils will take pride in feeling that they are members"[37] as well as the University could keep up with the development of Club work, each branch was named and the full list of members with their address and the kinds of plants they were growing in the year was to be kept by the Extension.

The strong connection between the 4-H Clubs and the Extension became definite after Graham himself moved to the Ohio State University Extension as the Director in 1906. By that time, the 4-H Club had spread across the State of Ohio, and had 1,036 members.

Remaking Agriculture in the 4-H Club: Farming Made Scientific

The main theme of the Club activity was the recording of farming procedures. Students in the Club when growing corn or vegetable on a patch of their own family farm were given blank sheets of paper to keep records and write down their observations on

---

[36] *Agricultural Clubs in Rural Schools*, p.6

[37] *Agricultural Clubs in Rural Schools*, p.4

the growth of the plants. When growing corn, students recorded on two separate varieties of corn to compare. They recorded the dates of plowing, planting, days for it to grow the first stalk, when it was hoed, numbers of stalks with ears and no ears, etc. (see Appendix 1). The blank sheet had an elaborate instruction on how to plant the corn. It specified the size of land where the seeds were to be planted, how to mark them from other corns on the same field, and in how many hills they should be planted. For vegetable and flower growing, children were given blanks of the similar format to keep track of their garden project.

Graham regarded record keeping as an important part of club activity. He asked students to mail in their logs for his review, even after transferring to the University Extension as the supervisor. The initial emphasis of the 4-H Clubs on the recording of one's own farming practice remained as the most important feature of the club activities even after the club organization expanded. Even at the agricultural competitions and contests which I will discuss further in the following chapter, the recording of farming processes remained as an essential part of the evaluation criteria. The recording and tabulation of farming processes were not limited to children's education, however. Farming analytically and methodically was regarded as the core of scientific agriculture, for adult farmers in the University Extension courses.

The tabulation of farming was not done only for the sake of recording. It was a tool for students to observe why certain tasks were necessary to improve yields. Graham particularly encouraged students to ask the reasons for farming procedures, such as "why is the ground plowed?" and "why is it plowed?" to which students answered "because if you put just manure on the field and plow it under that is so that it makes the stuff grow

larger and makes the ground richer in time.[38]" Students answered these questions and wrote back their answers to Graham. Some students were prompted to come up with questions that arose while trying out farming: "Why are certain seeds are simply being sowed on the ground and the dirt stirred?"[39]

Scientific agriculture that the 4-H Club advanced in collaboration with the University Extension also encouraged children as well as adult farmers to observe the connection between the objective conditions in which they grew plants, such as the acidity of soil, temperature, and the use of the land in the previous year and the quality of plants they get. These items of questions were always included on the garden records that children kept, as well as on the farm records that the Extensions encouraged adult farmers to keep.

By situating the "why" questions of farming in the core of 4-H activities, Graham contrasted the existing way of farming to scientific agriculture. He argues that just being able to execute procedures of growing crops does not count as "knowing" how to farm. He discounted the embodied and unspoken type of knowledge of farming as illegitimate. Graham criticizes, "Most people in their adult life think in terms of things just as they did in child life. Their difficulty is to think in terms of the conditions which led to the production of the thing and the relation of these things to each other."[40]

---

[38] *Rural School Agriculture*, 1903, and the letters of correspondence between Graham and 4-H members.

[39] From letters of correspondence between Graham and 4-H Club members. This question is raised by a boy in Republic 4-H branch, Ohio written in 1907.

[40] Graham Papers;40-8-1-1, p.9

Graham disqualified the traditional form of farming for two reasons. First, in the existing method of farming, the farmer did not have conscious projection of the consequence of individual work. Second, the farmer did not reflect on the causal relationship between different tasks and the resulting yields. The tabulation of the cultivation process in the 4-H Club was an attempt to reconstitute the formerly implicit and embodied form of farming.

This was not a sole effort by the 4-H Club, but also a point of reform for adult farmers too. The *Agricultural Student* criticizes the "old" model of thinking in a similar manner.

> Many farmers consider their business as a rather uncertain thing…if the weather doesn't 'happen' to be unfavorable, if the seed 'happens' to be good seed, and the ground 'happens' to be fertile, and if all the other factors bearing upon wheat production 'happens' to be favorable, they consider their seasons' work lucky and are content to be glad that one or more of the things that prevent profitable yields did not 'happen' to enter into the matter"[41]

The common theme of scientific farming was that reliance on contingency as a determining factor of the outcome of farming had to be replaced by a projected link between the result of action and conditions which led to the particular consequence.

These features of early activities of the 4-H, therefore, put the entire procedures of farming in a projected connection in which one task had temporal and functional relations not only to the following task but also to the entire practice of growing one crop—the yields and quality of harvest. The point of the educational reform, then, lay in the debunking of farming as an embodied practice, and reconstituting it as an undertaking

---

[41] *Agricultural Student*, 1917, May.

with a specified and clear relation between each components and the entire practice of farming.

Schema of Practice in Scientific Agriculture

The stress placed on the "why's" of farming in the 4-H clubs may look as if the reform promoted the idea of the farmer *consciously* choosing one's conduct anticipating specific results of that conduct in the future. Reorganization of one's action based on intentionality, indeed, has been the interpretation of the research on pragmatism; that the social impact of pragmatism was the creation of the purposeful agent who makes rational choice of action in the world filled with contingency (Popkewitz, 2005: 24).

Reducing pragmatism to an agenda to create space for intention in action, which is conceptualized as a "particular historic invention of one who plans and orders action in a rational way to bring about progress in a world of uncertainty" (Popkewitz, 2005: 5) ignores the core argument of pragmatism's ambivalence toward the role of consciousness in social action. This notion of rational action assumes that the criteria for "modern" action, allegedly proposed by pragmatism, lies in the property of the actor, which in this case is the capacity to design and foresee, in temporal axis, the origin and consequence of one's action.[42]

---

[42] The problem of this view is that it ignores the original criticism with which the very project of American pragmatism was initiated, i.e. pragmatic critique of the Kantian notion of the subject of knowledge, who grasps the world through the bi-dimensional axes of time and space. For example, Dewey, "Experience of Knowing" criticizes the assumption of psychology that "the organ or instrument of knowledge is not a natural object but some ready-made state of mind or consciousness, something purely "subjective." (187)

It is also false that farming before the 4-H Clubs and scientific farming had no methods to reflect on farming procedures. Although it is hard to know how farmers perceived farming before rural reforms due to the scarcity of documents farmers themselves left, we can estimate from the report of the Board of Agriculture on harvest and crop in the late nineteenth century. These documents show that some kind of analytical examination of farming practice is not necessarily a new feature introduced for the first time by the 4-H Clubs. For example, in 1870, the cost analysis of farm management by the State Department of Agriculture in Ohio breaks down farming into items such as breaking up, harrowing, furrowing, and planting and harvesting. This table also shows the typical cost of labor expended on each individual task. The fact that such a system existed to organize farming procedures shows that the compartmentalization of practice itself was not the novelty of scientific farming that the 4-H Club and Extensions propagated.

What was new in scientific agriculture, then? The point of the reform lay in the synthesis between farming as physical work and farming as an analytical endeavor, to elevate farming into a different terrain of practice from "mindless drudgery."

> "Agriculture is a synthetic process, a producing process, and not merely analytic…the boy who produced 154 bushels of corn on an acre may not have known all the modern theories but he produced the corn. A man may be theory conversant with the theoretical side of agriculture, but we are not satisfied until we know the extent of his yield of corn."[43]

Graham also contends that making farming analytical redefines agriculture from drudgery to labor. He argues that "the pleasure that comes from overcoming difficulties

---

[43] *Agriculture Student*, 23(1) 1916.

and in seeing long looked-for result must be in the mind of the laborer." Otherwise, farming "becomes drudgery."[44]

Scientific farming, therefore, was more than just a standardization and rationalization of farming practice. Rather, it was an attempt to reconstitute the organizational principles of farming practice and farmers' perception about it, and consequently, what farming meant to the farmer as daily practice.

Making Farming a "Holistic" Practice: Construction of the Experiential Farmer through Pragmatism

Remaking of farming from mere drudgery at mercy of contingencies to analytical work to pursue favorable consequences which requires expertise called for reorganizing the constituting principles that made up farming practice. This reconstitution involved the construction of the site of "whole experience" and the "experiencing subject" as the kernel of the scientific farmer.

This means that the criteria for an experiencing farmer, despite what scholars of pragmatism would argue, does not require refined rational consciousness as its component. Scientific farming was neither mere systematization of farming process, nor the articulation of procedures to shed off the traditional implicitness of farming knowledge. Rather, the criteria for the farmer who practiced scientific farming centered on how components of practice were laid out in a particular relationship to the whole of practice. In the practice thus defined, the farmer threads together the fragments of

---

[44] *Report of Springfield Township Schools*, 1904, 1904.

activities to constitute farming as a holistic and coherent practice. Farming thus carried out, becomes *labor*, not a drudgery.

In order to achieve this reconstitution, the 4-H Club, in particular, turned to the language of pragmatism and pragmatic educational theory. Graham did not necessarily point to specific sources of pragmatists to develop his own principles of the 4-H Clubs. However, his tone of argument clearly reflects John Dewey's theory of action. As long as I can observe the connection within discourses between the 4-H Club principles and pragmatism, the lack of direct reference and personal connection between Dewey and Graham is not important. In this section and the following, I will use Dewey's ideas as indexes of the 4-H Club's attempt to reform farming through the category of experience to refine my definition of the "schema of practice" that scientific farming cultivated.

The 4-H Club activities put in contrast two different ways to grasp the quality of activities; undefined, unclarified "doing" which is a mere activity, versus the definite "experience" which entailed continuity between fragments of activities. Dewey, *Experience and Education* argues right to this point: "The principle of continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which comes after." (p.27)

The contrast between mere "activities" and "experience" was not patented to the 4-H Club but also a core principle of scientific farming. Let us examine another excerpt from *Agricultural Student,* a popular medium of scientific agriculture published by the University Extensions. The author of this article argues that scientific agriculture is based on scientific experiments, which is "an experience that could be put in pedagogic form and used as a basis of instruction":

> The days are rapidly passing when important and valuable interests in live stock and investments may be entrusted to men whose only qualification is experience under the direction of owners. The farmers are now calling for men of education, and of sound judgment, of integrity of character and of adaptation to the work of productive farming.[45]

The author contrasts the two types of "experiences" and evaluates which type of experience is more conducive to the scientific practice of farming. The "old" experience is what a farmer would "accumulate" in his daily work. In informal apprenticeship, or learning to farm from his father, a farmer would store this kind of unspecified experience. On the other hand, the new type of experience, which the rural reformers argued would be the foundation of scientific agriculture, has distinct qualities: it has to be carefully cultivated by means of education, and above all, this kind of experience is nurturing of the character of the farmer himself too.

Farming as a Pragmatic Experience: Coordinated Parts and Whole

How reformers delineated these distinct qualities resonates with exactly what Dewey expressed in his contrast between valid and invalid experience—whether pieces of activities are connected with one another as a meaningful whole. Although it is often misinterpreted, Dewey's theory of pedagogy does not honor just any human activities. "Mere activity does not constitute experience" Dewey argues:

> [mere activity] is dispersive, centrifugal, dissipating. Experience as trying involves change, but change is meaningless transition unless it is consciously connected with the return wave of consequences which flow from it.[46]

---

[45] *Agriculture Student* (1911) vol.18 n.1

[46] Dewey, (1916) p.495

Dewey argues that, for an activity to constitute a valid experience, it has to have two characteristics: 1) The activity has to lead to more varieties of actions, and 2) it has to occupy a place in the "holistic" and "coherent" whole practice as opposed to an isolated piece of activity. Dewey writes:

> A piece of work is finished in a way satisfactory; a problem receives its solution; a game is played through; a situation, whether that of eating a meal, playing a game of chess, carrying on a conversation, writing a book, or taking part in a political campaign, is rounded out that its close is a consummation and not a cessation. Such an experience is a whole and carries with it its individualizing quality and self-sufficiency. It is *an* experience.[47]

Dewey defines experience as a chain of activities in which any partial activity leads to the commencement of a following piece of activity. Probably the best example to illuminate this point is the "reflex circle" model by Dewey. The "reflex circle" model is a criticism of the traditional psyschological model of action. The traditional psychological model, which renders the learner as the "thinking subject" would portray learning in terms of a stimulus triggering a response; for example, when a child learns that flame is hot, the child touches the flame, and the stimulus of the burning flame transmitted to the nervous system triggers the motor response of the child who retrieves his hand at the burning sensation.

The "arc" model takes the nature of experience as linear, consisted of a completed sequence of stimulus-perception-motor reaction. Dewey's criticizes that this model regards stimulus and respons as two discrete and hierarchical entities where motor movement is subjugated as a consequence of perceived stimulus. This model captures experience of the child as a mere reaction to stimulus, and his action itself does not carry

---

[47] Dewey, *Art and Experience.*

any active meaning in the learning process. Dewey's point is that describing the entire occurance as composed of two separate stages is an artificial fabrication of psychology [48]," which portrays the learning process as "mechanical conjoining of disjointed parts."[49]

As a criterion for a "valid" experience, Dewey instead proposes the organic "coordination" between what is described as stimuli and responses in reflex arc: stimulus and response constitute mutual reference for each to be meaningful in the full range of action of "touching the flame and learning flame is hot."[50] Dewey argues that the meaning of stimulus (seeing the flame and the child gets curious) cannot be determined without its relation to the response that follows it (touching the flame), and the consequence of this sequence (the child learns that flame is hot). What exists between touching the burning flame and retrieving of the hand should not be understood as a one-directional causality between stimulation of sensory nerves and glandular movement, but the relationship among these seemingly discreet phrases should be consolidated in its holisticity of the entire sequence—this, Dewey calls "rounded experience." The act of

---

[48] Dewey's critique of psychology resonates with but precedes the current development of Sociology of Culture, such as "General Linear Reality" (1988), Abbott's critique on explanations of causality in social science. Abbot argues that the assumptions regarding temporality and causality are build-in elements of the general properties of sociological reasoning. "General Linear Reality" is a notion that shows that causality is a synonym for the abstracted relationship among the variables of entities, when the relationship among them is a theoretical construct. Dewey's critique traces the same route in which psychology abstracts generalized causality between stimulus and action, when one-vector causality is actually a construct.

[49] Dewey, *Reflex Arc*, in McDermott, p.137.

[50] Ibid. p.145

touching the flame does not constitute an "experience" unless the movement of sticking his finger into the flame is connected to the learning progressing—in the child, namely, the realization that flame is hot.[51] If the agent does not get any meaningful reflection as her engagement in the sequence, it is only a mechanical, linear activity.

Note that the criterion of experience does not depend on whether activity has a-priori moral values or even functional meanings. Dewey's standard for a "rounded" experience is solely based on the formal continuity in which each individual piece of action obtains meaning in relation to actions before and after. Individual activity does not have any a-priori meaning, but only when it is contextualized in the holistic chain of experience.

By redefining farming practice as a projected cycle of activity and consequence, scientific agriculture attempted to reorganize farming according to the criteria of "rounded experience." Scientific agriculture that the 4-H Clubs and the University Extensions advocated proposed to make farming a "rounded experience" for farmers by placing each procedure and task in farming in the entire process of cultivation, where one task had procedural connection from previous work and to the following. Farming as experience makes the farmer learn to organize farm work as a holistic chain of action. This way, scientific agriculture made farming a "complete cycle of activity,"[52] elevating farming to the level of "an experience."

---

[51] *Experience and Thinking*, Dewey, 1916.

[52] This view of activity as a whole cycle of planning, implementation and evaluation was a common argument in numerous reformative curriculum ideas, including "Project Teaching," another stream of

Farming as a site of "whole and rounded" experience means that the introduction of scientific agriculture made farmers perceive their own action in a different way from they had used before. Let me quote a report by farmers in Ashtabula County stating the state of farms in 1856, fifty years before the advent of scientific agriculture:

> Gentlemen---my corn is the second crop of corn on the same ground. About eight years ago the timber was chopped down, in 1854 was burnt over, plowed in the spring of 1855, and planted in corn. Had a large crop. This spring plowed once, twice harrowed, planted May 15th, in hills two feet right inches apart; four stalks in a hill. Seed all grew. I would here remark that the seed corn was picked when fully ripe, and laid on the floor over the kitchen fire. Some of the same corn was put in the crib out of doors. Not any of it would grow. Some of it was brought from the crib in the middle of winter, and out over the fire. About one-third of that would not grow. I am more particular about the seed corn, because, six years ago, our seed corn froze, and we planted miserably poor corn. My corn that I raise now, is the red-cobbed yellow dent.[53]

The structure of this statement is governed by simple progression of temporal linearity, rather than a clarified, analytical relationship between the connection between each procedure and the outcome of those procedures that this farmer applied to his farm. How he proceeds with the applications of work to his farm is mostly organized by a temporal grid, rather than the functionality of each procedure vis-à-vis its outcome.

This mode of presenting one's practice of farming is very different from that which is more dominated by the meaningful succession and connections among pieces of action. The following rather lengthy text shows a way to calculate cost of farm labor in 1907, which was informed by scientific agriculture;

---

pragmatic educational ideas proposed by Kilpatrick in the teaching of science (Kilpatrick, 1917). Project Teaching was intended to be a method to teach agriculture in rural schools, but as obvious in the account of the 4-H clubs so far, the 4-H clubs had already preceded its idea.

[53] *Annual Report of the Board of Agriculture* (1856).

> First, let us consider for a moment the 'average farmer.' He grows in Ohio 34 bushels of corn to the acre. At an average price of 30 cents per bushel that brings him about $10.00 per acre….Let's see what he has done. To plow an acre of land his horses must walk about 2560 rods. ..To harrow that land slightly, 820 rods. To drag 320 rods. To plant, say 400 rods. To cultivate five times 400 rods. Footing up we find that to grow his acre of corn, with 34 average bushels he has made his team travel about 7100 rods. Footing up we find that to grow his acre of corn with 34 average bushels he has made his team travel about 7100 rods….This is a little more than 22 miles of team travel to grow an acre of corn. To grow a bushel, then the team must travel .647 of a mile. Now the factor of cost of operating a team must be considered; it varies, of course, but one cannot hire teams for less than $2.50 per day, and a team will walk about 20 miles a day in farm labor. That makes the team cost per mile 12.5 cents. So to grow that bushel of corn has cost on team work 8 cents. To husk it now costs from 4 cents up. To haul it to market at least 2 cents. So here we have a cost of 12 cents per bushel to produce and market a bushel of corn. But that apparently leaves 16 cents per bushel as pure profit. Let's see about that. The land is valued at $50 per acre. Really, there is hardly any land capable of growing 34 bushels of corn per acre that can be bought for that sum but put it at that sum. Eight percent interest on $50 is $4 per acre, or 14 cents per bushel more. That brings the cost of producing the bushel of corn up to 28 cents.[54]

The above text shows the kernel of scientific farming that dissected the practice of farming into specific activities, calculating cost of each procedure based on the meticulous counting of the number of rods taken in harrowing, dragging, planting and cultivating. The total number of rods needed to raise one acre of corn are added up to get the distance the team of horse and man have to travel to apply all the procedures. The cost of hiring a team and the distance it typically travels gives the cost *per distance* that the team travels. Cost per bushel is thus finally obtained as the factor of the distance a team has traveled to produce the amount of corn.

The reconfiguration of farming as a practice that makes meaningful connection between fragments and whole was also applied to the organization of a single activity. Take the selection of seed corn as an example. Because corn was a money crop, educating farmers how to select good seed corns for the coming year was of crucial

---

[54] *Agricultural Student* 1907 14(3)

importance for the University Extension. The 4-H Clubs as well as farming courses for adults at the University Extension regarded teaching of selection of seed corn an urgent task.

The Extension bulletin published for the 4-H Clubs drew attention of readers to the importance of observing the whole plant of corn, while paying particular attention to crucial characteristics of the corn in selecting good seed corns. [55] The textbook instructs that a careful observer should pay balanced attention to the condition of the *whole* corn plant as the unit of observation, while paying elaborate attention to how the details of the plant make up the quality of the whole plants of corn, such as the kernel, seeds, and the arrangement of rows of kernels. The extension, in order to disseminate this practice, distributed a table of items that helped farmers should have been heeding attention to when evaluating corn, such as the shapes of individual kernels, uniformity of the rows, arrangement of rows, husks, the height of the plant and how leaves are attached to it.

The delineation of the specified characteristics of corn plant from which the farmer could infer about the quality of seed corns, and the quality of harvest in the following year, points to the reconstitution of farming practice based on the same principle; the components of action are put in a mutually-referring relationship with the comprehensive task that the farmer is trying to achieve.

---

[55] *Extension bulletin*, 1907, II(7)

Motor Mind or Use of Hands: "Thinking is Action"

Another conspicuous aspect in the 4-H Club activities was the strong emphasis on the use of hands in the learning process. When the 4-H Club advanced agricultural education, it meant actual work using hands, not a "textbook agriculture." Graham stressed the educational value of actual farm work as well as household work such as baking, food preservation, and sewing. Graham argues, "not only must provisions be made for the three R's but for the three H's as well,"[56]—for Head, Heart, and Hand.

Graham advocates that education should be centered on the use of body in order to mend the fundamental defect of the existing education based on recitation and memorization. He believed that the mind-centered education did not fit the way human naturally mind worked:

> A predominant characteristic of many minds is the inability to think clearly without actually taking part in the performance of a piece of work through the use of some part of the body, usually the hand. This type may be called "motor mind" and "can be reached most successfully through demonstration teaching in which these persons take part. [57]

Here Graham presents his belief on the alternative principle of learning that involved hand-action—activities using hands is situated as the main venue of learning, and only activities activate the working of mind, not the other way around.

The emphasis on hand work in the learning process was indispensable for the 4-H Clubs to legitimize the direction the reform was taking in order to avoid criticism that agricultural education was narrow vocational practical training. For this reason, the 4-H

---

[56] *Report of Springfield Township Schools,* 1904, p.38

[57] Papers;40-8-1-1, p.9

Club had to design agricultural education that cultivated a whole new idea of the learner, more than just teaching updated technology of farming. Graham writes:

> We are told to begin with the elements. These are assumed to be the single beginnings, from the teachers' point of view. But the elements with which most books begin, are far from being simple. They are really the final results of a process of abstraction; they are the end rather than the beginning of knowledge (underline in original). The chemical text-book takes elements before compounds. The [new] teacher will reverse the order and take the compounds first. He will not begin with atoms and molecules or even with oxygen or hydrogen, but with the air we breathe or the water we drink. Or even with more compound substance than these…The old method of teaching nearly everything was to introduce the pupil the formula (deductions), the symbol, the law, and the chances were that he rarely got beyond these or came back from them to reality of which they were the beggarly elements.[58]

According to Graham, there are two implications of the existing model of learning about the property of the learner. First, the individual as a learner is supposed to gain access to knowledge through abstracted frames, such as laws and formulas. In such pedagogy, the relationship between the abstract is given as the frame of comprehension which is transplanted in the child to understand the concrete. Second, the faculty of comprehending the abstract principles, and the external world are separated—abstraction of the world by law and formulas objectifies the world as the object of knowing, which makes the relationship between the learner and the world alienating and static.

The 4-H Club attempted to displace the abstract with the concrete in pedagogic elements, not only as the venue of learning but also as the goal of education. The concrete element of learning, or activities are no longer seen as a ladder to the abstract. Nurturing

[58] A.B. Graham Papers, 1902 40-8-3-3, "On the teaching to think."

the individual who acts out the concrete, experienced chain of activities—to obtain the "rounded experience" itself—becomes the aim of learning.[59]

Graham argues: "In teaching, as in life, we must always be passing from the concrete to the abstract, and back and forth the intricate web of experience, and the concrete and abstract are closely interwoven like warp and woof." [60] I would like to emphasize that the relationship between the concrete and abstract observed in the pedagogic principle of the 4-H Club is not anymore that of linearity in which the abstract is reached by means of concrete activities. Graham here portrays the leaning process as constituted by "warp and woof" of the particular and the abstract, which are woven together by the learner. A rounded experience now is the goal of learning in itself, where the learner makes incessant trips between the abstract laws and the concreteness in everyday life. Experience of the learner is envisioned as the very site in which one makes the synthesis between the discrepancy between the concrete and the abstract.[61]

---

[59] It is interesting that Graham seems to reserve the notion of consciousness as the "other" of action. Pragmatism as a social thought, was not as radical as to eradicate all sorts of consciousness, but rather it permitted consciousness as manifesting in action, rather than as an a-priori faculty of the subject. It is important to note here that the stress on action as an expressive vehicle of thinking results in preserving consciousness as a product of action.

[60] A. B. Graham Papers, 1902 40-8-3-3 "On teaching to think" p.4

[61] There was an unforeseen consequence of this new vision of subject, however. When Graham argues that the abstract has to be interwoven together with the concrete in order to create the subject of learning, the experience, the self-reflexive action became the "wholeness" that learning should be directed at achieving. When put in the inverted vector of learning from the concrete to the abstract, however, there is a movement

This leads to the most radical statement by Graham as to the goal of education:

> One common mistake is to treat thinking as memory as a peculiar and mysterious power different from our other activities to be trained apart as it is supposed to exist apart. We may distinguish men of action from men of thought, but that distinction refers to a difference in the manner of life men lead, and not to the fact that one man thinks and the other does not. Thinking is action, always action. (underlined in original). All conscious life is activity.[62]

This is a more radical statement than it seems. Graham advances the idea that action is where the individual expresses the kernel of his or her subjectivity. He redefines the goal of education from the cultivation of the ability to think abstractly and logically, to nurturing of the subject of action.

Goals of the 4-H Clubs and scientific farming tried to redefine the very principle of learning and the learner from the "thinking" model to the "action" model. However, it is not that any action counts—the aim of agricultural education lay in the cultivation of good actors in everyday farming. Graham and advocates of scientific farming rendered farming, which in itself the site of activity and physical work, a site of manifesting subjectivity of the farmer—improvement of action is the object of education and learning.

Experience as a criterion of the Subject

Three elements emerged in the radical reformulation of practice emerging in the 4-H Club and scientific farming. First, the 4-H Club recreated the farming site into the

---

in which the agent who weaves together the pieces of concrete reality that he faces itself becomes the "abstract." What Graham imagines as the end-goal of learning is the agent of action, who is capable of "self-activity." This point will be elaborated further in the following chapter.

[62] A.B. Graham Papers, 40-8-3-3

site in which the farmer could obtain "rounded" experience. Scientific farming and the 4-H Club, through the garden projects as well as dissemination of modern farming methods, delineated the relationship between the whole [the practice of farming] and parts [individual procedures] that comprised farming practice. In scientific farming, knowing how to farm meant that the farmer project connections among pieces of activities as well as to the result that derived from them. Second, by this redefinition of farming, farming became a new type of practice. It was no more a mere activity, or "drudgery," but it itself became a positive educational site, a site of improvement and efforts.

The combination of these two conditions set a ground for the third element of scientific farming. Farm work was endowed with a new meaning—as a venue in which the subjectivity of the farmer was constructed through action. Scientific farming had a wider potential than merely being a technical agricultural reform because it displaced the abstracted notion of the subject with pre-fixed faculty to interpret the world with the notion of subject who "acts out" his subjectivity in physical activities.

This reconstitution of the subject to an "active subject" also meant to situate the creation venue of the subject in the immediate environment of everyday work. Dewey argues:

> In reality, the environment is just as much comprised within behavior as are organic processes…To describe the action of a part of the nervous system, or of the entire nervous system, or of the entire organism in isolation from the environment included within behavior is like thinking that we can understand a machine, say a loom, if we omit the material the yarn, upon which it works and the transformation of the material into cloth wrought in the operation.[63]

---

[63] "Body and Mind" in philosophy and civilization, p.311-12

The 4-H Club also advocated that the immediate, the most accessible environment of physical work was the site of education. By challenging the linear hierarchy between whole/part and abstract/concrete, and making the subject of action, not the subject of thinking, as the goal of agricultural education, the 4-H Clubs made farming activity the site where the farmer could cultivate and manifest his subjectivity through the involvement in the hand-labor within the concrete and immediate quotidian environment.

In the 4-H Clubs, making farming the site of “rounded experience” made it a potentially powerful device of changes in multiple spheres in rural communities. Making the subject (of learning) through experience in activities in one’s immediate environment such as the farm and the household, is widely applicable to everybody—even to the very young members of rural society. As I will argue in depth in the following chapter, the principles of the 4-H Clubs had a significant consequence in making the experiential subject the productive part of the nation-state system.

Chapter 4: “Corn Growers Go to the War”: Pragmatic Mobilization of Ohio Farmers in World War I

This chapter analyzes the transformation of how farmers perceived and carried out farming through the schema of practice advanced by the 4-H Club and scientific agriculture. As I delineated in the previous chapter, 3 elements were entailed in the new schema of practice scientific agriculture: 1) farming is a rounded experience in which fragments of activities are connected meaningfully to each other to form holistic practice, 2) farming is a site of education, where coordination of fragments of activities should be improved and trained, and 3) physical work became a site of expertise, through which one proved the quality as the actor. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate the political consequence of such a schema by showing how the practice of scientific farming became a cultural infrastructure for the participation of farmers in the State agenda during World War I in Ohio. I will demonstrate that the pragmatic construction of everyday agricultural work as the site of realization of self-worth of the farmer was indispensable in making farming as an expressive action of nationalistic participation of farmers.

In arguing that pragmatism prepared a schema of practice that led to the collaboration with the State in action, I intend to present an alternative argument to the Weberian theory of action. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Weber argues that the desire for redemption *turned into* a certain economic conduct in this world. Weber shows how ideas and desires for redemption correlated with certain capitalistic practice. I argue the opposite—conduct that looks as if driven by sublime

values is actually driven by a schema of action according to which social action is designed and executed. Pragmatism redefined the schema with which farmers conducted everyday farming, which laid the schematic infrastructure to make farmers act patriotically. The implication of this argument is that ideas (such as “love for country”) do not have to be internalized to cause action, as long as people practice the schema of action that resembles the nationalistic conduct model. As long as people “do” nationalism, whether or not they really believe in the nation-state or patriotism is a superfluous question.

The organizational development of the 4-H clubs and educational discourses of scientific farming reached its climax with the advent of World War I. The development up until mid-1915 seems like the prelude to the integration of farmers into the urbanizing nation-state as productive and contributing members of society.

This meant most and foremost increasing crop yields. Agricultural organizations in Ohio responded to the pressing state agenda to increase the food supply for growing urban populations. Farmers’ Institute in Ohio, for example, was pressed to persuade farmers that maintaining soil fertility was essential in order to sustain the population of the country, because crop yield was not increasing in proportion to the population growth.

As far as this project is concerned, however, whether farmers indeed became more productive and better yielding by following the scientific farming, however, is not as important as whether farming became a practical venue of acting like a “good farmer.” Indeed, statistics in 1912 show that the increase in crop yields since the last decade of the

nineteenth century had been 1% while population growth was 47%.[1] Also, according to the official statement appearing in *Ohio Farmer*, the total yield of corn in Ohio in 1917 was 115,762,000 bushels, compared to 70,637,140 bushels in 1860.[2] It is difficult to determine whether the increase of 60% indeed means significantly enhanced productivity or not, but here my question focuses on the different form of engagement in the farming practice, not necessarily the resulting yields. In other words, if farmers changed their perception of farm work to consider it as a site of pursuing productivity, and of proving one's worth, it was enough to make a significant change regardless of the actual yield increase appearing in numbers.

Another item on the agenda of the State along with the increased production of foodstuff to be sent to the war front, and particularly increase the yields of certain "war crops," organizing rural communities as part of the state system emerged as an important issue. In fact, building the sense of belonging to the State among farmers through the scientific schema of farming practice was more consequential than the actual increase in yield; World War I marks the completion of the centralization of rural organizations. County Agents, dispatched from the Extension to better disseminate information and technology of farming among farmers were assigned in most counties in Ohio by 1916, and they supervised the 4-H club activities to better coordinate with the Agricultural Policies of the federal and State government.

---

[1] *Ravenna Republican* Dec. 5, 1912

[2] *Ohio Farmer*, 1917, April 26, p.4

Not only in their structure but also in their activities, 4-H Clubs came to be more synchronized with the image of the ideal farmer pursued in the State agenda in the mid-1910. The year 1915 witnessed the zealous popularity of the Corn Growing Contest, both in children's and adult men's divisions. The cult of the "100-bushel Man"—the title of honor given to farmers who were capable of growing more than the average of 100 bushels of corn on an acre—became iconic in rural Ohio. The period immediately preceding World War I was marked by the emergence of the cult of the celebration of output of farming as an individual achievement.

Importantly, the State agencies approached the task of integrating the rural into the entity of the State system by using the logic of education. The ten years preceding World War I are marked with the increasing efforts by various State agencies such as the University Extension, Agricultural College, and County Agents to reach out for rural Americans under the cause of disseminating knowledge and technologies for better farming. Smith-Lever Act in 1914,[3] which gave birth to Cooperative Extension—another

[3] Section.2 of the Act defines, "Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the development of practical applications of research knowledge and giving of instruction and practical demonstrations of existing or improved practices or technologies in agriculture, home economics, and rural energy, and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise and for the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the foregoing; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges or Territory or possession receiving the benefits of this Act."

example of educational agency—succinctly shows that educating the rural population was the pillar of the logic of the reform.

As iconic in the zealous popularity of Corn Contest and Scientific Farming, it seems that rural Americans responded actively to the initiatives of the State, which pursued the improved yields of crops, and more per acre harvest. *Ohio Farmer* newspaper and other publications point to that rural Ohioans were indeed enthusiastically talking about profitable, productive farming methods. It seems like rural Americans, including Ohioan farmers, did try to serve the "agricultural interest of the state" by practicing scientific farming.

This chapter explores why the practicing scientific farming became a venue of nationalistic action. I will point out that scientific farming and the State wartime agenda shared the same schema with which farmers carried out farm work—farming productively and efficiently, and farming as a place for manifesting the quality as a "good farmer."

Patriotic Action—Belief or Practice?

The above question derives from another question: Did farmers act cooperatively with the State agenda because of their increasing patriotism toward the beginning of the war? What was driving their practice when they were growing the "war crops," and trying to maximize their corn yields?

It is common to portray wartime farmers as patriotic farmers, producing for the sake of the country. In the midst of World War I, Ohio newspapers hailed farmers fighting the war on their farms. Headlines reported about farmers "going to the war" by

increasing the production of corn, dairy products, and meat.[4] The following, as titled "service" is a typical example of nationalistic discourse; it appeared on the first page of the Official Bulletin of the Board of Agriculture of Ohio in 1917.

> In a period of national crisis such as this country faces today, it is clearly the duty of every loyal citizen, every state department and every organization of whatever nature to be prepared to render a full measure of service. Love of country should dominate every thought and action, and for the sake of the liberty and freedom which we enjoy and the form of government in which we believe, all forces should be prepared not only to stand for the final triumph of these things, but to aid as well other peoples struggling for similar freedom, privileges and the right to live in peace and happiness. To fight for these principles means sacrifices, heavy burdens, suffering and the loss of life itself. This department has organized the work of its several bureaus in such a manner as to render the agricultural interests of the state the greatest possible amount of assistance in the present emergency. Protection for the farming and food interests forms a large part of its regular duties, and where this service can be applied to the end that food products may be increased and conserved, unusual efforts will be made and less important duties will be somewhat slighted in order to accomplish the greater good.[5]

The language is typical propaganda urging popular mobilization in national emergency. It demanded that farmers should respond to the "agricultural interest of the state" in their daily conduct. The organization of the Agricultural College and Ohio State University Extension also took active measures to respond to this urgent call. The above quote reflects the typical tone of a spiritual mobilization that defines patriotism as action penetrated by "love of country" and is a "duty" of every citizen.

Were farmers, when "serving" the state agricultural interests by increasing their yields, really driven by love for the country? While explicit messages of patriotism and nationalism were certainly rampant in farmers' magazines and newspapers, there seems to be a gap between patriotism propagated in discourse and what farmers were thinking.

---

[4] Nov. 2, 1917 Extension Services

[5] *Official Bulletin* No. 2 1917

Browsing through agricultural publications from the mid-1910's through the end of World War I would give a reader an impression that farmers were concerned about the war and country only when the war had a direct influence on the management and improvement of their farms, such as the labor shortage issue due to the drafting of young men, allocation of excess labor from the city, as well as the changing price of crops.

Another factor that makes it dubious that farmers were driven by "love for county" in collaborating with the state was the scarce reference, if any, to the war in records of farmers' meetings, such as meetings of a local Grange branch. The Grange minutes in Darke County in Ohio from 1916 through 1919, for example, shows no reference to the war situation, except one entry stating that, when asked what members would buy if they had extra money, everyone answered they would buy war bonds.[6] The scarcity of reference to the war situation suggests that the world war and love for the country was by no means the top concern for farmers.[7]

I argue that it was not nationalism and patriotism infused in farmers' head as ideology that pushed farmers to increase yields. By examining the pragmatic reformulation of the schema of practice, I will demonstrate that farmers seem to have responded to the State agricultural demands as a result of acting out the schema of practice that the pragmatic reforms cultivated in disseminating "scientific farming."

---

[6] This entry was in the Grange minutes in Darke County, recorded in May 1917.

[7] This is not because this particular Grange was especially apathetic and indifferent to the war situation; the same Grange was one of the largest branches, which means they were one of the most active Grange branches.

Scientific farming that promoted profitable farming, or bringing he maximum yields per acre, transformed farming in a profitable and competitive way into a site in which farmers demonstrated their self-worth as a productive member of society. Bringing out the maximum yields, as a consequent, coincided with "patriotic" action—regardless of farmers' actual beliefs.

Scientific Agriculture: Profitable Farming as a Site of Devotion

The previous chapter reviewed scientific farming and its general schema of practice as the 4-H Club activities as well as University Extension promoted it as educational discourses. This section of the chapter examines how these elements in scientific farming crystallized in actual farming practice and agricultural reforms in Ohio. This will offer us a vantage point to analyze the transfer of the cultural schema advanced by the pragmatic reforms to their political consequences.

The discourse of scientific farming entailed a wide spectrum of ideas to reform farming, which included two seemingly contradictory directions. The first pillar of scientific farming was embedded in the pragmatic educational reforms. It pursued to transform farming to a social practice which the farmer realized as a "rounded" experience. Rural reformers, in an attempt to render farming a "wholesome" practice, as opposed to mindless drudgery, introduced actor's experience as an essential ingredient for learning.[8] This way, pragmatic reforms constructed farming as a site in which the

---

[8] If we understand alienation as a general condition in modern society where the objectified system of mediation binds (without going through consciousness necessarily) social relations as well as actor's perception of action, then, rural reformers might have had more than one target of their fight fighting, such

farmer would connect himself to a worthy, self-fulfilling practice through his “immediate experience” on the farm.

The second pillar of scientific farming, on the other hand, championed profitability and efficiency of farming, as explicitly observed in the languages such as efficiency of farm labor, cost and profitability in farm management, and likening of farming to wage labor in manufacturing jobs. This aspect is not only pertinent to the fact that scientific farming promoted the introduction of updated agricultural technology such as the use of fertilizers and farm machines to increase yields and decrease cost. Besides the technical advancement, the advocates of scientific farming such as the 4-H clubs and the University Extension contributed a great deal to positing agriculture as a profitable business. Even the 4-H clubs, usually seen as a purely pedagogic organization, was an important vehicle to spread the language of efficiency of labor application and cost analysis. Scientific farming the University Extensions led, especially targeting adult farmers was also a major advocate of profitable farm management.

These two pillars of arguments in scientific farming seem to be based on seemingly discrepant arguments in terms of how they envisioned the farmer and farm work. Whereas the push for profitability involved objectification of value of farm labor expended by the farmer by externalizing its value from the farmer himself, the first element in scientific farming takes farming as the integral constituting element of the identity of the farmer.

---

as the rise of industrial labor, the dwindling significance of the rural and the like. This essentialization of the “rural” is at heart of agrarianism.

The practice of the 4-H Clubs was also marked by this contradiction. The 4-H clubs constructed farm labor as different from modern industrial labor. Agrarian ideal in scientific farming envisioned farming as essentially different from alienating labor in industry, where the laborer sold his labor power for piecemeal work; agriculture was a practice to refuel the "wholeness" of subjectivity of the farmer in the "rounded experience" that pragmatism proposed.

I present the mechanism of farmers' cooperation of the wartime State agenda as a result of the merge between these two potentially opposing visions on farming: profitable farming and achievement of the maximum yields possible from one's farm became a practice in which the farmer made farming as a site to manifest his worth and quality as an actor. Pragmatism therefore was an important vehicle of this translation from a cultural reform to political mobilization, not only in increasing yields, but also in inventing a link in the schema of practice where profitable farming became identical to realizing the wholeness of farm labor.

Productive and Efficient Farming: Two Criteria of Scientific Farming

Scientific farming was a body encompassing a broad range of ideas when it came to agricultural reforms. It emphasized maximization of yields and the improvement of efficiency in farming practice. Its main proponent was the University Extension. The University Extension actively administered various reform measures not only for adult farmers but worked in collaboration with the 4-H clubs both in the timing of reforms as well as the goals of the reforms. Since the founder of the 4-H club, Albert Graham, was invited to serve as the direct of the Ohio State University Extension, the uniformity of the

reform vision between the pragmatic educational reforms and the Extension Services for adult farmers became even clearer.

While measurement of profitability and efficiency comprised the central discourse of scientific farming, this did not mean that farming before the advent of scientific farming was void of any concepts of cost efficiency. In as early as 1855, a report by the Board of Agriculture argued that successful farming consisted of the "proper application of labor and capital, management, and full knowledge of his soil, manure." Also, the late-nineteenth century report of the Board of Agriculture reminds us that American agriculture was not ignorant of the idea of cost and profit. The report contained the calculation of the cost for each individual task in wheat growing, "cost of labor" and the length of time required to pursue each task. It also included the per day cost for plowing, and various measures such as per acre, cost per bushel, and deducted cost and profit analysis.[9]

What was definitely new in scientific farming, however, was the sense of entitlement to the output of the farm, and the efficiency in which farm is managed. *Agricultural Student*, one of the University Extension magazines, declares:

> If you are a careful and painstaking producer, you have a right to expect a proper reward for any superiority inherent in your gain, as compared with that of your neighbor who has produced, either by accident or lax methods, grain inferior to yours. You should receive the premium; he should be subjected to the discount that equitably attaches to the superior and the inferior. The grain dealers of Ohio are working up this idea of equity. It is one of the substantial incentives to better farming and must ultimately be one of the great controlling factors of better and greater production, and increased profits in your farm operations.[10]

---

[9] *Board of Agriculture Report*, 1899

[10] *Agricultural Student*, 1912 no.6.

The link between action and its result, the new schema of farming practice in scientific farming, was translated to promoting attaching the sense of entitlement to the yields.

More concretely, the sense of entitlement led to the emergence of the very idea of "good and bad farmers," as "there are good and bad business men in other lines." Now it was set as the object of scientific farming "to bring the men at the bottom of the list up to the top."[11]

There are multiple levels of criteria according to which results of farming were evaluated. One was the maximization of yields. Scientific farming promoted the cult of the *maximum* yield for farms. Scientific farming contended that farmers should not be contented with mediocre harvest, but should strive for the best possible result from his farm. *Agricultural Student* magazine promoted the maximization of corn yields ion particular:

> Many farmers are producing sixty to seventy-five bushels per acre every year on an average soil and their methods are not by any means as they might be. Some are producing by somewhat improved methods as much as 100 bushels per acre. Many instances have been reported of small areas producing from 150 to 200 bushels per acre.[12]

High yield, however, did not mean expanding the size of the farm but rather meant improving farming methods to increase *per acre* yield. Increase in per acre yield was almost the shibboleth in scientific farming as apparent in the following argument by the University Extension:

> What is scientific farming? In effect it is the making of two grains of wheat grow where one grew before and making the quality of those two grains better and the

---

[11] *Kent Courier*, 1913 July 4.

[12] Agriculture Student, 7, 1906

> relative cost of production less. The difference between scientific farming and ordinary farming is the difference between full years and nubbins, bumper crops and short crops, plenty and poverty, success and failure.[13]

The pursuit of the maximum yield per acre that the land was capable of was chimed by farmers themselves. One farmer, who attended the Extension classes in agriculture at Ohio State University seems to believe that making best use of the farm was the mission that all farmers should have been striving at. This farmer reporting on the Extension course categorized his fellow farmers into three groups with the "progressive class" on the top, implicating that majority of people and communities are not yet "awaken" to the importance of aiming at better yields:

> I think I am safe in saying that in the majority of communities scientific farming is not practiced. By scientific farming I do not mean technical, cranky, text-book rule system of farming, but a thoughtful, sensible, practical knowledge of the elements of the soil—the nature, need and requirements of plant and animal life, and the manipulation of a system of producing and marketing our products in an intelligent way, producing somewhere near what our surroundings are capable of yielding. (1907-AS-vol.14, no.3)

It is not hard to imagine that such demand of the increased per acre yield was coupled with a call to promote increased profitability. Agricultural publications such as the Extension Bulletins and *Agricultural Student* were particularly adamant about this point; "Successful farming does not consist of simply raising large crops or fine animals, but rather in raising the crops which are the most profitable for our conditions and raising the animals which will give largest returns for the feed consumed by our animals."[14] The selection of crops mattered too, "Too many farmers are raising corn and wheat who ought

---

[13] *Board of Agriculture Report,* 1912

[14] *Board of Agriculture*, 1903, p355,

to be growing fruits and vegetables or dairy products." [15] *Ohio Farmer* newspaper also redefines farming as an analytical business enterprise, "in which for the greatest result, a certain equilibrium between acreage in different crops and labor."[16]

Farmers did not so readily accept this call for enhanced profitability in farming. What would look only intuitive to a rational choice theorist, i.e. scientific agriculture tapped into the profit-maximizing intuition of farmers, does not apply here. At the beginning, farmers were indifferent to making tactical moves and changing the ways they had run the farm for the sole purpose of making profits. The *Agricultural Student*, a monthly publication from the Agricultural College in Ohio State University, for example, shows the frustration of reformers, saying that farmers were concerned about higher production and improvement of method, but ignored the "equally important laws that control business."[17]

According to the Extension, it seems that farmers before scientific agriculture had some intuitive readiness to increasing yields but they lacked the sense for profitability and efficiency. For example, while how to calculate profit in farming was a complicated matter for there were quite diverse elements involved in the calculation of farm profit, Ohio dairy farmers were careless about pursuing profit because of their "very simple and ignorant way of calculating profits as [simply] the difference between the cost of feed and

---

[15] *Board of Agriculture*, 1903, p355

[16] The Ohio Farmer, 1917, May 5.

[17] *Agricultural Student*, 1915XXI(6)

the profit of milk."[18] The Extension lamented the inadequacy of the existing calculation method of cost employed by farmers that used only cost of feed in the calculation of profit. The Extension argues farmers did not realize the inadequacy of this method, because many other factors that should be counted as cost are invisible to them as part of cost-expenses relationships.[19]

Here we see contrast between two kinds of farming: farming before scientific farming whose criteria was as simple as the size of yields, and scientific farming that was constituted with far more diverse and detailed elements to judge the quality of farming practice based on profitability. The new schema of practice in scientific farming is resonated here: farming was now reorganized as a mindful practice in which farmers made careful connections among activities to achieve an end result. Scientific farming, in advancing profitable farming, defined the end result in terms of efficiency of practice, quantified as profitability of farming. For this aim, it was essential to disseminate an explicit frame to quantify cost of labor in order to improve efficiency and profitability of farming.

Man Work Day: The Standard of Farm Output and Abstraction of Farm Labor

---

[18] *Agricultural Student*, 14(3) 1907

[19] Yet another reason why profitability was seen as a relatively new concept to farmers was the potential conflict between increase in yields and profitability. More yields might trigger plunging price due to overproduction. In World War I, when increasing the output of wheat and corn became an pressing agenda for the federal government, in effort to encourage farmers to increase yields, the Extension wrote "Increase in yields is possible, and has to be pursued…the yield of corn can be materially and profitably increased." This shows that profitability was not necessarily and naturally concomitant with the increase in yields.

Scientific farming entailed the moment of abstraction of farm work at two different levels: productivity and efficiency, compared to the existing form of farming. One example that speaks to this is the emergence of man work day as a standard of productivity and efficiency. "Man work day" was iconic in that this unit redefined farming as a quantifiable labor, as well as *individualizing* the farmer as the owner of labor power of certain productivity. It also represented the idea of an expected productivity of the "average" farmer in a given region in Ohio.

"Man work day" was constructed as part of the farm management movement administered by the County Agents. More specifically, man work day was a product of the farm survey that was originally administered by the County Agent in Geauga County and was later adopted in other Ohio Counties. This survey was propelled by the idea of the "standard" of the productivity of Ohio farmers, differentiating "successful" farmers from "unsuccessful" one. Targeting at 167 farmers in the County, the survey asked, "Why do some succeed with others fail?… is it possible to analyze the business of a farming community and determine the factors that make for success on the successful farms, and point out the elements of weakness of the unsuccessful ones?"[20]

The surveyors asked questions of each selected farms regarding the amount of capital invested, the size of the farm, types of labor applied, crops grown, number, kind, and quality of livestock. The central aim of the survey was to explicitly define the measurement of profitability, by effectively demonstrating farmers that "larger operations

---

[20] *Geauga Leader*, 1915, Aug 25th

and better arrangement and system of the farm" was the necessary components in order to enhance profitability.[21]

Man work day, by definition, was the number of days needed to take care of an acre of a crop, from plowing to harvest, based on an assumption that the farmer worked for ten hours a day.[22] The Extension survey on man work day, for example, spelled out that when the amount of work done measured in "man work day" was small, the crop acre per man (or the number of cows per man kept in the case of dairy farm) was twice as much smaller compared to the farms where man work day was larger.[23]

The Man work day concept demonstrates succinctly how scientific farming reconstituted farming from the previsouly existing practice of farming. First, "man work day" coined farming as practice of efficiency in activities, and the productivity was a function of it. Man work day was a unit based on one man's output of work from the beginning till harvesting. Therefore, man work day measured the efficiency of how the entire actual practice of farming was carried out. In contrast, the conventional way of calculating labor efficiency had been simply the quantity of output, which was extrinsic from the process of farm work itself, such as the cost of labor per bushel, or cost of labor per acre. These modes of quantifying the farm output were essentially different from the

---

[21] *Geauga Leader* Aug. 4th, 1915.

[22] This means that man work day is a unit of both productivity of the farm per acre as well as the efficiency with which the farm operation was done. This conclusion might look counterintuitive because in man work day, efficiency is not measured only in terms of the speed of the work but it is a combination factor of yield and better management of the procedures.

[23] *Ohio Farmer*, June8 1918

mode of measurement of successful farming by man work day. The existing method of measurement, i.e. per bushel cot or per acre cost of farming had projected the value of farm labor based on the objective condition of production, such as the bushel (bushel of crop) or land (acre), without explicit connections between the laborer himself and the content of farming practice itself. Cost per acre or bushel did not take into consideration the whole process of farm labor, but quantified the expended amount of labor only based on the finished product (per bushel cost) or the external physical context in which labor is applied (per acre cost).[24]

Second, man work day—the abstracted measure of efficiency of practice of farmers—also individualized farmers as owner of labor power of expected productivity. It served two purposes: to evaluate productivity and efficiency of the individual farmer's work on one hand, and to spread the idea of the "standard" of productivity of the farm on the other. The Extension service argued that man work day was an "independent variable" that determined the expected amount of work each farmer should be putting in. [25] Therefore, man work day was set differently from region to region within the State of Ohio, because different regions had unique types of soil and weather that would make the

---

[24] Interestingly, the same article contrasts the concept of man work day in the United States to the equivalent unit for German farmers. The article argues that although German farmers have a good reputation for their large per acre yield compared to American farmers, in the American case, "per man yield is more important than per acre, due to the three times as much land that a typical American farmer cultivates." This contrast shows that per man unit was indeed a preferred and legitimized unit of measuring over per acre measurement.

[25] *Ohio Farmer*, june8 1918

amount of time required to operate the farm from start to finish. The University Extension, based on the survey, set a unique man work day in each region, and accordingly, suggested the amount of acres and livestock that could be realistically kept by a single farmer in order to achieve the ideal man work day. The acreage and number of livestock were considered the "dependent variables" in the determination of the ideal man work day, because these elements have to be adjusted in order to achieve the standard expected man work day in that region.

The farm management survey also used man work day to assess the profitability of different farms, to set the standard of excellence in farming in a given region. The County Agent who administered the survey draw a comparison table among farms with different degrees of success and presented labor income and man work day as in the following example in the Geauga County:[26]

(Table 1) Survey Table Presented by Geauga County Agent

	Mr. A	Average 167	Average 25 better	Mr.B
Labor income	98	346	1662	3224
Working capital	1050	2127	3743	3215
Total acre	27	116	151	240
Crop acres	27	29	58	66
No. of man work day	63	353	506	574

[26] *Geauga County Leader*, Aug. 11 1915

The comparative intention of this table is ubiquitous. The County Agent organized this table and published in the County newspaper with the aim of raising farmers' realization of the large discrepancy existing among farmers in productivity and efficiency. By ranking farmers into different categories—the average, the "better" average, and the worst and the best cases—the farm management survey embodies the practical application of the schema of practice derived from scientific farming—farming became a practice whose quantified consequence in the form of productivity and efficiency signifies the quality of the farmer.

The comparative design of the farm management survey points to the advent of the idea of the farmers as an individual competitor against his fellow farmers as well as the set standard outcome. The principles of the per man productivity was "to give farmers an opportunity to measure their success as individuals in comparison with the standard of their own community,"[27] as well as "to furnish farmers with standards of excellence from among their own neighbors which will enable each of them to see the weakness of their own farm organization and the need of taking steps to strengthen their business where it needs strengthening."[28] The idea of man work day was essential in achieving this effect, as a common unit to show per man productivity. [29]

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] *Cooperative extension report* 1 (4)

[29] The principles of farm management movement included: (1) To show farmers that a well-coordinated farm is the first essential to a good labor income, (2) to point out to farmers how to record and interpret their farming business in order to develop such a well-coordinated farm.

Man work day points to an important moment of *abstraction* of farming as quantifiable "labor." Man work day is a unit based on the number of *days* needed to take care of one acre, based on the *assumption* that he works ten hours a day. Not only that the assumption of ten hours a day is quite detached from the reality of farming—farm labor time per day is not evenly distributed throughout the year—man work day is a unit expressing the productivity based on the assumption of the number of hours spent daily on the farm.

The contract between two methods of calculating labor output illuminates that man work day advanced a more reified notion of farm work, as calculable in terms of time (day/hour). Although it is not clear the County Agents intended it this way, the notion of man work day comes very akin to the principle of wage labor, where the individual laborers are paid by hours, based on the amount of labor that he generates as an individual "seller" of labor power.[30]

Honest Labor: Ownership of Labor and Pragmatic Discourse

Likening of farm work to wage labor was only one aspect of the redefinition of farming by scientific agriculture. The final goal of abstraction of farming lay in elevating farming from mere drudgery to a field of expertise—the making of the professional farmer.

---

[30] This includes such as bringing farm labor conditions as close as possible to wage labor, for example, by setting a fixed wage for farm labor at a reasonable price, and fixing work hour just like a normal working day in a industrial job (*Agricultural Student*, 12(6), 1907 "The Labor question on the farm," and 1912 Ohio Farmer, Jan 13 "Cooperation among farmers"). This was a major tone of argument in making farming competitive against industry wage labor to attract more men in times of labor shortage.

There are two criteria that scientific farming applied to redefine agriculture from drudgery to "occupation." One was to name farming as a field of expertise—the ability of the farmer to reconstruct components of practices into a projected goal of productivity and efficiency. The other component of farming as an occupation was farming as a site of self-fullfilment, and dignity; farming had to be an object of devotion, through the manifestation of expertise in practice.

The 4-H Clubs and the University Extension shared the vision to "dignify farm labor and common things on the farm and in the home." [31] For the 4-H Club, this meant to undermine the "foolish" notion that "if my son can't be anything else he can be a farmer,"[32] and for the University Extension, it meant that "Drudgery is elevated to the place of work by creating interest in knowing nature's laws and by the pleasure which comes from knowing them." [33] When contrasting "drudgery" to dignified "labor," what was meant was "honest labor," as Graham put it:

> The [4-H Clubs] should serve to "dignify [farm labor and homemaking], making it scientific. They should be economic in that they would increase yields and quality as well as lesson losses; some should appeal to the esthetic—an appreciation of the beautiful; they should help to acquire in a small degree the habit of observing and recording; and above all, they should develop the sense of ownership and heighten the evaluation of *honest labor*.[34]

The idea of "honest labor" here, has paradoxical nature, however. Farm work was distinguished from mere "drudgery," by the element of the sense of ownership of his or

---

[31] A. B. Graham Papers 22/0-12-1, one of the six goals of the Agricultural Club.

[32] A.B. Graham Papers: 1905, 40-8-1-18

[33] *Agricultural Student,* 1904 11(1)

[34] A.B. Graham Papers: 1905, 40-8-1-18

her own honest labor.[35] Man work day realized this goal, by introducing a way to evaluate the quality of one's work as an individual in action. At the same time, the other principle of scientific farming alludes to the essentialized concept of ownership of labor—farm labor as the site to act out one's dignity, pride, and integrity.

As apparent in the emergence of quantifying measure of efficiency of farm labor such as man work day, "honest labor" comes with the condition in which labor is objectified as measurable to be evaluated and compared. Scientific farming in the notion of "honest labor" combined the two ideas of the relationship between farm work and the farmer. The farmer constructs himself as the subject of labor, where the integrity of the farmer is achieved in action through his engagement in the "rounded experience," while the quality of his subjectivity itself is objectified in the abstract measures such as man work day.

Scientific farming patched together the two elements of farming smoothly in order to reconstitute farming from drudgery into labor—"honest" labor, to be precise. First, farming became a pursuit of quantifiable result, as opposed to drudgery that did not entail abstracted valuation of outcomes of the practice. In farming as labor, the quality of practice hinged on how good the farmer made the connections among the components of practice to achieve productivity and efficiency. At the same time, farming as labor also meant the fulfillment of the "rounded experience" in practice. In the angegement in activities on the farm, the farmer was to construct the integrity as an actor, to become the

---

[35] A.B. Graham Papers, 1905 40-8-1-18. Graham argues that 4-H club activities should "above all, should develop the sense of ownership and heighten the evaluation of honest labor."

master of practice of farming. Farming as drudgery, in contrast, did not nurture the experience conducive to the quality of the actor as a laborer.

From "Educational" to "Competitive" Agent: The Transformation of the Agricultural Club and the Corn Contest

The conjunction of the two concepts of farming—the farmer as the subject of honest labor, as well as farm labor objectified in its quantified form, found a definite expression in the Corn Contest in the years immediately preceding the centralization of rural America, right before World War I. This section demonstrates how the new schema of practice proposed by scientific farming, through the institutional venue of the Corn Contest, became the basis for mobilization of farmers in practice.

The 4-H Clubs were first launched as an educational organization. Despite their strong inclination to center their activities on farming, their intention was originally first and foremost coined as "educational." Graham, in his retrospective account on the 4-H Club, states that records of farming procedures such as recording of the date of tilling, sowing, and harvesting had a larger importance than the items that concerned economic aspects of farming, such as the selling value of the produce and the amount of profit made out of sale. Graham's recollection on the club activities shows that these economic items were not even included at the nascent stage of the club in the activity log because the features of growth and conditions of weather and soil were supposed to have had a greater educational value than the economic aspect of farming.

The initial conflict Graham discerned between the "educational" values and "economic" aspects in the 4-H Club activities, however, eventually came to be intervened by the dual nature by which scientific farming reconstituted farming. Only three years

after the club was established, Graham himself made a correction to the mission of the club; that 4-H club activities had to be "economic in that they would increase yields and quality as well as lesson losses."[36]It did not take long until farming as defined in scientific farming—profitable farming and increasing yields as the way to manifest the quality of a good farmer—came to become a major defining factor directing the activity of the Club.

The shift of the nature of the Club was most clearly seen in the way of evaluation of the yield. In the early years, the boys in the 4-H brought in their corn they harvested to be individually evaluated for the quality of their corn by a faculty member of the Department of Agriculture of the Ohio State University. There was no explicit structure of competition among members in this process. In the " 'Why's of the first boys' and girls' agricultural club," Graham clearly states that the nature of the club was non-competitive:[37] "The entire plant [of corn] was set up in such a way that the child could select what he desired to do without being tempted by awards or prizes to beat some one

---

[36] A.B. Graham Papers, 1905 40-8-1-18

[37] Admittedly, this idea by Graham had some difficulty to begin with, because the first exhibition of the club work was modeled after Farmers' Institute County Fair, which traditionally had a salient feature of contest. In order for the existence of the club and its output to be recognized publicly, however, the Agricultural Clubs followed the template familiar to the general audience in rural community. Besides, the boys were already acquainted with the Farmers Institute exhibition, which made the transition for the newly established organization smoother.

else. The only one to beat was himself."[38] Graham here sets the normative model of farm labor that it has to come from internal motives as a propelling incentive.[39]

Within a year, however, as the corn exhibition started bearing a more overt structure of a contest, 4-H Clubs started inviting judges who placed contestants in ranks. Graham still maintained his efforts to keep up the desirable ethic that the club was supposed to be cultivating wrote; "The real purpose of the exhibit was not to beat any other members, but to measure exhibitor's product with another. Here is the opportunity for a judge to be worthwhile as a teacher through a fine object lesson."[40]

Graham's efforts to save the club from the heated competition battle, however, were to no avail. Soon, the Boys' and Girl's Corn Growing Contest became the signature event of the 4-H Clubs, one of the most popular events in rural Ohio along with the Agricultural contests in the adult divisions supported and promoted by the University Extension. The Corn Contest hit the height of its popularity in Ohio in the mid 1910's. The "100 bushel Corn Club of Ohio" was organized by adult farmers who were capable of yielding more than the average of 100 bushels per acre. The members of the 100 Bushel Men Club were regarded with a great respect by members of the community.

---

[38] A.B. Graham Papers 22/0-12-1

[39] This initial concept of farming is somewhat in resonance with the idea of "practicism" in Saitama, Japan which I will discuss in the following chapters, although this Graham's idea was not as delineated as in Japanese agricultural reforms. The fact that farming as non-competitive practice was replaced by competitive practice in Ohio shows the point of contrast in the two schemas of practice in two societies.

[40] A.B. Graham papers 40-8-1-16

Winning contestants were glorified with their pictures on the cover page of the Agricultural circulations.[41]

Meanwhile, the Boys and Girls' agricultural contests also grew highly institutionalized and advertised. Prizes for winners grew exponentially big too: a trip to Washington D.C., excursions to Columbus, and cash prize. The way of glorification of winners was very much identical to that in the adult division. A boy who raised 100 bushels in an acre was praised on the front page of newspaper and their secrets of corn growing were introduced in details.

According to the Corn Club Contest Rules,[42] the child and adult divisions shared the common evaluation methods, only with the difference that children competed in one acre while adult men in ten acres. In both groups, contestants competed mostly on per acre yield of corn, but the ratio of labor expenses to the yield was also an important criterion for judgment. In the Boy's division, for instance, the breakdown of points was calculated based on the per acre yield (40 points), cost and profit ratio (30 points), and exhibition (15 points), but also report and story written on the growing processes (15 points)[43]. In both divisions, contestants were required to send a map of his field to the judging committee and to keep a precise record of expenses. A blank to keep this record was supplied, which included the items such as detailed breakdown of labor, not only

---

[41] *Circular* 1917, 3(52)

[42] *Circular* 1917 3(52)

[43] Adult men's division used a similar criteria but without the 30 points for exhibition and story. This could mean that boys' corn clubs still retained educational significance attached to it.

cost, but also the types of labor adopted: whether it was the contestant' own, his family member, horse, or hired labor. Other cost, such as the tax value of land, sources of labor, cost of manure and fertilizer were of course recorded.

A Good Farmer is a Productive Farmer: Transformation of Farming into a Site of Self-Realization

The Corn Contest, and its high popularity is institutional evidence that the specific notion of farming that scientific farming entailed came to be enacted widely among Ohio farmers. The Corn Contest, since it takes the form of competition, evaluated the output of farming as individual achievement. At the same time, contestants strove for the maximum yields by trying the various methods that scientific farming and the 4-H Club recommended as an improved way to structure farming practice. Obtaining the maximum yield by the most efficient methods became a way to express one's worth and quality as a farmer by winning the contest. Ohioans wanted to become "good" farmers, and being a high yielding, highly efficient farmer meant to gain access to the status of the carrier of dignified labor—the glorified 100 Bushel Man, for example. Furthermore, the glorification of winners, and the label such as the 100 Bushel Man testifies that farming was increasingly connected to a form of individual achievement. The honor attached by the community to the members of the 100 Bushel Club means that practicing scientific farming was a frame of recognition that links farming practice to individualized sense of achievement and self-worth.

Corn Growers Go to the War: Corn Growing as Patriotic Action

The development of the Corn Contest vividly shows the process in which the educational agenda of pragmatic reforms to build the rural subject based on the internal

elements that constituted practice of farming—or farming as a whole "experience"—developed into a practice that linked individual achievement based on the externalized results of farming as the index of the worth of the farmer.

The corn contest was indeed a perfect vehicle for the State agency to propagate the need to increase the corn production as a war crop. Just like the label such as the "100 Bushel Man" became an icon of successful farming practice and a successful farmer, having many 100 bushel men would certainly have matched the agricultural agenda of the State to improve the production of food supplies for the coming time of emergency. Indeed, the Corn Contest hit its height of popularity right before the United States entered World War I, and the following organization and centralization of rural America to meet the wartime needs.

It is important to remember, though, that the University Extension did not put efforts in the organization of the Corn Contest to help the Federal needs and to encourage farmers to increase yields of corn. For sure, the "Growing 100 Bushels of Corn to the Acre" that the Board of Agriculture published in 1918, for example, starts out with a patriotic tone, arguing the importance of corn as a war crop and how much increased production would help the nation. However, the article promptly moves on to its main point, the cost per yield problem, which marks a rather sudden disjuncture from the nationalistic language that the article started off with. The main argument of the article is mostly devoted to the argument that the yield per acre has to exceed certain standard in order to reap enough profit. Another typical article in the Department of Agriculture also opens with a patriotic tone. "Now that the war is upon us, it behooves every farmer to increase of what he has to do with," but the author swiftly switches his argument to the

necessity “to raise the greatest possible amount of merchantable food with the least amount of labor” to gain profit.

The strange discontinuity between the two arguments, patriotism and profitable scientific farming, as well as the paradox how snugly they are coexisting in the same body of discourse during wartime, suggest that the form of conduct promoted in scientific farming and Corn Contest was easily transferable to patriotic consequences *in practice*—of increasing yields and running the farm cost-effectively—but not necessarily in the background beliefs. The Corn Contest prepared a channel through which the pursuit of profitable farming and its end result matched the demands of the State.

Does the seeming cooperation of farmers with the State initiatives in increasing yields suggest a coincidental match between the interests of the two parties? Were farmers merely calculating while their primal concern was to maximize one’s profit, and that farmers were collaborating only because when their *interests* happened to have synchronized with that of the State agent?

I do not think the match at the level of practice was primarily due to the coinciding interests. Practicing profitable agriculture and increasing yields was surely a way to participate in the war and “act patriotically” for farmers, because scientific farming provided farmers with a schema of practice through which they could “act out” devotion of the self through increasing field—while bypassing the need to express why they “acted patriotically.” Scientific farming contained a model on the relationship between profitable farming and the worth of the farmer as the agent of the action that was parallel to the language of nationalism—farming, and gaining the best output from one’s

farm is the way to expresses self-worth—one's worth as a good farmer, or one's worth as a good citizen.

Under this schematic condition of practice, everyday practice did not have to be welded to the language of patriotism in any logical ways. As long as the farmer can "do" his nationalism in practice, why does he (or do we) have to worry about his belief? The absence of logical connection at the narrative level does not matter, as long as the two practices are connected in the actual practice of people.

Self-Activity and the Collective: Pragmatic Farmer Makes a Good Citizen and Community Member

Profitable farming reconstituted the concept of the individual worth of the farmer according to the output result of practice, and eventually connected to farmers to patriotism in *action*, but not necessarily in beliefs. The same schema of practice also aided in establishing a new link between rural populations to the larger entity of the nation state.

World War I marks the time when the organization of rural communities and absorption of the rural by the state agencies such as the University Extension was completed. County Agents dispatched by the University Extension were stationed in nearly all Counties in Ohio, except the scarcely populated, mountainous areas in Southeast. The function of County Agents was important as the link between farmers and State organizations, tightening the connection between the two in the centralization process of rural Ohio. County Agents were the vehicle of not only technologies of modern agriculture but also agents that organized rural communities through the ideal of autonomy and self-help. The County Agent was often in close contact with the local

Rural Improvement Committee, working collaboratively with local leaders in road building, centralization of schools, and improvement of farm management.[44] The County Agent often contributed articles to local newspapers to disseminate the latest information of farming technologies, knowledge, as well as the political and social need of cooperation and organization of rural Ohioans.

The appointment of the County Agent starting from 1913 in Ohio coincided with the nation-wide movement to develop the sense of belonging of the rural to the Nation State.[45] This is part of the larger efforts to intervene the increasing discrepancy between the urban and rural, by incorporating the rural populations who had been seen as "too independent and resilient into the larger entity. The Country Life Commission Report in 1907 expressed explicitly the need to establish economic collaboration between agriculture and the rest of industries, and to reform rural communities socially and

---

[44] The most prominent example is the Ravenna township in Portage County, where the local leader and the County Agent Miller went into a tight allegiance to consolidate all rural organization, even including the Grange, to improve farming profitability. *Ravenna Republican,* the township newspaper had a column every week for Miller to address his reports and advices on dairy farming, and he was often the keynote speaker at the Ravenna Rural Improvement Association.

[45] *The Country Life Movement in the United States*, Bailey, 1911. Bailey, the founder of the Nature Study Movement, kept exercising influence on rural reformers. He proposed the need to build an organic relationship between the rural and urban. He sounds highly Durkheimian here when he argues that the "fundamental weakness of our civilization is that city and the country represent antagonistic forces." (19) He argues that an "organic relationship" has to be formed in cooperation between the two. He seems to try to give a concrete example of this relationship by defining agriculture as "business" which requires capital and knowledge (29)

culturally to fill in the large gap with the urban. The report emphasizes that the solution has to come from the rural itself: "Neither society nor government can do much for country life unless there is voluntary response in the personal ideals of the men and women who live in the country"[46] and "Personal initiative and a cultivated cooperative spirit are the best source of this work."[47]

The organization of rural communities led by the County Agents was carried out along this logic. From the time of the assignment of first County Agents in 1914, it was repeatedly emphasized that the mission of County Agents should not be deemed purely technical. County Agents and the University Extension took great caution not to be seen as a mere dispenser of technical knowledge and as a dispatched community organizer from higher authority. While maximizing farm yields was the largest concern for county agents, County Agents emphasized their role as a facilitator of establishing connections between the rural and the nation-state as a whole.

More specifically, the rural had to be remade into a useful, contributing part of the nation. At the Portage County Improvement Association, County Agent address like following:

> This week I want to talk about ways of making human energy more efficient in the field of commerce…The real big service to be rendered the county is that of so organizing the human energy now expended in the county as to make it all really contributing in the highest measure to the public good. A man who is going a useless work, something which does not contribute to the public well being is really a burden to the community quite as truly as the tramp or pauper. There is a growing feeling that a man who owns land and does not make it produce up to its capacity is a "dog in the manger" and that the public has a right to force him to make it produce or let some one else do so.

---

[46] *County life commission Report* , p.8

[47] Ibid. p.59

Now the creed of scientific farming—maximization of yields in the most efficient way as possible—was defined as a way to express farmers' worth as a member of society—because this method of the cultivation of the subject in daily farm work was potentially possible to every single member of the community. It was an accessible way to gain the new form of the actor for everyone, making it possible for this new model of the rural subject to spread widely.

The strategy of County Agent did not consist of merely pushing farmers to produce more for the good of county, however. It was coined also as a process of self-improvement and self-help of the rural community itself. One of the first appointed County Agents in Portage County, for example, announces his three missions as increasing per-household income, teaching better farm management and more economic farming.[48] Here he places larger net income of rural household as "a means to an end," to making each citizen the "most efficient social unit of the whole community." Through better practice in farming, he argued, it was possible to develop "better rural communities in which to live and develop the most effective citizenship."[49]

The connection of practicing scientific farming to better citizenship, and more autonomous and desirable rural communities was an application of the pragmatic schema of practice which made farming an "occupation." Making the rural people economically independent by promoting profitable farming was meant to make the rural more

---

[48] *Agriculture Student* 1914 21(1)

[49] *Agricultural Student*, 1915 21(1)

harmonious with the raising capitalism by making potential consumers out of farmers.[50] This was in the center of the reconstruction of the rural by bringing to the farm a "civilization in full harmony with the best American ideals" proposed by the Commission of Rural Life.

The mission of the County Agent was also to nurture a valid sense of citizenship among the rural population. This was especially a problematic task, because the sense of citizenship in this case had to accommodate two things; while preserving the rural identity of country people, the "new" citizenship had to contain the organic sense of belonging to the larger political and social system. [51] The Ohioans had to be made into the rural Americans who would give to the country. "But cooperation for what?" This question that the Farm Bureau asked is right to this point: "Not for that will make our farm people merely receivers, but for a plan and a system that will quicken social consciousness and make our people givers."

> Communities are much like individuals. No individual can grow unless he serves. No community can grow economically, socially normally, or ethically unless it is aroused to the need of service. Growth, to be permanent, must come from within and the only way it can come from within is for the people who constitute it to move, to act, to do

---

[50] *Rural Life Commission Report*, p.17.

[51] The Agricultural Club seems to have had a positive impact in nurturing the sense of "rural" citizenship. According to A.B. Graham Collection, 40-8-2-35. Memoir written in 1940) tracking what happened to the former members of the club after completing school, even those who moved to the city found a niche of trades with some connection with agriculture. This is evaluated as a positive impact of education of the 4-H Club in the recollection of the founder: "Many of these young people have retained their identity with the farm. Many who went into the city are pursuing certain kinds of business very closely related to agriculture. One is selling agricultural implements, another is manufacturing agricultural lime, another is selling tractors, and so it goes. One girl married one of the club boys another is at home helping to operate the farm but within the last year or two she has secured a doctor's degree from Wilmington College. Charles Schneider, living northeast of Springfield account three miles, tells a very interesting story. He began his club work at the age of ten with the expectation of later becoming a factory hand. He said that is entire attitude toward farm life was changed. Today, he is an active citizen in his community, as well as the owner of purebred livestock."

> something, for the common good. In the old days when we selected a good farmer, because he was good, to go out and help other farmer, the most surprised man was the farmer himself for he found at once that the mere fact of his helping other farmers helped him as much or more…if farm bureau work is to be permanent, if is to accomplish its aims economically. Socially, and I might also say, morally, and ethically, it must be an outgrowth of local spirit.[52]

Situating rural community vis-à-vis the larger social body was definitely new in the definition of the rural. This vision of rural citizenship holds that the farmer has to be a "giver" to the larger, common good—the way to achieve this was to accomplish economic improvement—through which social and cultural improvements should be concomitantly achieved. Being a good economic subject also meant being a good political subject, and a serving member of community.

Attaining the desirable form of economic citizenship, as an efficient producer as well as consumer— leads to politically viable citizen. This conjuncture of multiple types of citizenship comes to a close resonance with the language of service in the 4-H club. As if trying to salvage the increasing emphasis of the 4-H Club on the competitive aspect, Graham argues about the sense of belonging to collectivity that must be nurtured through the competition and club work:

> Even if my exhibition isn't as good as some others, I have a feeling of satisfaction because I helped fill up the class. If the judge placed my exhibit in class A, I probably have company and like it; if in class B, I have company and we all like it. Company softens the thought of defeat. I like it because I helped my group in receiving their award or recognition….Yes, I am a joiner…I join the group who buy bonds and like it because I can help a little to get this scrap "over it." I join those who pledge their "hands to greater service" and like it because I am doing something to carry out that pledge "to my club my community, and my country." I attend my club regularly and promptly; with my hands have not only done something for myself, but have raised the average of completions for my club. I like it. I have planted and cultivated a garden to provide food for ourselves and others that more commercially produced food could be sent to feed the armed forces where older club members may be serving. I am rendering my service to my community and to my country. My hands have gathered scraps as a contribution to my country's needs. They have fathered

---

[52] C*ooperative extension report* 1915 1(7)

> cast-off clothing for unfortunate children and adults in other lands. These things have been done in response to our patriotic and charitable impulses."[53]

The pragmatic idea of physical work as self-nurturing is expanded to celebrate the participation in the collective enterprise. Joining the competition does not only mean beating others competitors, but joining the competition also meant being part of the community as a productive member. Now, farming is not only a self-enriching practice but also through this practice, one can expresses his "pledge" to the collective body, the club, the community, and the country.[54]

Later Development of the 4-H Club as a Mobilizing Tool for Youths

The pragmatic theme of the reform—better yielding and more efficient farming as a way to serve the community as a good citizen—was realized mainly through Corn Contest in World War I. It developed into a core frame through which mobilization of the rural youth took place in the 4-H clubs during World War II. At this time, the 4-H clubs had matured into a nation-wide organization, but the fundamental logic of the schema of practice employed in mobilization remains the same. There are two salient features through which mobilization of rural youths was facilitated: 1) the proficiency in hand-labor makes the individual a worthy man/woman as a contributing member of the nation-

---

[53] Graham's recollection written in 1943, in A.B. Graham Papers

[54] The connection between self-activity and democracy is very Deweyian, and the 4-H clubs literally put it into practice at its mature stage: "The primary source of social control resides in the very nature of the work done as a social enterprise in which all individuals have an opportunity to contribute and to which all fell a responsibility (1938, p.61)

state, 2) club activities nourished patriotism and citizenship, and the club itself embodies democracy in its nature and quality—as opposed to fascism in Europe.

A Congress report on Rural Youth Act issued in 1941 advances the importance of the 4-H club arguing that, "76% [of the population] learn best by doing…which is the work experience, the 4-H project type f thing, which really teaches people to be more efficient" (pp.2-3)." The address draws on Hitler Jungend as an example that applied the same principle, by training the youths by engaging them in actual labor activities. In this Congress report, the training of youth was labeled as a "defense measure" as well as an "economic measure" by insulating the youth against the lackadaisical attitude and harmful -isms (p.4). "Learning by doing" was seen as a new measure of socialization for the masses, responding to both economic and moral problems at the same time.

A girl member from the Iowa 4-H club testified that the 4-H club was living up to the national ideal of democracy, fighting against fascism:

> …when became a 4-H club member I learned how to use a pressure cooker. I could then show my mother how to improve her practices at home, things she had not learned when she was in high school…I wonder if any of you gentlemen could make a suit such as I am wearing now. I bet if you had been a 4-H club member you could have. It happens that the suit I am wearing is one I made. I wonder, too, how many of you have had the social contacts that we have had with other boys and girls in camp life and on tours. That fellowship has meant much. It has developed loyalty in our hearts so that we want to be citizens of the United States. We want to help ourselves and stand upon our own feet. We want to help American to be the best that ever was. (p.6)

Similarly, an Iowa dairy and hog farmer testified:

> Our local club are a democracy in themselves; we have regular meetings every month, have parliamentary procedure; we have free discussion in our meetings and enrollment in these clubs is voluntary not compulsory…These 4-H club organizations are the most economical educational programs we could have. (p.15)

The 30 years of development of the 4-H clubs shows the maturity of the club as an organizational tool for mobilization of rural youths. Developing from the nascent stage of

the Club in the 1910's, the 4-H clubs and agricultural reforms have transformed the realm of farming into a social realm where one could become a national citizen, by engaging in everyday farm work. At the mature stage at World War II, an ideological language was added as seen in the above testimonies by members, but this should be seen as an addition that was reliant on the cultural infrastructure that reformed farming as a site of proving self-worth, and expressing one's devotion.

Conclusion

This chapter examined how the schema of practice in scientific farming crystallized as the norm of high yielding and efficient agriculture in Ohio. The new practice of farming was an application of the reconstitution of farming practice into a "whole experience"—meaningful connections among pieces of activities through which the subjectivity of the actor emerges. This basic schema of practice, when applied in the actual agenda of agricultural reforms, remade farming into a practice whose result was evaluated and quantified to prove the quality of the farmer as the actor. Furthermore, in scientific farming, farmers were not tilling the soil only for one's and his family's survival; farming productively and efficiently became a way to determine one's position in the community, as well as to contribute to the country.

Remaking agriculture into a practice to demonstrate one's worth as a member of society was actively utilized as a way to integrate farmers as a contributing part of the nation state. County Agents defined desirable citizenship for rural Ohioans as becoming a farmer who practiced productive and efficient farming, and consequently ran household economy steadily and independently. Such an ideal form of citizenship set the path for

the rural to become a part of the new order of the modern capitalist state, both as a provider of food, not as a detached burden of society.

Farmers always had intuition for maximizing yields before the advent of scientific farming. However, it was only by the early twentieth century reforms that the model of farming went under a significant change. The decisive change was possible through the dissemination of the new schema of practice—the reconstitution of farming practice as a whole experience. The change in the schema of practice had a more permeating effect to increase the total yields than merely tapping on farmers' profit-making intuition.

Chapter 5: Action as the Aim in Itself: "Practicism" and Educational Reforms in Saitama, Japan

This chapter shifts focus from Ohio to Saitama, Japan. The analysis focuses on the categories that Japanese pragmatic educational reforms constructed, and the schema of practice that developed from that category—the sphere of everyday practice, [1] and the technology of writing as the method to construct the reciprocal relationship among the actor, action, and writing—which eventually matured as "practicism"—*jissen shugi* or action as the aim in itself— as a new model of action. The construction of practicism as a cultural infrastructure is particularly important for the analysis of nationalistic mobilization in Japan during World War II.

I analyze the practical agricultural education in public schools in Saitama prefecture in the 1920s' that reflected the popularity of pragmatic ideas in pedagogy then in Japan. In addition to the agricultural education, I also examine the pedagogy of writing, another widespread educational movement in the 1920s' in Japan. The pedagogy of writing was implemented in tandem with agricultural education in Saitama, where students were encouraged to record and reflect on their activities on their farming project.

---

[1] Translation needs a little explanation here. In most of data that I am consulting, the word "nichijo seikatsu" which can be literally translated to English as "everyday life" is, as Silverberg (1992) points out, more appropriately translated in meaning as "everyday practice." The Japanese word "nichijo seikatsu" does not only mean the contextual "everyday life" in English, but carries a connotation of banal activities in ordinary life.

The aim of this chapter is to illuminate the commonalities and differences between the Japanese educational reforms and those in Ohio concerning how reformers re-envisioned learning, everyday practice, and the kernel of subjectivity of the learner. I contrast how reformers incorporated physical activities in Saitama, and contrast it to the case of Ohio to illustrate the unique schema of practice that emerged as a result of the Saitama reform. This chapter provides a foundation to the comparison between the two different mechanisms of mobilization of rural populations, by delineating that reforms in the two societies developed distinct relationships between the farmer and farming.

Rural Japan: Belief History and its Position in History and Academia

The analysis in this chapter mainly deals with the case of Saitama Prefecture immediately north of Tokyo, during the time period between the mid-1920's and 1945. Rural Saitama, like any other rural communities in the inter-war Japan, experienced a series of turmoil. Until the 1920s' half of the Japanese populations were residing in rural areas (Mori, 1999), and these areas were still feudal in structures. The tenant-landlord levying system that had survived since the Edo period kept farmers in a politically and economically subjugated position to landlords. The same system was challenged in the fierce tenant-landlord conflicts between tenant farmers and landlords in the 1920's.[2] The politically turbulent 1920's—a period of relative affluence in rural economy—was followed by the plunge of agricultural product prices in 1932. By the end of World War I,

---

[2] The rise of tenant conflict nowadays is understood not as a result of increasing poverty in villages but as a result of the growing consciousness of farmers of the value of his labor, influenced by labor movements also flourishing then in cities (Nan, 2002).

Japan had entered the world's economy as an industrialized and capitalistic society. Due to the inter-dependent connections among different sectors of industries within the society, the impact of the Great Depression immediately crystallized as a hazardous outcome in domestic agriculture in Japan (Lockwood, 1968). The Depression hit hard rural households in Japan, especially farm households that depended on sericulture, which threw rural households into extreme poverty in some regions, especially northern Japan. Increasing farm debt and bankruptcy of farm households caused a national unrest in rural areas. Starving farmers and selling of rural young girls to prostitution became social issues.

The government immediately implemented the Rural Revitalization Project to advance the "reconstruction" measures to save the devastated rural communities in 1932. As we will discuss in details in Chapter 6, the Rural Revitalization Project later became a conduit of rural mobilization during the 15-year War with China and the Pacific War. Pragmatic educational reforms, introduced in the 1920s, threaded through these years of political and economic turbulence in rural Japan.

Scholars have regarded this sequence of events—from rural depression to the intervention of the State in the Revitalization Project—as important conditions that eventually surrendered Japanese farmers to the reign of the military authoritarian regime from the late 1930's until 1945. The history of pre-war rural Japan is often depicted as the progressive integration of the rural society into the rule of the authoritarian military regime, from the devastation of agricultural economy in the 30s' that consequently became an impetus to and justification of the increasing incorporation of rural populations into the wartime system. (Smith, 2001)

Several persisting assumptions support this view that rural communities were the cultivating ground for political authoritarianism in prewar Japan, which indeed resonate with the argument of agrarian policymakers and bureaucrats in prewar Japan (Havens, 1974). There are two reasons for the attention the rural has been enjoying as the political root of authoritarianism. The first understanding is that acute imbalance existed between the rural and urban cities in economy, life-style, and political awareness which threatened social order and integration of the country. This is the "rural problem" perspective. Policymakers in the early 20th century as well as post-war scholars particularly focused on this discontinuity to make "rural problems" pressing as a national concern (Pyle, 1972, Harootunian, 2000, Nan, 2002). The second understanding of the rural root of authoritarianism is that, despite the backwardness and feudalism, the rural at the same time always represented the "core" of Japanese culture, which reproduced and preserved the national virtue of Japanese people (Vlastos, 1998, Scheiner, 1998).

These two assumptions are often combined to explain why the rapid industrialization that modern Japan experienced through in its modernization project ended up in the self-claimed "fascism." The Marxism-influenced tradition in Japanese scholarship such as Maruyama Masao has attributed the rise of military regime to the late development of Japanese capitalism compared to the "model" cases of capitalization in Western societies, where proletariatization of peasants was accompanied by the healthy development of civil society (Maruyama, 1969).

Pre-war agrarian bureaucrats could chime in with Maruyama, although with a different motivation. In an attempt to "reinvent" the rural as traditional, eternal, and foundational to the nation—rather than withering, leftover of modernizing Japan (Gluck,

1985), prewar policymakers contrived that retaining small-scale farming and the patriarchal village culture with landlord dominating both as political and economic masters and caretakers of tenants—or in other words, the virtuous and harmonious village of Japan— would serve the national interest better by keeping farmers hard-working, compliant, and politically benign national subjects, away from vices and lures of urban cities.[3] Agrarian discourses that idealized in an idyllic manner the dominating but patriarchal relationship in the village between landlords and tenants farmers, which many researchers liken to the model of nationalism that puts the Emperor as the Father of the nation. (Havens, 1974, Iwasaki, 1997).

The second framework that the rural represents the "true" virtues and values of the Japanese nation was cultivated aggressively by popular agrarians—such as local elites, "model" farmers in villages, bureaucrats in local governments, and leaders of farmers' cooperative movements. These popular agrarians argued that farming had to be essentially distinguished from wage labor, because farmers worked with the earth, without selfish and worldly concerns for profits-making (Nan, 2002). As we will see later, village fraternal associations (*seinenkai*) and local agricultural reformers combined the discourses of self-cultivation and improvement with the practice of farming, framing agriculture as a practice through which one devoted oneself for the sake of the state and the emperor.

In these views, Japanese farmers are often depicted as "mentally" unarmed and particularly vulnerable to ideological manipulation through the propaganda of the

---

[3] This is the mainstream argument of prewar agrarian bureaucrats, such as Yokoi Tokiyoshi.

military regime in the 1940's. The role of national ideology, in combination with agrarian ideology in this case—is overemphasized in this explanation as the sole goal of any social engineering, reforms, and even popular reforms (Havens, 1974). As a result, scholars have focused their efforts in pointing out how ideology was forced, implemented on, and made believable to the masses (Gluck, 1985, Havens, 1974)—such as the unified endeavor by agrarian bureaucrats to incorporate the rural while maintaining the political subjugation to the half-feudal village power relationship, and the popularly held beliefs that farming is a way to serve the glory of the nation state.

This excessive attention to ideology and ideologues as a condition for the advent of the military authoritarian regime and the role of the rural embedded in that historical perspective is apparent when compared to the position that rural America has occupied in historical studies. For sure, American farmers were also exposed to similar discourses. Agrarianism—a mode of cultural representation of the rural as the embodiment of the moral, ethical, and national essence that dissipated in the course of industrialization, was of course present in twentieth century Ohio, where rural reformers were trying to reestablish the rural with the "things that only rural can have, that the urban cannot have."[4] However, the presence of agrarian discourses is disconnected from the issue of politicization of rural populations in the case of the United States. In contrast to Japan, the presence of agrarian discourses in the United States are seen rather as a proof of resilience and autonomy of farmers from the competing political discourses, rather than a device to co-opt farmers.

---

[4] *Ravenna Republican*, Feb. 13 (1913)

The ultimate aim of this and the following chapter is to disarm the direct role of ideology in mass mobilization in the case of Japan. By examining the cultural infrastructure of practicism, I argue that only through this emergent new schema of action, nationalistic ideology could have a substantial effect in mobilization. However, in the Japanese case, this cultural schema of action put the actor in a different relationship with practice compared to the American case—the idealized model of practice imagined the actor completely immersed and internalized in the conduct itself. This schema of action, I shall point out, was interpreted by scholars later as the psyche of manipulated masses (such as Dower, 1993). I will refute that interpretation by delineating that practicism, action as the aim in itself, if examined in its development, was far from a simple tool for brainwashing, but rather invented as a way of meditating on one's autonomous conduct.

Saitama is an especially good example to examine how pragmatic educational reforms were intertwined with these major event for two reasons: Saitama was heavily reliant on sericulture which was particularly hard hit by the restriction of importation of silk by the United States during the Great Depression, and Saitama was one of the prefectures where pragmatic agricultural education was most avidly accepted and implemented by school teachers.[5]

---

[5] The implementation and development of pragmatic ideas present a great deal of regional variety in Japan. In Northern Japan where rural poverty was more acute compared to other regions, a radical version of pedagogy by Marxist pedagogues had a strong influence. Therefore, my analysis of Saitama does not claim to exhaust the entire spectrum of pedagogic development across the country. Nonetheless, the themes that I

Education as a Quest for the Genuine Autonomy: Background of the Pragmatic Reforms in 1920's Japan

The centralization of school system of Japanese education following the Western model of formal schooling was embarked shortly after the Meiji Restoration in 1868. It was a process in which the new Meiji government tried to consolidate and centralize the decentralized Tokugawa system of education. Implementation of formal schooling in rural Japan met obstacles from uncooperative and sometimes explicitly hostile farmers in the early days. Farmers in some areas regarded schools as taking away their children as precious labor force, and mistrusted the invading power of the new central government. In some Prefectures, schools were burnt down by farmers who protested against schools. However, formal schooling was successfully implemented by the first decade of the 20th century, when the enrollment rate almost reached 100%, although the actual attrition rate is assumed to be high in some Prefectures, especially among girls (Rubinger, 2007).

Education until the 1920s', especially the legacy of Meiji education, is summed up in two elements by Saitama reformers. First, the "old" education is portrayed as oppressing the child's initiatives and spontaneity in learning. Second, the Meiji education was regarded as inclined to formalism—memorization of facts and formulas dictated from the teacher to students was the mainstream teaching method, and studies of classics dominated the curricula. Teaching of writing consisted of teaching templates of official practical writing. This was also the case in rural education, where how to write legal

---

will focus in this chapter, such as the problem of everyday life, was the common denominator of educational reforms across the country, even in Marxist pedagogy.

documents, such as letters to borrow money, buy and sell land, and keeping almanacs was the content of education (Rubinger, 2007: 155).

The Meiji education was challenged in the 1920's, the period popularly referred to as the era of "free education" (*Taisho jiyu kyoiku*). The critics of the old education contrasted the "new" education to the "factory model of schooling" of the Meiji era. Education to raise an "active" property in the learner was an urgent task:

> We need a healthier and more active nation body. To do so, the current education system does not suffice, because it merely educates children in static teaching methods that force them to memorize what is presented. It is absolutely necessary to develop an active educational system that cultivates voluntary attitudes of children.[6]

"Free education" included the variety of popular movements that contested the rigidity and formalism of the Meiji education by educational researchers, pedagogues and teachers themselves. This movement contained several streams— the introduction of the European and American educational psychology promoted the new idea of education as a science, or education as the object of rational social policies and planning (Oouchi, 1999). Another initiative includes the pedagogy of writing which we will discuss later in the chapter, and introduction of progressive curricula such as Dalton Plan and Parkhurst methods at some urban private schools. They shared the criticism of the Meiji education for its suppression on and negligence of the active role of the learner in the process of learning, and instead proposed that the spontaneity and autonomy of children should be the basis of learning.

---

[6] Oikawa, in Nakano, 1977.

The argument of the 1920's reformers, however, bore an interesting resemblance to what the founders of the Meiji education claimed. Both criticized the Tokugawa feudal education. The Meiji education was propelled by undoing the Confucian view of children as a passive, empty-minded vessel who had to be disciplined before the teacher pours knowledge of canon in his mind (Lincicome, 1995). The history of Japanese modern education, then, has been a continuous quest for what autonomy and spontaneity of the learner is, and how to build education to nurture that.

This element of modern Japanese education is particularly important because of the way pre-war Japanese education has been portrayed. Almost by consensus, scholars have regarded education as one of the most effective and important devices of social control in modern Japan (Gluck, 1985, Garon, 2001, Hirota, 1996). Scholars have emphasized education in modern Japan—including both formal schooling as well as popular organizations of tutelage— as an institution of morale suasion, dedicated not only to endowing children with knowledge and skills, but to a greater extent to inculcating moral and the spirit of fidelity to the nation and patriotism. While it is true that the Meiji government geared its efforts to utilizing the tutelary power of school to create the Imperial subjects, by means of the censorship on textbooks, school ceremonies that hammered in the Rescript on Education—the Emperor's words on the expected civility— a review of the discourses of educational reforms in Japan would show that oppression in education is never a fixed matter; in other words, education and the problem of mass control should never be analyzed without the equally strong incentive for autonomy of the subject.

Institutionalized Autonomy: Practical Education to Nurture Spontaneity

Rural teachers and school principals in Saitama were quite receptive to the movement that first sprouted in the urban educational scenes. So enthusiastic about reforming their own schools, they made trips to Tokyo to attend workshops of new curricula and teaching methods. At the same time, rural educational reforms unfolded in the unique rural contexts. While urban progressive reforms mainly centered on pedagogic methods in classroom teaching (Nakano, 1998), rural reforms developed around farming practice as a promising sphere for cultivation. Education that bases learning on actual engagement in farming—popularly called *jitsugyo kyoiku*—became the central venue of rural educational reforms in Saitama in the 1920's. The *Kyoiku Saitama,* a widely circulated teachers' magazine featured special issues on practical education in which teachers at elementary, middle schools discussed the topic with enthusiasm.

Admittedly, Japanese teachers did not refer to Dewey as the single model of reforms to follow; at least they did not show their singular inclination to Deweyean pragmatism as explicitly as the Ohio reformers did. Admittedly, Deweyan pragmatism was not the sole source of inspiration for Japanese reformers, either. Other pedagogues, especially Europeans philosophers, influenced Japanese reformers along with Dewey, such as Pestallozzi, Parkhurst, and Spengler to name a few. However, the ideas on which Japanese reformers designed their reforms contained a surprising resonance with the 4-H clubs that embodied the pragmatism of Dewey: 1) Farming practice as an effective conduit of learning, 2) emphasis on everyday physical agricultural work, and 3) weight on the spontaneity of the child on organizing his own action through engagement in farming. These are the basic similarities between the schema of action in Japan and the United States.

Just like the 4-H clubs that promoted farming as a means to nurture the ability to engage in a coherent sequence of conduct, Japanese reformers also found in farming practice rich resources for learning to create the actor as the supervisor of his own action. In a very similar tone as the 4-H clubs that embodied the principle of pragmatism that "thinking is action, always action," teachers in Saitama held that education should not involve only sensory organs, but engagement of hands and the whole body to be conducive to the active learner.[7]

The agricultural education in Saitama was mainly practiced on the patches of vegetable farms attached to school. These gardens were usually called by names such as " diligence farm" or "discipline farm." By the end of 1920's, almost all elementary schools in Saitama implemented some sort of practical training on the farm during breaks. Students worked on their school farms during their playtime and before and after school, usually not during normal class hours. While individual teachers seem to have had quite a high degree of freedom about how to organize and manage school farms due to the absence of an official curriculum, how they actually carried out the school garden project demonstrates a high degree of uniformity within the prefecture, showing the high permeation of the uniform goal, practice, and planning of practical agricultural education.

While in both Ohio and Saitama, teachers of public schools were the active agents of reforms, Japanese teachers tried to implement the ideas within the existing institutional

---

[7] Here this principal calls practical education "*rosaku kyoiku*"—literally translated as "labor education." There are some varieties in the ways practical education was referred to, but the ideas expressed by them were pretty much uniform.

environment. While the 4-H clubs developed always outside of official school curricula, Japanese practical education developed *inside* the institutional boundary of school.

However, this does not mean that agricultural education was simply incorporated as another academic subject. The form of institutional implementation of the pragmatic reforms in Japan displays an interesting paradox of spontaneity and institutionalization by which the "autonomous learner" was to be cultivated.

Practical education was supposed to nurture uncoerced and spontaneous participation and willingness of children to work on their agricultural project. Learning through physical activities was advanced on the ground that it nurtured the active role of the child to organize his own action at work. A principal advocates the pedagogic benefits of agricultural education as follows:

> The meaning of practical education is that, by 'doing,' the child can train oneself, and stimulate and educate oneself. In education that involves manual work (*sagyo kyoiku*), the child sets his own goal spontaneously, and reflects on what he has done. This is why work education can be so creative, and nourishing of autonomy and independence. When the child sets his own goal, he concentrates so much better on completing the task. This immersion (isshokenmeisa) is the basis of diligence required in any work. [8]

As with the 4-H club, the emphasis on the cultivation of desirable qualities of the child was important for the Saitama teachers in order not to reduce practical education to "shallow vocational training." Through practical education, teachers sought to develop qualities such as spontaneity and autonomy of the child by "making learning work (*rosaku*), and to make work a learning process, in order to help children to spontaneously

---

[8] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 49, 1936

earn knowledge and morals."[9] This teacher reports on how their school garden took off from the initiatives from a student:

> During the free-play time at the schoolyard, one student came up to me and said "It is a pity we cannot tend the school garden when the second graders can. We want to grow vegetables in a corner of the school yard." I was impressed at this suggestion, and asked the entire class if anyone else was interested. Most of the students were enthusiastic about the idea…[10]

Basing practical education on the spontaneity of the child was explicitly linked to the nourishment of a "spirit of autonomy." This same teacher introducing the "child-centered approach" in his school garden[11] names his approach *mukansho shugi* by which he means he would not give instructions to students how to tend the school garden, unless he was asked and demanded by them. He would provide indirect suggestions and instructions on when to sow what kind of seeds, and how to manage the garden in each season on the classroom bulletin board, but "even if a students is wondering why safflowers did not grow well when fed with fertilizer and grew better when not," he would not take initiatives in explaining why, unless the student asked him.[12]

This emphasis on the cultivation of qualities of the child through learning at work explains the somewhat ambiguous institutional position of agricultural education at Saitama schools. While it would have been contradictory to assign an official class for

---

[9] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 271, 1931

[10] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 249, 1929

[11] It is apparent that this particular teacher was influenced by the pedagogy of Parkhurst, because he called the school garden the "Project Method Garden." This also supports the idea that while the source of practical educational ideas were quite diverse, but the actual practice of educational reforms implemented was uniform.

[12] *Koyiku Saitama*, 210, 1925.

agricultural education to "teach spontaneity," agricultural education was seen very much the task that schools, as educational institution, should have been taking care of. As a result, no designated time slot was set in the official curriculum to teach practical agricultural education. But at the same time, agricultural education was incorporated into the grading system.

When students were assigned to part of the school garden, they filled in the "practice card," on which they kept information such as the location of the farm, size, kinds of crops, breed of crops, what was grown in the location in the previous year, dates of sowing, thinning, the kinds of fertilizer applied and finally the budget and profit analysis at the end of the year. This is similar to the 4-H club activity log. However, Saitama students were subject to a more rigorous inspection by teachers and were graded for their execution. Students submitted the card to the teacher, or sometimes to the principal, who regularly collected and evaluated those cards as part of school grade. Students were graded based on how hard they worked on the garden, how neatly they kept the farm record, and to a much lesser degree, the quality of the harvested vegetables.[13]

The Context of the Pragmatic Reforms in Saitama: Underlying Discourse of Self-improvement in Japan: Discursive Precondition

Saitama reformers saw the pedagogic benefits of agricultural education most and fore most in the cultivation of certain qualities in the child, such as diligence and industriousness. This means that Japanese reformers developed pragmatism into a more

---

[13] *Kyoiku Saitama* 180, 1923

specific practice of self-improvement. One reason for this development is Japanese reformers had a discursive context and background in which they received practical education.

The benefits of learning by doing were interpreted by Japanese teachers linked to the discourse of perfection of *jinkaku*—honing of one's personhood,[14] a discourse of self-improvement popular among the youth and young-adults from the late nineteenth century. Polishing one's character and conduct through self-discipline, abstinence, and diligence was widely called *shuyo* (private training for self-improvement). Since the Meiji era, the improvement of personhood through personal practice had had a continuous influence as an informal pedagogic discourse.

Learning by doing, and learning based on farming in Japan were absorbed by teachers through the lens of the existing discourse of self-improvement and discipline as a frame of interpretation. While this does not mean that practical education was merely absorbed as a variation of, or the method of the preexisting discourse of self-improvement, the existence of the resonating discourse such as *shuyo* did demarcate the range of interpretation of learning by doing among schoolteachers. Probably this is why

---

[14] The term *jinkaku* was originally coined by a Meiji philosopher Inoue Tetsujiro as the translation of English "personality" and German "Persoenlichkeit." However, in this context, understanding *jinkaku* as personality in English gives a wrong connotation due to its too psychological implication—such as in the concept of "personality types." *Jinkaku* in Japanese points to what is the object of daily disciplining practice. *Jinkaku* is, so to speak, is the broadly defined quality of the individual character that determines the overall tendency of one's action, inter-personal relationships, etc. In this sense, personhood (or German Pesoenlichkeit) comes closer to the original connotation of *jinkaku*.

Saitama reformers were in a relatively peaceful unison as to how to define the pedagogic value of farm work.

For example, Saitama teachers were in agreement that farming in educational settings was to be distinguished from other kinds of work whose nature they deemed was purely economic for the purpose of making a living. The purpose of practical education was linked to the improvement of the internal character of the child such as to "establish a serious, hard-working individual through engaging in a task."[15] Practical agricultural education sought the pedagogic value of agricultural work in the improvement of the child's character, habits, and attitudes.

The existing discourse as a frame of interpretation provided a discursive condition that set the practical education reforms in Japan on a different path from the Ohio case. Compared to the implementation of the same idea of "learning by doing" by the 4-H clubs, Japanese reformers put the quality of the actor himself as the ultimate object of education, more than to sophisticate the actual farming methods, technology, and knowledge. While the improvement of farming methods was certainly seen as one of the goals of practical education in Saitama, acquisition of farming skills and knowledge constituted only a secondary goal. If the acquisition of farming skills was taken into consideration at all as a pedagogic aim, the *process* in which the child discovered the better way of tending the farm through trial and error was regarded more important.

It was not only a handful of reform-minded teachers that put forth farming practice as a method of improvement of personhood. This was a widely shared idea by

---

[15] *Kyoiku Saitama* 221, 1940

rural youths in the rural youth fraternities (*seinendan*). [16] These village youth associations often defined themselves as a place where the youth gave intellectual and cultural stimulation among themselves for more rigorous self-improvement practice. Members of the group saw everyday farming practices with creativity and diligence as a continuing process to improve one's personhood. "Based on everyday practice (*nichijo seikatsu*), enjoying and taking advantages of labor," they took the principle of improvement of oneself through concrete action, in order to "take caution not to entertain empty theory without substance."[17] .

Many fraternity members carried out their own private "research" project. Each of them picked a topic related to the improvement of farming or household keeping, did some research and experiment on the topic, and presented the results and findings in the monthly magazine which they published, often in their own handwriting when they lacked financial means and technology to print them. One youth in *Yatsumoto* village who studied how to grow cucumbers before the season, said he was motivated to "solve

---

[16] The village fraternity *Seinendan* is not similar to the 4-H or to the Grange. *Seinendan* (Young Men's fraternity) and "*Shojyokai*" (Young Women's Sorority) were organized by rural youths around the age 20-30 and were village-based organizations. They did not have political power in village politics, but were positioned as self-enlightening educational groups of rural youths. Rural youths gathered in their spare time to engage in voluntary work such as cleaning the village shrine, temples and public streets, and planning of village event such as village summer festivals and organizing study groups. Monthly meetings often served as a discussion group for topics such as the role of village youths, and the importance of education in agriculture.

[17] *Yatsumoto-mura Seinen Danpo* (6), 1925. Monthly magazines published by Yatsumoto village youths.

the most important economic problem" in his village—making use of the unused mulberry farms left idle for growing cucumbers.[18] His report is fairly detailed in the economical tricks to grow the cucumber plant, such as how to cut the costs of fertilizers. In another example of the private project, a village young man reported on his cultivation of sweet potatoes, comparing the effectiveness of different kinds of manures. In the conclusion, he states, "with the same amount of labor invested, the yield was twice as large with fertilizer. This will help with the economic rationalization of farming, to gain the largest yield with the least labor"[19]

While village youth expressed their interests in economizing farming in their projects, the overall tone of the village fraternity publication was very different from scientific farming practice in Ohio. Scientific farming primarily focused on the quantifiable results of practice, such as per acre yields and man work day. The village youth in Saitama enthusiastically argued for the importance of self-improvement through diligently working on the farm, but not the total yields from the farm.[20] One rural youth argues:

> The most important thing in this world is to polish one's character.. to have a good character means to have a good manner (*hinkaku*) as a human….do not take your own body for granted, because we have to keep making efforts to make our life worthwhile.[21]

---

[18] *yatsumoto Mura Seinen Dampo* (7), 1925

[19] ibid.

[20] ibid.

[21] ibid..

The writings of rural youth in Saitama were often marked by grandiose ideas of improving one's worth through hard work. The research for a better and more economic farming methods was rather taken as a means to the more sublime aim of honing one' personhood.

The existing discourses of self-improvement through diligence and hard-work in Japan set a precondition in Saitama in which reformers as well as village youth groups when incorporating pragmatism as an educational idea and put it into use to establish a new form of the rural individual. This means that the Japanese reformers had a resource as well as limits to interpreting the central element in pragmatism—action as a realm of manifestation of subjectivity. The *shuyo* discourse preset the Saitama reformers into taking in the notion of action in its cultivating function on the individual. This means that for Japanese reformers, learning through doing is only relevant when it is aimed at its object—the quality of the individual.

From Content to Form: Educating Children for the "Form" of Practice

How did Japanese reformers define the "quality" of the individual that reforms were geared to achieving, and how did they approach this task? The pragmatic education reforms in Saitama set the distinction between the "values" that guided action and the "attitudes" or "form" with which the same action was carried out.

Saitama teachers believed that qualities such as autonomy could not be "taught" through explicit inculcation by didactic teaching. The forms for action such as autonomy, willingness, and voluntarity toward farming and any other everyday practices, they argued, had to be built into the child through the training of habit. Such qualities could be nurtured only by education *at* action, submerging the child in the immediate experience

of work activities.[22] As one teacher put it, "in order to develop the spirit of autonomy, the only ways is the self-discipline in everyday practice."[23]

It was, then, no coincidence that learning by doing at farm work was taken as an ideal place to establish the form of action. By setting the aim of agricultural education on education of the form, the scope of practical education widened: if the aim of education is to nurture the good form of action, it had to incorporate not only school life but also child's home life as its venues of education.

For instance, teaching raising chickens was a popular project advanced by schoolteachers advancing practical agricultural education. The benefit of teaching children how to raise chickens at home brings not only economic benefits to make a good side business to supplement household income. The educational value of the practice of chicken farming—was emphasized by teachers rather than the economic benefit. They called for nurturing good everyday habits in children, because:

> by raising chickens, the child develops a good habit of getting up early, learns the idea of making efforts (*doryoku*), and starts wasting less time meaninglessly fooling around. They start engaging in fruitful labor *without even noticing it themselves*…When the child collects eggs and sell them, advice the child that he calculate the sale and save all or part of it in postal office or bank account: This will *automatically* nourish the idea of saving in the child.[24]

This idea of chicken farming at home illustrates some key concepts in practical education. The practice of raising chickens is not aimed at working on the child's consciousness or explicitly inculcating the child with norms such as diligence,

---

[22] *Kyoiku Saitama* 249, 1929

[23] *Kyoiku Saitama* 249, 1929.

[24] *Kyoiku Siatama* 203, 1925 Italics added by me.

punctuality, or even economic awareness. Instead, this pedagogy takes as the object the general and fundamental "form" in which the child goes about with their practice everyday.

Through keeping chickens, the child is expected to acquire the "form," without even noticing that he is acquiring that himself. This educational process does not require the mediation of child's consciousness as a component of learning. This pedagogy expects that the children learn the habit "without even noticing it themselves." The innovation of this pedagogic method makes consciousness redundant, as long as the actual engagement in practice is the medium through which the child acquires the form of action.

Practical Education, not for Practical Goals: Economy as a Means of Self-governance

The notion of the improvement of practice in the Japanese case was based on the particular notion on the relationship between the actor and practice not limited to the result of action, such as resulting economic benefits. The emphasis on the form of action, in other words, also meant that, as long as the desirable "attitudes" were pursued, action did not have to be followed by a desirable consequence.

The decoupling of action from the consequence of action made the practical education in Saitama quite "unpractical," paradoxically—dissociated from the reality of economic and political structures. Learning based on everyday practice, in other words, assumed idealized and insulated activities in social vacuum of pure practice.

Take the example how Saitama teachers incorporated economics into education. Saitama reforms did not exclude economic consequence and economic practice as a constituent of practical education. On contrary, practical agricultural education in

Saitama devoted considerable attention to raising the economic consciousness of the child running the farm. For many teachers, practical education literally meant broadening the scope of education beyond the formalism of conventional education, which they considered as detached from the reality. If practical education takes on the problem of everyday life, then, the problem of economy cannot be ignored.

Saitama teachers introduced the economic element in a manner that might seem quite "unpedagogic" to us; teachers reproduced the tenant-landlord structure on the running of the school garden. Teachers collected tenant fees from students for "renting" a patch of the school garden.[25] Teachers were faithful in reflecting the "reality" that how much was charged as tenant fees were based on the actual average tenant fees in the particular region that school was located.[26]

According to Saitama teachers, tenant fees were collected with the aim of guiding students to acquire understandings of the actual economic structure in which the child would put himself in the future, as well as to raise in the child the awareness of how valuable land was, so that he would not get lazy and waste the assigned land. [27] It was a

---

[25] *Kyoiku Saitma*, 210, 1925

[26] Tenant fees in Saitama were set by convention, and the rate varied across the Prefecture. That the school garden tenant fees were calculated based on the actual fees in the village is another evidence that Japanese practical education was closely linked to the actual village politics.

[27] There were some varieties in how the harvested vegetables from school gardens were dealt with. In some schools, students were allowed to freely decide what to do with them. In others however, the tenant-landlord structure replicated in school went too far and led to the school version of tenant-landlord conflict,

tacit pedagogy to motivate children to work hard on the farm. The reason to collect tenant fees was often not explained directly to the students. Through the payment of the "tenant fees" and by situating the running of school farm in the virtual model of the tenant system, students were "expected" to run the farm assigned to them with more rigor and diligence.

Despite the uproar of tenant-landlord conflict that had spread across Saitama less than a decade before the practical agricultural curriculum, the application of the mock tenant-landlord relationship in practical agricultural education did not explicitly include the analysis of the political subordination between tenants and landlords in Saitama. Practical education adopted only one aspect of the relationship, the economic renter-leaser structure as the condition for farming practice. This was certainly a very limited introduction to the reality of village political economy in a de-politicized manner, where the tenant-landlord relationship was causing numerous serious cases of disputes between the two parties over the tax rate.

This skewed adoption shows that the "volutariness and autonomy" that practical education purported to nurture had a specific boundary within which it was supposed to be enacted. Autonomy here was interpreted as something purely intrinsic to the manner of engagement in practice, but disconnected from any political reflection outside of the practice of farming itself. In other words, autonomy and spontaneity in organizing everyday action meant that the actor was propelled from his inner motives to pursue action, but this actor-practice relationship does not take into consideration anything

---

in which school administrators sold off the harvested vegetables grown by students, and students protested that they did not get any of the share. (Kyoiku Saitama (221), 1940).

extrinsic, such as autonomy toward another form of consciousness, such as a critical consciousness of the exploitive relationship.[28]

Toward Practicism: Use of Writing as a Technology of Self-improvement

Probably the most significant difference between Japan and the United States was that practical education in Japan entailed a specific model of self-reflection specifically through the practice of writing. This section devotes special attention to the "technology of writing," because the technology of recording of everyday practice presents the crucial property of practical education in Saitama, the schema of practice based on the triad elements; the actor, action, and self-reflection. Here, I will discuss two types of recording of everyday practice as a technique of self-reflection promoted by the practical agricultural education: (1) *tsuzurikata*, the pedagogy of writing and (2) the farm diary. The third category, (3) farm accounting was an application of the principles of the pedagogy of writing and it will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter.

Both the pedagogy of writing and farm diary are forms of recording writer's everyday practice.[29] They demonstrate the unique implementation of pragmatic ideas in

---

[28] In Northern Japan where the Marxist pedagogy had a strong influence, there indeed was practice of critical pedagogy that aimed at raising the consciousness of children to critically view the political and social exploitation by landlord on tenant farmers. I would like to remind readers that this statement is only applicable in Saitama, or Kanto-region.

[29] Everyday life (*nichijo seikatsu*) itself is a modern concept, as can be observed in the series of the "philosophy of everyday" that popped up in the inter-war period in Japan in the 1930's. To me, this seems the contribution of Marxist scholars such as Tosaka Jun, who developed philosophy of everyday life—the realm of consumption, which was abstract and saturated by capitalist structure, yet, in a way unharnessed

Japanese practical education; writing as a technique for self-reflection on one's practice, and at the same time for objectifying one's action through the act of writing.

The recording of everyday practice, or the *tsuzurikata* pedagogy, had a pervasive influence on educational discourses across the country. *Tsuzurikata* literally means teaching writing, composing sentences and expressing ideas and feelings. Despite the aborted attempts by the Ministry of Education to edit an official textbook, *tsuzurikata* never became an officially implemented school subject. Instead, *tsuzurikata* developed as a pedagogic philosophy which attracted sympathy among teachers, especially at the elementary level. Immensely popular among progressive teachers in urban areas who were dedicated to the "free education movement" in the 1920's. Its popularity spread to rural schools too. Its influence did not dwindle even in the 40s. Even after the "free education movement" died out, *tsuzurikata* became an established educational discourse, which was inherited by and reflected on agricultural practical education in many ways.

But writing what, how, and for what purpose? The *tsuzurikata* pedagogy also developed as a criticism of the Meiji education, challenging the traditional way of seeing the child as *tabula rasa*, a passive object of inculcation and subjugated to the set categories of knowledge to absorb. The early urban proponents of the pedagogy of writing maintained that learning should be based on the child's experience. To counteract

---

by tradition and therefore pontentially conducive to the new form of modern subjectivity of the masses (Tosaka, 1977). Interestingly, philosophy of everyday did not have the exact equivalent in the U.S., although pragmatism shows a faint resemblance to the reforms through everyday practice in that it situated the modern subject in practice of everyday action.

the rigidity and formalism of the conventional education, *tsuzurikata* pedagogues turned to the primordiality of daily life, the sphere of experience.

Most conspicuously, the *tsuzurikata* pedagogy emphasized the expressive ability of the child based on concrete every day experiences. Writing rooted in the "lively," "authentic" experience of the child was celebrated as the supreme source of the child's content of writing. For example, the first proponent of *tsuzurikata* pedagogy, Suzuki Minekichi—a literal critique and an author himself— harshly criticized the teaching of writing in the school system inherited from the Meiji period arguing that,

> The worst thing in our current teaching of writing is that, when selecting the topic, the teacher completely ignores whether students have or do not have experience necessary to write about that topic. More often than not, the teacher chooses a topic of which only a few students have experience. ..for example, some teachers still give an essay assignment about "Perseverance" "Spring" or "Our National Flag." You can write fact, but you cannot write a concept or notion. Even if you could, it would end up as mediocre and unexciting writing without any value whatsoever as written work.[30]

The pedagogy of writing "discovered" children's experience as an antithesis of the defects of the old education. Experience was seen uncontaminated within abstraction by the existing categories of knowledge. Indeed, the constructed primordiality in experience was the weapon for the pedagogues of writing to attack the formalism and abstraction of the Meiji education.

The *tsuzurikata* pedagogy was critical of mere "realism" in writing that did not go beyond the trivial description of daily occurrences as much as it was critical of indoctrination in the teaching of writing. Suzuki formulated the real purpose of the pedagogy of writing as the elicitation of the lively and actual feelings of the child.

---

[30] Suzuki (1935) p.504

The early development of the pedagogy of writing entailed aestheticism and romanticism in that it celebrated the purity and innocence of the child. Also, it attempted to seek the realm of the uncontaminated primordiality of the experience of the child as the last frontier of literal expression. Teachers who were very much attracted to this understanding of the child at the beginning, however, came to be frustrated by this artism. In the mid-1930s, tsuzurikata developed into a very different educational discourse—the goals of writing shifted from the "expression for expression's sake" in the early *tsuzurikata* to a practice of writing that takes the improvement of the object of writing—everyday practice itself— as the goal, through the act of writing.

In the early *tsuzurikata*, children's experience was defined most and foremost in the sensory manner. Daily practice that they engage in was, so to speak, only a canvas against which the child's inner emotions and sensory experiences were expressed and described. Daily life and activities were a source of uncontaminated experience, but everyday life itself was not endowed with an educational meaning. As *tsuzurikata* took a decisive turn toward a practice aimed at the organization and rationalization of everyday life, the role of everyday life was also transformed. *Tsuzurikata* came to be more popularly called "*seikatsu tsuzurikata*," translated as the "pedagogy of writing about everyday practice."

Recording of feeling, action, emotions and observation became a technology of objectification of everyday life. One *tsuzurikata* textbook for teachers argues this point:

> [*tsuzurikata*] intends to enrich children's lives through writing. We do not make a child help with house chores in order that he can write good composition. Rather, we

> make him write so that he can help with house chores more effectively and rationally, so that he can reflect on his own action and improve his everyday practice.[31]

At this stage, *tsuzurikata* utilized the primordiality of everyday life primarily not for its possibility to release the raw and unreified experience as an artistic realm, but more for a reciprocal relationship between the act of writing and everyday practice, in which writing takes everyday practice as the object of reflection and improvement.

Writing and Recording Farming to Elevate Everyday Practice

That the pedagogy of writing of everyday practice did not become a school subject gave it more flexibility to be applied in the existing curricula in various ways. Even arithmetic became a way to encourage the child to make observations from the quantitative perspective, solve questions, discerning quantitative phenomena in children's daily lives, and eventually "elevate their lives to one stage higher."[32]

The arithmetic curriculum in Saitama using children's writing added a new dimension to the goals of teaching in addition to teaching children mathematical concepts. The curriculum was dedicated to nurturing the habit of observing quotidian things in their quotidian lives from a quantitative point of view. Measuring, calculating, and other mathematical methods of investigation were regarded as a means to reach the more controlled evaluation of the "quantitative event" that the child encounters.[33]

---

[31] Minechi, 1940, p.160

[32] ibid.

[33] ibid.

Living up to the dictum of *tsuzurikata*, lesson themes were taken from the actual child' diary or record of daily occurrences.[34] This curriculum initiates the process of inquiry from the actual event that the child' encountered and wrote down in his or her diary, providing the child with necessary arithmetic tools and concepts to deal with the questions that spontaneously arose in their mind. The record of everyday life was really banal, as seen in the diary by one student:

> Yesterday, my brother and I visited the Ueno shrine and bought persimmons as souvenir. A pile of four persimmons cost ten sen. On the way home, we ran into uncle Yoshio, our neighbor. He was selling persimmons too and they were 20 sen for six. When we got home, father and sister were already home and eating persimmons. Father saw the persimmons that brother bought, and asked how much he had paid for them. Brother answered him. I told father too that Uncle Yoshio's were twenty sen for six. Then Father smiled and said, "then,
> my persimmons were the best bargain." I am not quite sure what he meant. His persimmons were fifteen sen for nine.[35]

The teacher exalts this writing for its closeness to the immediacy of the child's life. He states that this is "a precious record of his everyday life facts (*seikatsu jujitsu*). He wants the student "to grasp his vivid daily lives and solve problems in it to make it even better one."[36] Using this child's writing as an arithmetic question for the whole class, the teacher asked if the father's persimmons were indeed the best bargain. To answer this question, students were led to calculate the price per persimmon from the

---

[34] I translated this as "recording of everyday life" rather than as simply "diary," because the record of everyday life is meant to be shared and scrutinized by the teacher and peers, not a purely private practice of reflection as in diary-keeping.

[35] *Kyoiku Saitama,* 31, 1935.

[36] Ibid.

three people. Through the course of calculating it, the teacher touches on the arithmetic concepts such as denomination and rounding.

In the Japanese reforms, learning the arithmetic concepts was not the primary purpose but only seen as a process to reach the larger object, to gain control over everyday practice, by dealing with the "quantitative phenomena" in a rational manner. The goal of the arithmetic curriculum example above is, through the acquisition of arithmetic skills such as division and comparison of per unit price of fruits, to develop the "capacity for action" or "capacity to control one's life (*seikatsu tosotsu ryoku*)." [37]

Technology of Writing in the Rural Context

The pedagogy of tsuzurikata's principle, the connection between the act of writing and the organization of everyday practice had a systemic influence on practical education in rural schools in Saitama. Recording of one's farming on the school garden was a significant part of practical agricultural education in Saitama. Teachers encouraged students to keep records of what they have done on the farm everyday. In order to "teach students to understand their duties as a farmer and to manage the farm by learning to plan and execute the plan,"[38] students were given "planning cards." On this card, students filled out the conditions of the farm before planting and how they were planning to design the layout of the farm. After they actually started running the farm, they kept the "farming records" daily in which they described the process of the growth of the plants, and procedures they applied to it.

---

[37] Ibid. p.42.

[38] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 221 1940

Recording of farming practice was also part of the 4-H clubs in Ohio from its early stage. However, *tsuzurikata* of farming had a different focus in this activity, because its emphasis was not only on keeping the records of farming, but making a more intimate connection between the inner "self" of the child as the farmer, and the practice of farming by writing down one's work. As the following example of writing of a student shows, students were encouraged to include descriptions of feeling, emotions, and subjective observations in their writing, more than mere recording of tasks and works carried out on the farm:

> I rented 2 *tsubo* of land from school for 5 *sen*. I grow many kinds of vegetables and keep this farming diary. When I started the garden, I did not know how to grow vegetables well and it was not interesting to work on the farm. But now, I got used to it and everything became much more interesting. If we did not have the school garden, we would not be having as much fun as now in agriculture class. I think this school garden is a great entertainment for us. I am enjoying it a lot to plant different kinds of vegetables, give them fertilizer and wait for them to grow. On Saturday, I feed the garden with fertilizers, and when I come back on Monday, it is amazing to see that plants have grown much bigger over the weekend.[39]

The farm diary inherited and embodied the central feature of both early and later versions of the pedagogy of writing. Here, writing serves two-fold purpose in lieu of the aim of practical agricultural education. First, writing down about farming practice is the method for the child to gain access to a further analysis and exploration of how to improve practice of farming—contemplation on how to polish his "form" of or attitude toward practice through the description of innermost feelings. Second, writing down one's intimate feelings itself is seen as a practice to immerse the self of the child in practice. In order to immerse the child in the activity, it would not be enough to only write about the "objective" description of activity: It would have to touch on how the work touched on

---

[39] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 250, 1922.

the sincere, and unmediated feelings of the child himself. Only by going through the channel of writing down one's direct experience on the farm, teachers believed, education could teach the state of "submersion" in activity. Farm diary was a to for the writing subject to come to an incessant, and deep reflection on how he carries out quotidian practices, bringing himself to a constant vigilance and objectification of how the actor faces everyday life. [40]

This mode of self-reflection in *tsuzurikata* was unprecedented before the advent of pragmatic education. In practical educational reforms, borrowing *tsuzurikata* pedagogue's terminology, writing was a "technology" that constructed a specific mechanism among the three elements and the relationship among them; the object of writing (everyday life), the writer (the child) and the act of writing itself (farm diary).[41]

---

[40] This triad relationship was not what the initial *tsuzuriakta* pedagogue intended, and it was indeed criticized by the early pedagogues of writing. Improvement and organization of everyday life was by no means the goal of the pedagogy of writing for the founder of *tsuzurikata*. He criticized the argument of a school teacher who proposed that the aim of *tsuzurikata* should be the improvement of everyday life: "The purpose of unifying these spheres is to "emancipate" everyday life by connecting these formerly separated spheres so that they become coherent and improvement in one sphere leads to improvement of others, eventually ameliorating the entire society. For this purpose, this teacher encouraged the child to purge the inner conflict by writing the struggle between moral norms and human desires, so that the child can observe and realize the modalities of human life." Suzuki warns against the idea of improvement of society through writing, because the concepts anything larger than the immediate experience of the child risks another introduction of abstraction in pedagogy, which *tsuzurikata* intended to challenge.

[41] Minechi, 1940

The notion of technology is vital to capture the essence of the specific form of self-reflective practice the pedagogy of writing enabled.

Writing was not merely a "tool" or "method" of self-reflection anymore. The "tool" notion would imply that writing is instrumental, a set of procedures that the actor utilizes for any intended goals of his choice. The "tool" notion would imply that the act of writing does not have any a-priori connection to a specific goal. This is parallel to the notion of the "cultural tool kit,"[42] in which the rational actor determines the series of action to achieve a goal, which is determined *independent from the content of his tool-kit*.

The pedagogy of writing presents a completely different relationship between the actor and practice, because writing of everyday life is not an instrument for an extrinsic set goal. Writing is not an introvert, self-indulging reflection either.[43] "In contemporary society," a *tsuzurikata* pedagogue argued, "technology is not an instrument for life. It is rather an action."[44] Writing constitutes an integral part of the model of action and self-reflection. Writing is not an objective tool for choice but the actor is taken into the self-reflexive circle that writing imposes on him, and bringing him into the circle of writing on, reflecting, and changing his practice. This is the duality in the concept of writing as an action-technology: while writing takes action as its object, writing itself becomes a meta-practice in which the writing subject is constructed.

---

[42] Swidler, 2001.

[43] In this sense, the mechanism of creation of the subject in *tsuzurikata* is different from what Foucault argues about the practice of confession.

[44] Minechi, 1940.

By implementing the pedagogy of writing, practical agricultural education tried to cultivate within rural children and youth two important criteria as acting subjects. First, for the act of writing took as its sublime object the quotidian action in everyday daily life, and writing as a means to objectify the complexity of everyday life, practical education could take daily life and daily activities as a whole as an object of improvement and efforts. Second, the technology of writing realized an incessant process of production of the self-reflecting individual in every corner of ordinary life. The act of writing is the act of objectification of one's practice, but at the same time, this objectification puts the actor on the self-monitoring mode. Farm diary, for example, is an example of self-reflexive model of practice, in which the circle among the writer, everyday life, and the act of writing is closed, and complete. [45]

---

[45] This was not the only course of development for the *tsuzurikata* pedagogy of writing. One important ramification of the pedagogy of writing was the Marxist-influenced pedagogy of emancipation through writing. (Kokubun, 1948, 1974) The Marxist version of *tsuzurikata* held a critical view of the pedagogy of writing designed for urban middle-class children that the idyllic notion of childhood celebrated by urban reformers did not reflect the reality of the lives of rural children at all. These rural teachers, despite the censorship from the State and oppressions from the State police hunting down communists, maintained that writing everyday life meant to gain consciousness of the patriarchal social structure exploiting the rural populations. They claimed that the aim of writing everyday life lied in the "acquisition of the "eye to see everyday life," for the organization of everyday life by collective awareness of reality in an manner analogous to the Soviet education. A leading Marxist pedagogue of writing argued that organization of everyday life consists of two layers. First, organization is the process in which the individual is generated through an encounter with the raw reality. Second, through writing, recognition of the individual child is

It is important to note that the pedagogy of writing was not a pedagogy that attempted to change people's behavior through new ideas. Even on the "diligence farm," teachers did not preach the importance of "diligence" to make children work harder—teachers thought it would be impossible to "teach" diligence. Instead, teachers targeted the general formal relationship between the actor and practice as categories of conduct. For example, take a diary of a male student in Agricultural Vocational training course:

> A poor rural youth like me cannot pay a lot of money for fertilizer. I wanted to buy soybean hulls to apply in my farm, and asked my father if he could give me money to buy them. But he only told me mud and ash was enough [as fertilizer]. So I gave it a good thought. Father had promised me he would buy me a kimono when I pass the draft physical exam. When I passed the exam, I asked father to give me 50 *sen* to buy a summer kimono, and bought soy bean bran with that 50 *sen*. Then, I wanted to apply lime in my farm next but I could not possibly ask my father again. So I caught some fish in the river and sold them and earned 1 yen. It is very sad when a poor rural man need something he has to buy with money.[46]

This farm diary, which won the writer the first place in the Agricultural fair, impressed the judges because it presented the "dedication" of the boy to the running of the farm, his attempts to do his best despite his financial hardships. Here, we can identify a particular relationship between action and the actor; action is not geared to a goal to achieve an ideal or ideological goal, but the persecution of action in a certain form is the goal in itself. In the above example, how much harvest the boy could obtain as a final product using his hard-earned fertilizer did not matter. What earned him the prize was his attidudes or *taido*—Action is not a means to an end, but rather, practice itself is the goal in itself.

---

developed and enhanced by the "point of views and ways of thinking of the collective body" (Kokubun, 1948, p.314)

[46] *Kyoiku Saitama* 221

Everyday practice as a Pedagogic Sphere in Saitama Reforms

This chapter demonstrated that the realm of everyday practice became an adaptable and flexible pedagogic category to reach children's lives in entirety beyond the boundaries of curricula. That practical education in Japan was taken into the school environment, to a higher degree compared to the Ohio case, did not mean at all that it was confined into the isolated domain of school life. Agricultural education was not aimed at disciplining children for autonomous engagement in the task only on the school project garden: its ultimate aim was to extend the same diligence and self-discipline outside of schools, to their everyday practice on every single deed.

The inclusiveness of the Japanese agricultural education did not come from the institutional design of practical education, but rather from the educational category that agricultural education constructed. Agricultural education in Japan created everyday practice (nichijyo seikatsu) as a new pedagogic category,[47] a pedagogic tool to work on the "form" of everyday action of the child.

---

[47] Everyday life has been a popular analytical category in some schools of Japanese studies (Harootunian, Garon, 1997, Koschmann, 1996). The obsession with everyday life as an analytical category in Japanese studies itself is an interesting trend that distinguishes the varying academic focus in the studies of modernization in Japan and the United States. Everyday life attracted attention as the site of modernization, and more specifically, the site of State intervention in society (Garon, 1997). However, many research treat everyday life as if it had existed all the time, instead of delving into the question, how everyday life came to be constructed as a social category that was objectified for intervention. Furthermore, these research do not ask why indeed the category of everyday life leads to mobilization of the populace. In other words, they don't ask what kind of implication the category of everyday life contained for everyday practice of people.

Everyday practices were indeed one of the central concepts in the educational reforms during inter-war Japan. For example, the most progressive pedagogic magazines in the 1920's, *Kyoiku Kagaku Kenkyu* (Science of Education Magazine), argued that "the child's attitudes (shisei) in his or her everyday practices as a member of the nation has to be nourished and fortified"[48] and everyday practices had to be organized with the principle of what a good citizen of the State should be, which would ensure the quality of moral and national culture. Everyday practice became the site in which people were expected to demonstrate and show that they were productive and contributing members of the Nation.

For Saitama teachers, everyday practices presented an ideal medium of education of "form," because it was the sphere of intimacy to the child himself, where he has "unmediated" experiences in which the child encountered and struggled with everyday life problems; because it was the sphere of feelings, experiences uncontaminated by rigid reason that Meiji education tried to suppress or dismiss; because everyday banal activities presented the residual sphere unmediated through the reified and abstract system knowledge. Everyday practice was a sphere of autonomy, where the actor has immediate control on oneself and one's action, and, second, improvement of the form with which one governs his or her own practice is the goal in itself, regardless of economic and social success that might derive from it.

Situating learning in everyday practice was an ideal way to reach this goal---because it could grant access to where traditional academic subjects that focused on

---

[48] Kido (1940)

"teaching on the intellect" could not reach—the general "form" or the "voluntary attitudes" with which the child persecuted everyday activities. In other words, the Saitama reformers found another route of access which was prohibited to the Meiji education for its limited attention to intelligence and content of knowledge as the objects of education.

The two different experiences in pedagogy: Saitama and Ohio

There are two elements of the pragmatic reforms in Japan distinguishable from that in Ohio. First, Saitama reforms shifted the *object* of pedagogy from the content to form. As a result, the agricultural education removed the problem of consciousness, readiness, and aptitudes of the learner from the criteria and possibility of learning. The form could be taught, regardless of the perceived maturity of consciousness, mental faculty or whatever one might call it, of the learner. Furthermore, the aim of education was shifted from learning content to nurturing the ability to demonstrate certain attitudes and forms in action at work.

This was not the case in Ohio, where reconstitution of farm activities into "whole experience" meant the mastering of rational connections among activities, using farming skills and agricultural science to achieve desired results of practice.

The contrast becomes clear if we compare the arithmetic curriculum in agriculture. In both Japanese arithmetic education based on children's writing and the Extension courses as well as elementary agriculture in the 4-H Club, themes from farming were utilized in questions. The Ohio curricula insisted that even arithmetic

questions should have "a much more direct bearing upon the industries of the people,"[49] and would include questions such as "From a Merino sheep weighing 112 pounds, a fleece weighing 14 pounds was taken. What per cent of its weight does the sheep shear?"

In the Ohio reforms, however, real-life examples were introduced to arithmetic learning as an appropriate context of knowledge to be acquired for farmers, as well as in order to make the targeted knowledge more accessible. In the Saitama case, the emphasis was reversed: the context of the real life example was not taken as a scaffolding to acquisition of skill, but rather real-life itself was taken as a object, and skills were the means for that purpose.

Second, the definition of experience was different between the two cases. Ohio educational reformers' interpretation of experience was conditioned by the formula of the "reflex circle of learning." Experience was given a schematic formula, as a coordinated relationship between action, the actor, and the sensory reaction. Because of the rigorous definition of the components of experience, Ohio reformers could connect the schema of practice to scientific farming—pursuit of the consequences of practice by refining the composing parts of practice and relationship among them.

On the other hand, Japanese reformers did not formulate experience as rigorously as Ohio reformers. For Saitama teachers, experience mattered pedagogically only because of its alleged unmediated-quality, as a means to reach the core of the actor inaccessible to traditional education. Therefore, the goal of education was coined more diffusedly,

---

[49] A.B. Graham Papers, 40-8-1-8

compared to their Ohio counterparts—"improvement" everyday practice in action, and polishing of the form of practice.

Practicism: Toward the New Model of Action as the Goal in Itself

Practical education, both through the farming practice as well as the practice of writing of farming was a reform of the form of action, instead of education that was a reform through ideas. This was often expressed as education of the "attitude (*taido*)" with which children engaged in everyday action.[50] One Saitama rural teacher argues that, in order to nurture the habits such as a taste for farming, and the spirit of diligence, educating toward concepts through the child's consciousness is useless.

Education for the form of action, laid a cultural foundation of the "practicism" or *jissenshugi* as the sublime model of action. Practicism, according to one teacher, entails the innovative ideas on value and action; "practice is a form of action; but practicism maintains that action itself is the aim in itself."[51] Drawing on Aristotle, he distinguishes two types of action: "Action that has an external aim should be called 'work' or 'production,' and does not deserve to be called practice."[52] This new model of action suggests a channel between the actor and action that is not mediated by a motivation, rational calculation and normative values as external goals to pursue action. Practicism argues that engaging in the action itself is seen as the goal itself, and further improvement

---

[50] *Kyoiku Saitama,* 210, 1925

[51] *Kyoiku Saitama,* 75 1939

[52] Ibid.

of practice means nothing but improving practice itself.[53] To put it in a more extreme manner, this was connected to the ultimate phase of engagement in practice in which the actor is so absorbed in action that "doing (*nasukoto*) and the self become one and get into total unification."[54]

This new alternative model of action proposed by practical education remodeled everyday practice, and farming, and the improvement of everyday practice as the goal itself. Persecution of action itself as the goal of the action---this schema of practice reinvented everyday practice as the ultimate object and context of demonstrating the desirable form of action. This is the reason why the pedagogy of writing preferred the metaphor of "technology" then "tool," because "technology" captures the internality of the act of writing to the everyday practice of self-improvement.

Another important implication of practicism is that, when properly attained, practicism drives the actor to action *without being motivated by any external and superior goals*. Everyday practice itself became the object of perfection—if the goal of action is in this purified model of execution itself, then, action does not need the goal as a drive anymore.

---

[53] Action without a goal and consciousness in fact reminds me of Bourdieu again, because his habitus concept was made to account for the dispensability of subjective consciousness in the coincidence between practice and structure. However, Bourdieu's habitus notion can only account for the static, almost idealized world of class society—despite that he claims that habitus is a historical product (Bourdieu, 1988, p.56)—he misses the dynamic moment of the historical emergence of experience, and therefore reifies it as an analytical tool.

[54] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 49th, 1936

Next chapter will show that practicism in practical agricultural education constituted an important cultural infrastructure for wartime participation and mobilization of farmers as Japan went deeper into the Pacific War. Practicism, because it permeated the model of action that removes the problem of consciousness as a motivator toward action, it constituted an ideal device for mass mobilization. Paradoxical as it might sound, I argue that the "ideological" mobilization of the Japanese farmers was made possible because of the model of practicism, which practically nullified consciousness as an element of practice.

Practical education became a stepping stone for the Revitalization Project which took effect in 1933, following the prefecture-wide implementation of agricultural education. Practical education had preceded the Revitalization Project in many of its themes and ideas. Ideas such as interpreting the tenant-landlord relationship not as an exploitative relationship but rather an a-political relationship; situating recording of farm management as the central tool for managing farms profitably, were both the central principals of the Revitalization project. In this sense, the agricultural education reforms laid a foundation for the Revitalization Project by reformulating the basic components of farming practice.

Chapter 6: Labor as a Moral Sphere: Mobilization of Farmers through Practicism

> The members of our patriotic labor team of our school reached the realization that our work is aiding the state and its war efforts. Nobody complains about the tough work. Even when they unhull rice—this is new to most of members and very difficult—they grapple with this task with joy. They get 50 *sen* to buy lunch as compensation. Some donate even that money as part of service to the State…[1] (Report of a village teacher in 1942, on the labor team constituted with his students)

This chapter explores the connection between practical educational reforms and wartime mobilization of Saitama farmers. I will show that the schema of practice that the pragmatic reforms nurtured—practicism, or action as the aim in itself—became an essential conduit for mobilizing the rural population in Saitama during the Pacific War, from the late 1930's to 1945.

To explore this question, I will examine how the model of action cultivated in the pragmatic reforms in the 1920s was inherited and utilized in the course of implementation of the Rural Revitalization Project in the 1930s, a State-led emergency rural economic plan. This chapter demonstrates that the model of action bred by the pragmatic reforms offered a rich and powerful cultural infrastructure to mobilize farmers to cooperate with the Revitalization Project. The key question here is parallel to the analysis of the American case—what aspects of the "new" schema of practice within the pragmatic reforms became consequently expedient in making farmers organize their conduct in accordance with the plan of the regime? In the preceding chapter, I have

[1] *Kyoiku Saitama*, 118, 1942

shown that the pragmatic reforms in Saitama constructed the model of action that was not driven by an externally set goal, or a measurable consequence of action, but made how the actor engaged himself in action the most important criterion for "good" and "bad" practice. I point out that mobilization of Saitama farmers made use of this schema of practice.

Asking "how pragmatic education fed into mobilization?" inevitably runs into the paradox of pragmatic educational reforms.[2] The pedagogy of writing and practical agricultural education was a criticism of the existing education that the reformers contended suppressed the autonomy and spontaneity of the learner. Both the pedagogy of writing and agricultural education aimed at challenging the subjugation of the learner to the authority of prefixed categories of knowledge. How did such an enterprise come to collaborate with war mobilization, which would mean to throw the rural population into the subjugation to the entity, as abstract as the State?

Another question concerns the seeming gap between the domains of educational reforms and mobilization. Why did the building of subjectivity through the immediacy of everyday experience that practical education championed provide a ground for the devotion for something as "abstract" as the State—in other words, how did the State sneaks in to the realm of immediacy and familiarity of everyday practice?

---

[2] *Saitama Kyoiku-Shi*, 1972. This is not only true with the educational history. The 1920's in Japan is generally seen by scholars as the period of sprouting liberalism, as apparent in the names given to various "civic movements" that sprouted in this period, such as "Taisho Liberal Educational movement." This view accompanies the conventional paradigm that the military regime one-directionally imposed authoritarianism by oppression, censorship and the brutal power of policing.

In my attempt to answer the above questions, I do not intend to repeat the cliché; that the notion of autonomy and immediacy in everyday experience in the 1920's educational reforms was circumscribed from the beginning[3] (Nakano, 1998), or the wartime regime's tactics of suppression of liberal movements in the pre-war Japanese society was so powerful and effective that it successfully cracked down on the liberal moves.

Instead, I will delineate the model of action cultivated by the pragmatic educational reforms and its continuity into the period of war mobilization. I will illuminate the continuity between the pragmatic reforms in the 20's and the 40's mobilization in terms of the common model of action salient in each period.

The Rural Revitalization Project in Saitama, Japan

The Rural Revitalization Project—officially the Farm, Mountain, and Fishing Village Economic Revitalization Campaign—was the most comprehensive and systematic intervention measure taken by the State to "rescue" the rural economy and communities from the most devastating crises that followed the Great Depression and the steep fall of agricultural product prices in Japan.[4] The goal of the Revitalization Project

---

[3] This is another popular argument that claims the non-existence of civil society in Japan by arguing that the spontaneous moves from the society against the State in the 1920s were circumscribed from the beginning. Again, this view derived from the assumption that delegates non-West to the impossibility of the ideal typical democracy and civil society in the West.

[4] I have to refer here, however, to the precedence of the Revitalization Project, the Local Improvement Campaign, between 1900-1918. This campaign marks the bureaucratization and centralization of local rural organizations. In the context of rural society, agricultural co-ops and mutual help organizations were

was first coined as economic—controlling farming household debts, rationalizing the use of land and the allocation of domestic labor to increase farming household income, improving farming methods and eliminating the waste in the distribution system of crops to respond to the devastating state in which many rural villages found themselves following the severe agricultural depression that hit the rural communities across Japan.

In reality, however, the Revitalization Plan had a far wider scope than being a narrowly-defined economic salvation plan solely targeting at financial rebuilding.[5] The Project acted upon the social and cultural domains of village life to achieve the economic recovery, which included reforming the "feudal" habits in rural communities and raising the morale of farmers as "farmers of the Empire" to cope with the difficult time. In this sense, the Revitalization Project was a wholesale attempt by a modern State to consolidate the three domains; economy, cultural, and political. Economic recovery was to be realized through the cultural reforms and the robust political awareness of farmers as an important part of the nation state.

---

incorporated into the state bureaucratic system. Furthermore, the promotion of the ideas such as thriftiness, diligence and restraints in the spending habit of the people was one of the main themes of the campaign. The Revitalization Project, therefore, has to be understood in the larger trend and flow of the intervention in everyday life by the State (Garon, 1997) from the 1900's.

[5] Indeed, financial aids provided to the model villages were disproportionately small compared to the grandiose plans that the government set up. Historians evaluate the small support that the State provided was a result of the military budget pressuring the national budget, leaving little leftover to be allocated to agricultural reforms. Hence, the Revitalization Plan needed to resort to "self-revitalization" efforts relying of local resources.

The Revitalization Project also had large influences on rural people's lives, due to the highly structured organizations set up for the execution of the plan. The revitalization committee was set up within the governing structure of each village, which consisted of subsections responsible to unique tasks. [6] The central committee of the Revitalization Plan, nested in the Ministry of Agriculture, appointed model villages every year. While they were expected to follow the basic guidelines given from the central government, these villages set their own goals and plans. According to the selection criteria for the model village in 1932, "The spirit of Revitalization" as popularly called included ideas as the following:

> Following the establishment of the Nation, nurture the spirit of collaboration and mutual help within the village.
> Follow the spirit of voluntary revitalization. All the institutional preparation will bear nothing if we reserve the feeling of dependence on others.
> Find your place in the nation-state and be aware of it. Think contribution to the society and public. Regardless of your occupation, wealth, and aptitude, there is always a way for everyone to make contribution to society. [7]

---

[6] According to the "Guide to Making the Revitalization Plain in your Village," the subsections and the divisions of labor were as following: Department of Education: Raise the morale for revitalization and educate villagers; improvement of rural education; Department of farm management: rationalize land use and allocation of labor, cut the farm management cost, improve farming methods and control production; Sales and purchase department: control sales of agricultural products and purchases of fertilizers; Department of finance: helping agricultural households take care of debt. *Kosei Keikaku no Tatekata* (The Guide to Making Your Village Revitalization Plan), published by Saitama Nokai, 1933, pp.3-4. They covered the entire spectrum of the village life.

[7] "Ken Kosei Iinkai ni oite Shingi seru Kosei Keikaku Jyuritsu son no Gaiyo" (1933)

There is a consensus among scholars of modern Japanese history that the Revitalization Project was the steppingstone to the wartime mobilization and integration of the rural communities into the war regime during the Pacific War.

Institutionally, researchers have pointed out that the Revitalization Plan completed the unification and centralization of the pre-existing rural organizations (Nan 2001, Mori, 1999). In order to smooth out the distribution of goods, information, and resources and facilitate the recovery of the rural economy, the Project aimed at building coordinated or "harmonious" relationships[8] among the existing village organizations, such as the prefecture, municipal, and village agricultural associations (*no-kai*), various kinds of co-ops which were formerly fragmented along the lines of types of agriculture, farmers' credit unions, as well as municipal and village governing systems and schools.

In these studies, the Revitalization Project has been depicted as the completion of centralization of rural institution that brought various organizations under the communal goals of easing the financial situations of rural communities. The centralized institutional web, according to these studies, directly translated into the rural wartime system, which served to increase the production of war crops, allocations of the excess labor power in appropriate domains,[9] and—this is often the point of the strongest emphasis— the "spiritual" cooperation of farmers with the war measures under the severe shortage of labor, fertilizer, and tools. For example, the consolidation of farmers' co-ops into a well-

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Although not as prevalent in Saitama, the allocation of excess labor included sending out the second and the third sons to Manchu and other colonies of Japan as immigrant farmers.

connected and “harmonious” larger body in the Revitalization Project was appropriated by the wartime regime as an institutional conduit to supervise crop production and distribution (Nan, 2001).

The Revitalization Plan was the very first instance in modern Japanese history to centralize rural organizations and apply the idea of the “harmonious village” for the good of the country. There was a precedent, the Local Improvement Plan, embarked in 1908, in which the government tried to utilize the momentum and necessity from the hard-won war with Russia to capitalize on rural resources. The Local Improvement Plan is often situated as laying a preceding administrative model for the Revitalization Plan (Mori, 1999). While the spiritual emphases of harmony and diligence of the two plans are similar, the magnitude of the Revitalization Plan is incomparable in its scale, and its consequence as apparent in the whole sale mobilization of rural populations during World War II. Besides the institutional centralization, the Revitalization Project has been regarded as the foundation for “bottom-up” mobilization during the war. The Revitalization Plan projected the path to economic recovery by local efforts and initiatives, promoting “unified efforts and collaboration (*ichidan yugo*).” Scholars have argued that the Revitalization Plan prepared the “mental” condition which prepared the collective participation of farmers in the “voluntary” participation in the war regime. Various efforts aimed at revitalizing rural economy from the depression, after the war in China progressed in the latter half of 1930s, transformed into a means of the defense of the home front.

In the following excerpt from the Revitalization statement in 1938, the same language used for the economic revitalization, such as mutual help among villagers,

diligence and self-sufficient household economy was re-made into a response to the wartime demands:

> We have to increase the supply of domestically-made fertilizer. As the war deepens, it is becoming more important to secure the production of crops. However, the supply of fertilizer, an important agricultural resource, is getting scarce. To solve this situation, it is important to use commercial fertilizers economically and wisely, but also it is important to raise the spirit of diligence, up the supply of domestic fertilizer and intensify the labor on the farm. Help your neighbors if their men and horses have been conscripted.[10]

The Revitalization Project, despite that it was planned and supervised by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, needed to depend on the local institutional and human resources to the maximum (Smith, 2001, Nomoto, 1981). That the Project was often unofficially called the "*self*-revitalization project (*jiko-kosei*)" captures this point succinctly. The Revitalization Plan maintained that the spontaneous enthusiasm and initiatives of the local villagers and organizations was the indispensable ingredient for successful recovery of village economy.

Problem of Spontaneity, Ideology, and War Mobilization

Studies have interpreted the Project's emphasis on "spontaneity"—local morale, reliance on self-help and mutual help—as paving a path of the smooth development from the Revitalization Project to the wartime "fascism."[11] The argument here is that the

---

[10] *Kosei Saitama*, (16) 1938

[11] The Japanese Empire until 1945 was rejected as a proper "fascist" state by Western scholars (Linz and Stepan, 1997) while Japanese scholars have been persistent in using this term. From the point of view of this project, the problem of whether Japan was a fascist state or not is not a valid question to begin with, because it ignores the similarity of the process of totalization of the modern state across different "regime types."

Revitalization Project had prepared the vessels to elicit and suck up the "voluntary" collaboration of farmers with any given common goal, be it economic recovery or winning the war.

This view gains further momentum by being combined with the problem of imperial ideology, which is often the nodal point in the scholarship on modern Japanese history. Researchers, especially those in Japanese academia, have drawn a picture that the ideology of collectivity that the Revitalization Plan contained from the early stage, such as "whole village strives for recovery" and "beat selfishness and work for the entire village"[12] preceded much of the wartime discourse of self-sacrifice for the totality—"for the country," and "defense of the home front."

There is a good reason why scholars are inclined to draw such a picture. Any readers of the Revitalization Project Plans published by Prefectures and villages will be struck by their emphasis on "moral inculcation (*seishin kyoka*)" through various institutional conduits. The Revitalization Plan was often decorated with the statements such as "willingness to serve the totality is the real collaboration" and "revitalization with the spirit of service"[13] as seen in the statement of a Revitalization model village.

> The basis of the Rural Revitalization is the moral education movement (*kyoka undo*). Revitalization that focuses only on materiality will be destroyed at the first sight of obstacle. The fruit of Revitalization needs spiritual backbone. The real school education has to be rooted in the home village, and raises the youth who endeavors to build good villages and homeland. Being a good member of village means to be a good Japanese. For this purpose, at our school, children recite the Imperial Rescript

---

[12] *Kosei Saitama*, the revitalization magazine shows the transition from the Revitalization Project to the war time system using the same language, from the 1933 through the early 1940s.

[13] Both from Kosei Keikaku no Tatekata

> on Education, salute the national flag and worship the grave of the patriots every morning.[14]

The strong educational aspect of the Revitalization Project has often been interpreted as the proof that the Project was the conduit of the ideological content such as Imperial ideology. Scholars have argued that this idea of absorption of the selfishness and service to the totality (village as well as the state) has been combined with the existing vertical power structure inherited from the traditional village-society and reinvented as a channel for political mobilization to explain the "fascism" structure of Japan. The cult of voluntary service to totality and mutual help which fit the traditional rural political structure depoliticized the investment of resources and labor for the goods of the State, while it is sucked up through the imperial ideology, along the vertical power structure that led to the State (Ishida, 1956).

Research that criticizes this view as too static, and ignoring the agency of farmers argue that the co-operation of farmers with the war regime was driven more by their calculations and underpinned by their conscious choice (Itagaki, 1992). However, these two views are only the opposite sides of the coin, because they also treat the problem of the co-optation of rural communities as a matter of the presence or absence of farmers' "will" to the collaboration with the State—or if they "subjectively" chose their action.

Rather than approaching the problem of mobilization from the perspective of the consciousness of farmers, I take an alternative path, by turning to the dual nature of the Revitalization Project. While many of the Revitalization Plans were decorated with

---

[14] *Kosei Saitama* (13) 1938, p. 3

explicit expressions of imperial ideologies, the Plan at the same time had a very quotidian, down-to-the earth focus. It designated incremental changes in daily life as a way to financial recovery and reviving the rural morale. One of the signature traits of the Revitalization Project indeed was the unification of these two divergent levels as in the expression such as "harmony between moral and economy, material and spirit."[15]

This chapter argues that the pragmatic model of action laid out in the 1920s' made it possible for everyday reforms and the grandiose ideological expressions to not only co-exist but also make up the Revitalization Project as a coherent "plan" that unified quotidian practice and "spiritual" mobilization. This means that ideology on its own was not an independent variable that would explain the conduct of farmers.

Planning the Revitalization in Saitama: Devoted Planners and Favorable Conditions

Compared to other prefecture, Saitama Prefecture is characterized by the top-down and centralized approach to the implementation of the Revitalization Project, supported by avid local bureaucrats. Studies focusing on the implementation of the Revitalization Project in Saitama often stresse the strong leadership of the chair of the Prefecture Revitalization Committee (Nomoto, 1981). The chair was a devotee to the *hotoku philosophy*, a popular agrarian thought whose origin dates back to the agrarianist Ninomiya Sontoku in the Edo period.[16] Research on the Revitalization Project in Saitama

---

[15] *Kosei Siatma* (1) 1933

[16] *Hotoku* philosophy was one of the most influential and conspicuous agrarian thoughts in modern Japan. It is not a systematic body of philosophy. Rather, it preached a set of desirable virtues of a rural person and communities, "virtuous characters (*tokumoku*)" such as diligence, temperance, modesty and honesty, and

stresses that the dedication of the Chair to the *hotoku* thought explains the centralized push to implement the Project. *Tohoku* thought demonstrated a perfect match with the goals of the Revitalization Project. For example, Nomoto (1981) argues that the counties that suffered the impact of the agricultural depression the most witnessed the most vivid revival of the *hotoku* philosophy in the 30s, and these villages were the most active participants in the Revitalization Project. She also contends that the moral virtue in the *hotoku* philosophy, such as mutual help among villagers and self-reliance rather than dependence on state aids, had a decisive influence on building up the incorporation of the entire village and every community into the Revitalization plan, and therefore the *hotoku* thoughts had a virtual effect on the incorporation of rural Saitama to the war-system.

As informative Nomoto and others' studies are, they do not approach the problem of participation in the Revitalization Project from the perspective of everyday practice. They interpret the social influence of the *hotoku* virtuous items, which were also promoted by the Revitalization Project as "values" that encouraged people to certain types of conduct. This approach also tends to assume a gap between the 1920's "liberal" period—the period of the pragmatic reforms— and 1930's "fascist" period in terms of

---

also promoted harmonious rural community by mutual help and assistance. In a way, it could be called an agrarian version of the *shuyo* philosophy, a discourse on self-improvement (Havens, 1974). Throughout the history of modern rural Japan, rural reformers summoned up the *hotoku* philosophy as a guide of moral inculcation in times of crises (Iwasaki, 1997). It provided rural reformers a spiritual barrier to ward off the perceived ills industrialization eroding the agrarian society, while keeping up the morale of farmers and containing the complaints and grievances of farmers within the self-alleged virtuous personhood and status of farmers.

values that were supposed to be rampant in each period, while ignoring the possibility of underlying continuity.

Schools as the Central Agents of the Revitalization Project in Saitama

Contrary to the argument of many research, the continuity between the pragmatic agricultural reforms and the Revitalization Project is rampant. The collaboration of schools with the Revitalization Project has been the case in many villages in Saitama, where the major driving force of the Revitalization Project were the educated, progressive rural middle-class including schoolteachers and principals (Nan, 2001).

Researchers are quick to point out the leading roles that school principals and teachers took as local leaders in the Revitalization Plans. A famous example is their promotion of chicken farming by setting up chicken pens in the school playground, advertising the financial benefits of chicken farming to help household income. Some educators took a further step to "educate" villagers on the use of chicken manure as fertilizer in mulberry fields (Nomoto, 1981). These anecdotes have been used to demonstrate the collaboration of schools teachers to emphasize their influence as the local middle-class over farmers.[17]

However, it is not enough to point out "what" teachers and principals were promoting. When we look further into the practical agricultural education reforms and the Revitalization Project in term of the model of everyday practice promoted by the two, the continuity at the deeper level becomes clear. In fact, practical agricultural reforms in Japan, despite that they were launched as educational reforms, were highly conscious of

---

[17] *Kosei Saitama* (7) 1934

the agricultural problems in the village from its beginning. A school principal argues to this point:

> Reforms of rural villages cannot be done without the awareness of farmers. In order to nurture farmers with acute awareness, we have to educate young school children with avid enthusiasm to improve farming and love for farming. We have to encourage them to study farming method with creativity, while remain open to advice from others, and above all, be serious and professional about farming. [18]

Educational reforms in rural Japan, therefore, were from the beginning more than just educational reforms but took the reform of the entire village as its ultimate goal. It follows that practical agricultural education in the 1920's almost preceded the idea of the Revitalization Project, such as the "awareness of the farmer," the voluntary efforts to improve farming, and the ideal of self-reliance.

The agricultural education reform proved to be a useful resource to support the Revitalization Plan because practical education never held the acquisition of actual skills and knowledge of farming as the primary goal of the curriculum. The practical agricultural education was not a technique-oriented vocational education and did not "at all aim at teaching children skills in order to make a living in the future."[19] Rather, the real aim of it lies somewhere else, in:

> its training (kunren teki) value to stimulate and form the spirit. Through the collective engagement of practical training, the agricultural education emphasizes personal virtues necessary to lead daily life. Acquisition of scientific knowledge should be regarded as secondary.[20]

---

[18] *Kyoiku Saitama,* 221th (1928)

[19] *Kosei Saitama,* (1) 1933

[20] *Kosei Saitama,* (1) 1932

As I have shown in detail in Chapter 5, the significance of practical agricultural education in Japan was not in the content of education—but in the form of education. This made it possible to redefine the demarcation of the object of education beyond the traditionally defined realm to a more comprehensive range, that came to include the life at home, and the general form of action that the child took in the quotidian level of life.

The contribution of pragmatic education that the Revitalization Project actively exploited was in that it "educationalized" everyday practice by making the wider realm of the village life the object of improvement project. The importance of schools as the central agency of the Revitalization Project stems from the way in which pragmatic reforms transformed farming, household chores, and running of household economy as the domain of improvement, and improvement and perfection of the individual personality though practice.

Farmer Dojo: Training of the Form of Action through Everyday Practice

While the theme had been present since the 1920's, once the Revitalization Project was embarked on, Saitama villages started producing a more explicit venue in which daily practice of farming was turned into a polishing environment for the form of practice. One instance is the numerous number of "*dojo*"[21] or "training farms." These

[21] There are variation of names for the informal schools of the similar function, such as "training dojo (*shuren dojyo*)" "Youth dojo (*seinen dojo*)." The word "dojo" in Japanese usually refers to martial art training schools. The name "farmer dojo" therefore insinuates the aspect of discipline and training that the education within these farms attempted to pursue.

farms were the embodiment of practicism as a model of action inherited from the practical reforms and absorbed by the Revitalization Project.[22]

Farmer *dojo*s were village-based informal training "schools" for rural youths. Leadership of these *dojo*s varied depending on the village; in some villages, the village young men's fraternity (*seinendan*) founded it as part of their self-improvement project, and in other places, village agricultural association (*nokai*) took an active part.

The farmer dojos typically combined the logic of "education" and "work." Their motto was very much reminiscent of the "*shuyo*" or self-improvement discourse that practical agricultural education was also based on. These farms defined engagement and daily toil on the farm as the path to personal growth and refinement of the personhood. Furthermore, *dojo*s demonstrated a clear influence from practicism—many of these farms idealized the state of practice of farming in which the "whole person (*zenrei*)" was absorbed in work. These *dojo*s ultimately aimed at transforming everyday farm work to a transcendent action, beyond simple drudgery or a profit-seeking activity.

The *dojo* members met during weekends, and more intensively during winter when the youths were not occupied tending their own family farms. These farms put into practice the theme of building a good personhood through strict and almost ascetic

---

[22] There are several streams of the farmer *dojo* in modern Japan, including the farmer schools initiated in the mid-1920's by Christian groups modeled after the Danish *Folke Hoischkole*. However, the *dojo*s that I deal with in this chapter are only vaguely related to these early examples of Christian-supported farms whose principle aims was in building the ground for landed independent, small- to mid-scale farmers. The Farmer *dojo*s that were part of the Revitalization Project are derivative of the Christian farms in it promoted the self-reliance of farmers but it shed the Christina aspect in the 20's.

organization of daily life according to a rigid time schedule. They devoted most of daytime to strenuous work on the farm. [23]

According to the schedule of one farmer *dojo* in Kuna village in Saitama, the trainees woke up at 5 am, and after washing their face and changing, they congregated for the morning rituals. At the ritual, they prayed for the well-being of the Emperor, all lining up to south, approximately where the imperial palace in Tokyo would be, read aloud the Shinto script and the pledge as the following:

> Purity: we are innocent, and fight temptations, and stand here as the real Japanese man
> Reverence: Our land is the land of god, and our emperor is holy.
> Practice: We choose action over indulging in thoughts. We are not sages but we express ourselves in action.
> Collaboration: We are self-reliant. This is for us to collaborate with each other. [24]

After the morning rituals, they all went off to the farm except the cooking crew. The tasks they pursued included tending the farm attached to the *dojo*, clearing forest to cultivate new patches of farm, and offering help to other villagers if during harvest time.

The activities of the dojo were often completely geared to actual farm work. The *dojo* activities were not organized by subjects and lectures. Their motto was "physical work itself is learning"[25] and under this justification, the *dojos* often did not teach farming techniques and knowledge despite the advertisement that these *dojos* would

---

[23] The following data is taken from *Kosei Saitama* (8) on the case of Kunamura in Chichibu County. "murano kiso wo tsukuri seinen dojyo"

[24] *Kosei Saitama*, (8) p.20.

[25] ibid. p.19

teach modern farm management and technology.[26] After the day's works was over, at night, they gathered around the fire and filled in the farm account book, and in winter, they weaved ropes and straw bags.

The farmer *dojo* was indeed an embodiment of practicism. *Dojo* celebrated farm labor and the absorption of farmers in it as a path to reaching the real farmer-hood. This element is contrasted to the classroom farming that many *dojo* students despised. One instructor of the *dojo* argues:

> It would be far easier to lecture somebody how to farm. If you are only talking about it, you don't even have to even worry about weeding and budgeting…But when you are really dedicated to farming, and, on top of it, if you want to be self-sufficient from the crop from your farm, you get to learn that fertilizers don't grow plants: the soil makes plants…just imagining and talking about farming doesn't do any good.[27]

The farmer *dojo* defined learning in a very physical term: learning using one's own body and through the process of one's own work and toil. Here, experience is boiled down to the very immediate sense of hand-labor on the farm. The ultimate goal that the *dojo* students often expressed was to achieve the state in which the entirety of the farmer himself is absorbed in farm work, and this was often described as *mushin*—literally

---

[26] There is a gap between the perceived crises of rural youth and the actual practice of the *dojo*. The village youth attributed the economic and social stagnation they were facing to the "ignorance and lack of spontaneous efforts for improvement" because these were "satisfied with the primitive practice of agriculture and do not care about progressive" The solution to this, they argue, is to "improve farming methods and explore the way to revitalize the village without replying on the help from others." (Horigane-mura seinen danpo, 8, 1933) Despite this gap, the farmer dojo still maintained its popularity, and I argue that this gap itself demonstrates the attractiveness of practicism as a model of action to respond to the overall sense of crises and reforms.

[27] ibid. p.17.

means working with the "disappearance of mind." This points to the extreme stage of development of practicism, in which anything outside of the physicality and immediacy within the process of daily farm work was excluded from the relationship between the farmer and farming.

This rationale for the total absorption in labor went so far that farmer *dojo*s often limited farming to the work right on the farm, rendering any extra work involved outside of it unnecessary and irrelevant to the farmer-hood, under the rationale that, "as long as we make good crops, the co-ops will deal with the marketing. Farmers cannot farm and do business at the same time. We learn the value of collaboration (with the co-ops) through our experience."[28] This strikes a sharp contrast to farmers in Ohio, whose criterion of a good farmer was measurable according to the profit one makes from the harvest. In Saitama *dojo*s, the engagement in and devotion to farm labor is detached from any external motivations and results such as the marketing price of the harvest or how much profit it made.

In 1933, the Farmer *Dojo* was officially incorporated under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry that supervised the Revitalization Project. The farmer *dojos* within the Revitalization Project was relocated as a useful educational institution to spread the virtue of diligence, sacredness of farming and its "spirituality."

Research has often emphasized the resonance between the farmer *dojo* and the bureaucratic agrarianism that designated farmers as the producer of food for the country of the Emperor, and criticized any undesirable tendencies among farmers such as

---

[28] *Kosei Saitama* (8) p19.

commercialism, individualism, and profit-seeking (Nan, 2002). For sure, the argument of the bureaucratic agrarians that maintained the necessity of re-establishing the "virtues" of rural communities and the awareness of farmers is in match with the practice at farm *dojo*s.[29] It is also true that upon the arrival of the Revitalization Project, farmer *dojo*s were specifically designated as a training venue for young leaders that would serve as moral leaders at the village level to put forth the implementation of the vision of the Revitalization Project.

The contribution of the *dojo*s to the Revitalization Project is more than just the continuation of the ideas on the idealized practice of farming. The practicism around which the everyday activities at farmer *dojos* were organized became the conduit of action for the participation of village youth during wartime. Practicism became an ideal cultural infrastructure for Saitama farmers, because mobilized activities did not need to be mediated by ideas. Instead of agrarianism ("this is our position and mission as a farmer in the nation") or imperial ideology ("helping the villagers meant to serve the country"), practicism became a far more powerful and determining frame of action that drove village youths into participating in various practice for the defense of home.

Practicism and Mobilization of Villagers

Schools were one of such sites where practicism exemplified in the farmer *dojo* worked as a powerful resource for mobilization, in utilizing the "excess" labor power of

---

[29] This is the basic argument of Ishiguro Saneatsu, probably the most prominent and notable bureaucrat agrarian in the Ministyr of Agriculture at the time of the Revitalization Project. (Ishiguro, 1938)

village children to the goals of the Revitalization Project. Eventually, it was applied to solve the labor shortage problem during the war to maintain the level of production.[30]

As young males were drafted and sent to the war front in China, and the labor shortage in the village became pressing, there were many cases in which the village officials asked the school principals to send students to tend the untended farms.[31] At the surface level, this might seem another typical instance of total mobilization in which the segments of society that had been regarded as nonproductive or "pre" productive, such as children, became the last resort as a resource of labor. But how does the "total mobilization" become possible? The Japanese case shows that the cultural devices and the form of practice devised by the preceding educational reforms were indispensable in this process. The logic of education was essential in transforming some spheres of society such as schools into a productive resource. The tight connection between the "pedagogic practice" at school and mobilization became even more visible as the Revitalization Project became more overtly incorporated into the war effort.

---

[30] This logic was often applied in the mobilization of children as farm labor source during the time of labor shortage in the village. Under the banner of "education embraces family life and education," schools administered a household survey in 1943 on the size of the farm, number of livestock, whether the family kept silkworms or not. This survey served the purpose of calculating how many days of schools should be cancelled to make students help the farm labor, based on the calculation that the child's labor power was about 43% of an adult. The logic of inclusion of everyday life in education legitimized the appropriation of children to labor.

[31] *Kyoiku Saitama* (118) S17

. For example, the school farmer *dojo* in Okegawa village, the "Okegawa *dojo*," a typical example of school training "farm" in an elementary school, put the legacy of practical education in action. The Okegawa *dojo* was a "volunteer" group of students and teachers who met on Sundays early in the morning to help with farms suffering labor shortage. Their visit to these families was called a "condolence visit" and students and teachers helped the family with their farms.

The logic of practical agricultural education legitimized the mobilization of labor power of children. In the report of the principal of Okegawa Village, he maintains that service through the volunteer work was not only a service to other member of the village but ultimately and fundamentally had an educational value:

> Labor service should not be just a productive act. In the godly spirit of the mountains and river, we nurture the soul (tamashii) of the rural teacher and students. Through cutting the roots and trees, weaving straw bags, we polish our personhood (*shuyo*), and learn reading, math, and science, and we learn about life.[32]

While these visits were the last resort to cover the serious labor shortage in rural villages as the war progressed and often times it was doubtful how useful they turned out, the application of children's labor power was legitimized by the connection between physical work and education. Here again, hand-labor was given a meaning more than being a service to external end (such as helping others or even the country), but also it was ultimately embedded in the nurturing relationship between the actor (the child) him/herself and the immersion in physical work on the farm; farming was most and foremost the self-enriching practice. By the justification of "learning," service labor was

---

[32] *Kosei Saitama* (14), p.

removed of the externality in its aim, but it was defined as rewarding to perfecting the way the child engages in the labor process.

As the war progressed, "patriot farms (*hokoku nojyo*)" of like this popped up in many elementary schools to open and prepare new farms to expand the cultivable areas, as well as tending the farms that village tenant farmers could not take care of due to the shortage not only of human labor but animal power, fertilizers and basic farming tools after the State started drafting these to be used for military purposes.[33] As is obvious from its name, the organization of these student service groups were intended as a way to facilitate students to gain "awareness of being part of a member of the Great Co-prosperity in Asia." Meanwhile, practical engagement in farm labor was possible only because it was also defined for its educational function. The patriotic ideology was only effective when supported by the application of the combination of the pedagogic idea of self-improvement and the labor/practice as a means of polishing one's personality.

Book Keeping Movement: The Technology of Writing Applied in Economic Recovery

The Revitalization Project put a tremendous emphasis on promoting the habit of keeping household accounts and diaries as a strategy for recovery from debts of rural households. Diary and account keeping were regarded as the key to achieving the two central economic goals of the Revitalization Project; reviving farming households from debts by clearing the balance of expenses and income, and reexamining the monthly allocation of domestic labor to eliminate the waste. Under the banner of "No recording, no revitalization (*kicho naki kousei nashi*)" farm diary and account keeping were heavily

---

[33] *Kyoiku Saitama*, (134) 1945.

promoted as a way for farmers to find out the shortcomings of their management of the farm and household economy. [34]

A farm account movement was also present in the case of Ohio, as was discussed in chapter 4. In Ohio, the farm account movement promoted by the county agents was also an important part of rural reforms, as a way to increase per household income. The emphasis of the Ohio account movement, however, was on delineating the cost- profit factors by clarifying otherwise invisible costs in running the farm. It was specifically geared toward quantification of household economy.

The farm account movement in Saitama, on the other hand, had a different point of emphasis. First, it derived from the tremendous influence from the pedagogy of writing from the previous decade. Through the application of the technology of writing, the bookkeeping movement in the Revitalization Project had more implications than being a mere financial remedy; it perpetuated the triad relationship of self-reflection on practice, among the actor, practice, and the act of writing that the pedagogy of writing entailed.

Writing as a method to establish the triad relationship among write, practice, and the practice of self-reflection—this is exactly what demarcates the book keeping movement in the 1930's from the previously existing practices of record keeping. Japanese farmers of course had a habit of record keeping on household and management of the farm before the Revitalization Project. A traditional example is *saijiki*, or the record of family economy in rural households that small, land-owning farmers typically

---

[34] *Kosei Saitama* (3) 1938

kept on items such as family event, and community rituals and associated expenses, the locations, sizes and harvest of the farm they owned, and calculation of taxes.

However, the habit of keeping *saijiki* before the bookkeeping movement, first of all, was practiced by significantly small portion of farmers. One obvious reason was the low literacy skills for most farmers to keep such a record. Rubinger (2007) points out that only 20% of male farmers in the 1870s were proficient enough in writing and reading to be able to keep daily account (p.144). The actual number of literate farmers who actually kept the diary would have been even smaller. In addition to the technical problem of literacy, the pedagogy of writing was far more stronger in its influence than the writing habit in the past because it was accompanied with the expansion of formal schooling in the rural areas, which made it technically possible for at least male farmers to have enough literal skills and carry out such a practice,

At the time of the Revitalization Project in the early 30s', the technical problem of literacy was not a problem. The promotion of diary keeping was carried out methodically and aggressively by the Revitalization Plan Committee of Saitama Prefecture. The Committee designed and published two versions of diaries—for adults and for young children. In order to have as many farmers as possible keep the diary, they tried to distribute the diary book for a low price of 10 *sen*. In addition to keeping the cost of material low, various village organizations joined in heavily promoting diary keeping, such as the Agricultural Associations (*nokai*), agricultural experiment stations, village fraternity groups (*seinen dan*), and of course, schools.

Some county Agricultural Associations, enthusiastic of the promotion of the farm record movement, made copies of the diary sheets and distributed them among farmers

for free, so that farmers could not make excuses not to buy a diary book in order to save even the petty expense. Furthermore, county agricultural co-ops ran monthly workshops to educate farmers how to establish a habit of book keeping, how to fill in each item and columns, and how helpful book keeping would be for financing the household and getting out of debt. Co-ops also held promotional competitions where farmers submitted their diary books to be evaluated.

Our Household Diary

The "Our Household Diary" aimed at making farmers record daily financial transactions, expenses and income, and the amount of time spent on working on the farm correctly and orderly. The diary was devoted to clarifying the content of financial activities typical of agricultural households. For this aim, the Family Diary was far more detailed and methodical compared to the traditional format of farm account such as *saijiki*. The diary set separate columns for bartering and cash transactions, consumption of products of one's own farm inside and outside of household, and income from sales of produce and from property. In nutshell, this diary was meant to be a tool for farmers to comprehensively grasp the multi-layered and diverse financial structure of an agricultural household.

So how widespread was the practice of diary keeping in reality? Admittedly, the percentage of farmers in Saitama Prefecture who were actually keeping these diaries was not as high as the Revitalization Committee wished. In 1934, the Saitama Revitalization Committee reported that there were at least 50,000 households in the entire Prefecture that kept the diary and household accounts regularly. In Irima County in north of the Prefecture, the Book-keeping Promotion Association set a goal to have one-third out of

its 30,000 households keep the farm account, but the result was that only 20% of them, or 6,500 households, actually followed it.[35]

In addition, the efforts of the Revitalization Committees to spread the habit of account and diary keeping often faced obstacles despite their avid promotion and advertisement. Many farmers often could not keep up with diary keeping for more than a couple of months, and the Bookkeeping Promotion Association in many Counties lamented that during the busy seasons of spring and autumn, many farmers "dropped out" from the habit. Lack of time and the structure of the template of the diary, which turned out too complicated for many farmers, were the two main reasons that the book keeping did not quite become quite an universal practice in many Prefectures.[36] There were farmers who explicitly expressed their grievance that they didn't understand the reason for keeping the diary, and therefore, turned indifferent, if not overtly resistant.[37] The Revitalization committee often lamented that farmers didn't take book keeping as seriously as they should, and in the Diary Contests and Exhibitions, only one-fifth of villagers submitted their diaries for evaluation.

Despite that bookkeeping did not develop into as pervasive a practice as the Revitalization Committee had wished, I regard the practice of book keeping as the central venue for making a self-reflexive acting subject. While not all farmers might have kept

---

[35] *Kosei Saitama* (12) 1938

[36] These two reasons were cited most often by farmers who attended a promotional meeting for diary keeping.

[37] *Kosei Saitama* (23)

the diary regularly, for the following reasons, I argue the bookkeeping movement shows us the newly emerging relationship between everyday life practice and the actor.

First, the book keeping movement in the Revitalization was not entirely top-down: it was also avidly supported by local farmers who were desperate to get out of debts. Many of these farmers who actively participated in the movement were so-called "model farmers (*tokuno ka*)" who were often the leaders of the youth fraternity or Agricultural Association. On the other hand, there were farmers who were not in prominent political and social positions in the village but still adhered to the diary keeping. These farmers contributed their "success stories" to the village publications, and preached the benefits of diary keeping to encourage their peers into the habit.

Second, how many households were actually keeping the diary does not undermine the cultural importance that the diary keeping movement represents, because of the centrality of the diary keeping movement in the Revitalization Project, as well as the wide range of village society which was incorporated into the promotion of this practice. The bookkeeping movement was a pervasive movement, and got most of all rural organizations involved, which included schools, youth fraternities, and the Agricultural Associations. Therefore, the official number of households that actually kept the diary reported by the Revitalization Committee only shows one aspect of the permeation of the practice.

The farm record movement has been regarded as an example of "rationalizing practice" by scholars of modern rural Japan (Smith, 2001). Finding the moments of rationalization in the Revitalization Project and other wartime reforms is a recent obsession of the scholarship of modern Japanese history. These studies aim at

challenging the traditional view that regards the rural communities as passively engulfed in the authoritative co-optation of the regime. This recent revisionist perspective emphasizes that wartime reforms both by the authority as well as the middle-class reformers were most of all marked by the rationalizing elements that succeeded in taking in people for its novelty and progressiveness. (Koschmann, 1999, Itagaki, 1992).[38]

In the case of the farm diary movement, it was interpreted in the context of modernization of farming methods and management. Revisionist scholars argue that some progressive farmers were attracted to the farm recoding keeping movement because of its innovativeness and that farmers participated in the bookkeeping movement *as a result of* their own rational calculation and followed the direction of the Revitalization Project and the other agricultural policies.

For sure, the purpose of diary keeping movement was economic; it aimed at finding out the defects of farm management such as the sources of debt, eliminating the sources of waste that many rural households were trapped in. The rationalizing intention of the Revitalization Plan is hard to deny. A typical way in which "model" farmers described the benefits of book-keeping such as the following seems to testify to this point:

---

[38] One reason this perspective became controversial was that, by pointing out the rationalizing and modernizing elements of many war time policies, scholars could fabricate the "continuity" between the pre-war Japan and post-war Japan. This is another reaction to the conventional view that regards pre-war Japan as a period of authoritarianism, which was completely demolished and transcended after the defeat in the war. I think the argument of the continuity has nothing new in it, besides being a rather inflated reactionary contention that demonstrates how much the Japanese scholarship is obsessed with World War II.

> [before I started keeping account] I had not idea know how much I was spending on fertilizers. When I sell rice or wheat, how much I spent on fertilizer has to be subtracted from the profit. If I didn't know the number, I would forget to make payment to the fertilizer merchant. Book keeping helped me see it clear by which source our daily expenses are covered: agricultural income or savings. If my wife makes payments for household and I pay for the fertilizer, everything stays unclear and murky. Without the habit of book keeping, it would be impossible to know all this.[39]

Furthermore, living up to the slogan of "quantification of life," bookkeeping facilitated the quantified allocation of domestic labor based on the size of the land.

> With the help of the account book, I could determine the smallest land that our family should be cultivating, and the minimum profit that one *tan* of land should be producing. If we divide spending related to non-agricultural items by per-*tan* profit from the farm, we figure out the minimum number of *tan*s that we have to cultivate to make ends meet….in our case, if we cultivate 1-cho and 8-tans, we do not go into debt…the most fruitful thing we got from bookkeeping was that we could determine this.[40]

Widely called the "quantification" of everyday life (*seikatsu no keiryo-ka*), bookkeeping was indeed a quantification of household economy and labor allocation. It became a buzzword in the Revitalization Project as an icon of rationalization, as in the slogans such as "rationalization of farm management and life" and "rationalization of village economy."[41]

While rationalization and quantification did underlie the manifest logic of the movement, the significance of quantification should be interpreted in the larger schema of the self-reflection on everyday life that book-keeping practice entailed. Naturally, by definition, any bookkeeping makes the writer engage in self-reflexive contemplation, as long as it involves recording of one's own practice and indulging in retrospective inspection of one's own action. However, when it comes to the diary keeping practice,

---

[39] *Kosei Saitama* (9) March 1938

[40] *Kosei Saitama* (24) June

[41] *Kosei Saitama* (13) July 1938

the act of self-reflection is not such a self-evident practice of looking back on one's own practice and keep record of it for future reference.

The bookkeeping movement in Japan was unique in that it aimed at tightening the connection between the actor and his practice. Account books and diaries were seen as an self-examination to inspect how and how much the farmer engaged in farming practice in the Revitalization Project. This is evident in the analogy of mirror to the diary keeping practice. "By looking into this mirror," a booklet published by the Revitalization committee argues, "one finds out the defects of one' management and find out a solution to it."[42]

The aim of the diary keeping was not limited to the self-inspection of economic activities. While economic recovery was seen as the primary goal of bookkeeping, the way the benefits of bookkeeping was expressed shows that it aimed at changing the quality of the farmer as the actor, and his way of relating to the way he leads everyday life. The benefits of diary- and bookkeeping listed by the Revitalization Committee of Saitama included multiple items which went beyond being an economic tool. Besides that it worked "as a mirror of agricultural economy," it was also aiming at nurturing the virtue of diligence and giving farmers "hope and belief in farm management in rural life."[43]

Changing and Improving Daily Practice through Writing

Furthermore, the book keeping movement also tried to change the daily behavior of farmers, by making the patterns of daily lives themselves more committed and fit to

---

[42] *Kosei Saitama* (3) 1938

[43] *Kosei Saitama* (24)

recording. Along with the writing down in numbers one's everyday economic activities such as income and spending, the bookkeeping movement spread various devices for writing down one's daily activities in a continuous basis. [44] The promotion of the diary keeping movement was often accompanied by more specific tactics on how to develop and keep the habit of keeping accounts and diary.

A popular method was to keep a small blackboard at the entrance of the house, where one can put down notes immediately after coming home while still in their shoes. Promoters of the diary, as well as farmers who actually kept up with the habit, encouraged the idea of keeping the blackboard as a useful devise to make the daily recording more precise and less spotty, thorough and detailed, by easing the trouble of writing down everything at once after the day was over, by giving farmers convenient opportunities to write down items such as cash spent, earned, or the number of hours spent on the farm.[45]

Also, while major part of the diary was devoted to writing down the numbers concerning financial activities, "every single number you put it, and the little notes you

---

[44] This implementation of self-reflection that bookkeeping movement promoted certainly had a collective influence too. In some counties, the Agricultural Association (*Nokai*) organized the neighborhood groups in which the members brought in their own diaries and mutually criticized each other's diary. However, this kind of collective practice was often called a way to further stimulate "self-improvement" for revitalization. Therefore, I would rather understand this practice of writing as an individual practice, rather than directly connected to collectivity.

[45] *Kosei Saitama,* (26)

put down every day" were deemed equally important.[46] As one village governor claimed, the accounting and diary revealed their "everyday practice and facilitate criticism and evaluation of life."[47] This demonstrates that the impact of the diary keeping on the engagement of people in everyday practice was not so much the resulting economic improvement of the household income and management of the farm, as cultivating the basic form of action to constantly record the everyday action.

Seen from this aspect, bookkeeping is more than what researchers have called a "rationalizing practice"—it was a specific application of the technology of writing in that it targeted at reforming how farmers engaged in farming and running household. The notion of rationalization, purported by research, only assumes that farmers were consciously working on making larger profits, and adopt more economically sound way of running the farm. I believe dairy-keeping worked on the deeper, more tacit level on the form of action that farmers employed than their conscious calculation through rationality.

While this self-reflective practice was based on the basic triad structure of writer-writing-and practice, compared to the pedagogy of writing, the diary keeping was even more structured in hammering in this relationship in farmers because it had the fixed format of recording. Its focus on economic activities and quantified numbers of work hours spent on the farm did not mean that it left out any other kinds of activities in everyday life. The diary was organized in such a way that the writer projected every miniscule action on a day in relation to their economic and labor activities. In a way, the

---

[46] *Kosei Saitama* (30)

[47] *Kosei Saitama,* (8). P.30.

diary keeping movement made the practice of self-reflection penetrate deeper in farmers' lives.

Book keeping in Schools—"My diary" and the Revitalization

Schools became the central site yet again for the farm account movement. The oft- repeated rationale of the Revitalization Committee, which was employed by schoolteachers and principals themselves, shows the degree of emphasis that the Revitalization Project placed on educational institutions. They argued that bookkeeping should be literally a "unconscious habit." Ideally, keeping a diary should not be even an intentional effort. Educators agreed that building up such an habit should start in childhood. Under the slogan, "revitalization start with children,"[48] diary keeping at school was developed into a vital part of the Revitalization Project.

The Revitalization Committee distributed the child's version of account-diary books at schools called "My Diary (*watakushi no nikki*)." This diary was also advertised in the Revitalization magazine, to the same extent as the adult version, "Our Family Diary." The advertisement for "My Diary" shows that "My Diary" was integrated into the realm of the Revitalization Project. The advertising text for the diary intended for children goes like following:

> For the revitalization of rural economy, diary keeping is essential. In reality, however, it turns out difficult for many people to keep the habit. We have to make diary keeping as part of our daily habit, just like we wash our face when wake up and brush our teeth. To develop this habit, it is important to start with young children. [49]

---

[48] *Kosei Saitama* (6)

[49] *Kosei Saitama* (4) 1938

"My Diary" testifies for not only the centrality of schools in the larger scheme of the Revitalization Project, but also that the general goal to socialize and educate children was further developed in accordance with the visions of the Revitalization Project. "The revitalization of our people's lives" an elementary school principle argues, "depends on how practical we can make elementary school education. It is extremely important to establish the habit of keeping diary. This will not only benefit the education but also their future."[50] The goal of education was to a great extent transformed into that identical to what the Revitalization Project aimed at.

In its format, "My Diary" was not as detailed and complex as its adult version "Our Family Diary," but was designed to be a preparatory version of it. "My Diary" introduced financial accountant elements. Students not only made entry on the occurrences and event of the day, but they also recorded their daily expenses buying sweets and school supplies and calculated at the end of each month and year to get the total income from allowances as well as expenses. "My Diary" set several categories in which students itemized spending, such as "saving" 'school supplies" "snacks." The advertisement for the diary claimed that keeping of diary helps children save "at least 5*sen* of allowances in rural areas and 10sens in cities."[51] The intended likening of "My Diary" to the larger scheme of the Revitalization to nurture the sense of financial awareness was apparent in that teachers, through teaching children the habit of diary keeping explicitly, encouraged saving on the part of children. As a result of calculating

---

[50] *Kosei Saitama* (6) p.35

[51] ibid.

how much money students needed to spend in a year on school supplies, teachers encouraged that students negotiate with their parents how much money they would need to purchase supplies in the coming year. If the student spent less in the year, s/he was encouraged to save the rest of money in the credit union.

While the emphasis on children's financial habit was the main feature of "My Diary," its purpose should not be understood as that of a narrow financial education. As one principle put it, "My Diary" had a broader aim targeting at "practical, social and moral training" by giving students an "experience of being disciplined in financial activities."[52] Although "My Diary" was often called a preparation for "budgeted life (*yosan aru seikatsu*)" as an adult, its focus inherited the principles of the practical agricultural education which focused on the building of certain habits, attitudes, and the forms with which students controlled and reflect on their own lives.

Teachers added their own revisions and additions to the diary in order to further advance the diary's function to have students organize and discipline their everyday life. In some versions, children recorded their daily schedules, such as what time they woke up and went to bed. In addition to this, space was devoted for items such as "morning work" and "night work" where children recorded what kind of work they accomplished in the morning and the evening everyday. To include in the "work" item, young children could put in homework and study, but older students were expected to contribute to farm chores and domestic work.

---

[52] *Kosei Saitama,* (6) p.36

"My Diary" shows that the pedagogy of writing, which had taken roots in school curriculum in the 1920's as a pedagogical practice, was incorporated into the Revitalization Plan as a powerful resource to advance a self-reflexive practice through writing. While the *tsuzurikata* was transforming into the vehicle of discipline and control of everyday practice within the realm of education already in the 1920's, it provided an infrastructure to build the "ideal farmer" that the Revitalization Project was built on—writing as a method of self-reflection and discipline. [53]

From the Subject of the Rural Reform to the National Subject

One of the conspicuous contrasts between the reforms in Ohio and Japan was the centrality of schools in rural reforms. This is not unrelated to the fact that the Revitalization Plan was defined as a "moral revitalization" as much as it focused on

---

[53] Admittedly, this transition from the pedagogy of writing to "My Diary" as a resource for the Revitalization Project did not come without a conflict between the pedagogic and the economic. While the bookkeeping movement applied its central principle of writing as a technology of self-reflection and improvement of practice from the pedagogy of writing, there was a discussion as to what should be the focus of the diary for children. There was active discussion among rural educators what format the diary should take: should it focus on the description of everyday life, or on more practical training of book-keeping? How children take care of their allowances? In fact, many principals complained that the "My Diary" emphasized the "number" element too much and ignored more "pedagogic" purpose, the description of children's lives. On the other hand, the Revitalizaiton Committee insisted that diary keeping did not bring any good if there is no number element that students could calculate and use as a mirror of their financial activity.

economic revitalization[54], and therefore situated education as the central strategy of economic reforms.

The moral education (*kyoka*) that the Revitalization Project promoted, however, was not an education of the idea of education of instilling ideas or content, but rather aimed at the form of practice. Furthermore, a good actor was envisioned to be the one who "practiced" the morality, by the execution of hard work on the farm, and by establishing the self-reflexive patterns of daily life. Contrary to the popular belief, this stayed the case even after the war deepened and the Revitalization Project started getting more explicitly embellished with the "imperial ideology" in the late 1930's.

Although the war in China had been progressing since 1931, it was only after 1940's that Saitama agricultural publications started being marked with nationalistic messages. Reading through the Revitalization magazines after 1940, such as *Kosei Saitama*, would give an impression that the magazine was suddenly hijacked by Imperialistic messages that argued the necessity to cultivate the national farmer—farmers of the Emperor, who would till the soil for the glory of the Japanese Empire.

The self-reflexive subject that the Revitalization Project had attempted to nurture was indispensable in making the "farmer of the Empire." The idealized image of the farmer that the Revitalization Project had pursued, the farmer who "combined the moral and economic" in farm labor. The Revitalization Project transformed the farmer who struggled for economic recovery to the farmer who struggled for moral action, when the reforming subject was the farmer who engaged in the constant engagement of the self in

---

[54] *Kosei Saitama* (24) June p.43.

the task of reflection on one's practice. Being a good farmer was an economically supple farmer, but his conduct was not even economically driven anymore, but his conduct came to have a moral dimension now. The economic revitalization became the revitalization of the subjectivity of farmers, to redefine the farmer and his position in the context of the larger society.

> In the feudal times, farmers in reality did not think of other aspects of society. They were not
> aware that he was a member of society and his duty according to this status in the society. He
> was aware of himself only from his own eyes. Book keeping and diary keeping can change this
> traditional attitude of farmers. [55]

The agenda of the self-reflexive practice in the bookkeeping movement constructed farm labor a site where the farmer could perform his moral worth, both as a good reforming agent and a good member of the society.

Conclusion: Patriotism redefined—Practicism and War Mobilization

While the language of patriotism and nationalism, such as "for the empire" and "for the soldiers at the battlefront" saturated the language of the Revitalization Project after the war in China broke out, in order for such ideological beliefs to be practiced, it had to be mediated by a more concrete schema of practice that was nurtured by the practical education and the technology of writing in Saitama. Both practical agricultural education and the bookkeeping movement promoted a method of building up an internal relationship among the actor, practice, and the writing of reflection, where they were in mutually improving relationship. This particular relationship constructed a very intimate

---

[55] *Kosei Saitama* (9) 1939

space in the everyday practice of farmers where the actor, from the involvement in his own intimate experience in practice, weaved a space for subjectivity building.

This triad removed the notion of the ultimate goal to which action is geared, because it was a self-sufficient relationship whose perfection was the aim in itself. The internality of the triad relationship among the actor, practice, and the act of self-reflection also changed the model of action; where what the consequence of the practice was displaced as the primary concern for the actor. Action and the actor were evaluated according to how one executed that action.

In this triad relationship of practice, ideology was not included as an element that drove people's conduct and patterns of action toward patriotism. The internality of actor in action implicated in the technology of writing is important in the basic mechanism of mobilization in the Japanese case that is *un*mediated by ideology. Take the example of the pedagogy of writing. Studies have shown that the pedagogy of writing, which initiated as a liberal educational movement that promoted free expression of the child, was mobilized for an explicit war effort during the war,[56] when writing of everyday practice became writing of nationalism, so to speak, when *tsuzurikata* mobilized children to master nationalistic writing to celebrate the Empire and condolence letters to soldiers at war front.

According to this explanation, the opportunity for free expression in *tsuzurikata* progressive pedagogy was co-opted by the unilateral power of the State. Contrary, I argue

---

[56] Nakano, (1999) This is the popular tone in which researchers have talked about the liberal educational reforms in the 1920's that have been oppressed or co-opted by the military regime from the late 1930's on.

that the mobilization of the "progressive" move such as the pedagogy of writing was not the case of suppression but rather the adoption of the internally fixed relationship among the writer, the writing, and the object.

In fact, pedagogues at wartime themselves pointed this out. About using the topics such as patriotism and national flag for *tsuzurikata* education—the topics that were expelled and banned as writing subjects by earlier proponents of *tsuzurikata* as too "abstract" and estranging—were reintroduced to the pedagogy of writing as "perfectly appropriate for writing of children, since they now "already exist as an objective fact."[57] This is the alchemy of the pedagogy of writing, in which what was originally excluded from the immediacy to the writer re-appears as a "concrete" and "objective" fact through the act of writing.

This movement, where the "immediate" was to be consummated and absorbed into the "abstract" at the end, was indeed the feature of not only the pedagogy of writing, but the educational reforms based on the immediacy of everyday experience as enriching for the autonomous subject of learning in Japanese educational reforms. The pedagogy of writing claims that the form of subjectivity found in the first-hand experience was pure and untarnished. It took in the immediacy of everyday life as an ingredient to build the self-improving subject. At this moment, however, experience was not any more objective and untarnished and the unmediated relationship between the writer and everyday life was processed by the educational discourse already, despite the reformers' idea, when the

---

[57] Minechi, 1940, p.280

triad relationship reifies everyday life as a constitutive element of the subject who strives for its own perfection.

Chapter 7: Pragmatic Reforms: One Idea and Two Forms of Everyday Practice

Construction of Experience as the Realm of immediacy

The reformers in Ohio and those in Saitama were attracted to pragmatism for the same reasons. They shared a criticism of the existing educational system; they regarded it as oppressive to the spontaneity of the learner, and based on outdated and ineffective pedagogic methods that inculcated children with abstract notions, and knowledge that children had no direct understanding of or access to. The educational reformers sought to establish a new definition of the learner and learning processes, in order to overcome the image of the child as objectified, and subjugated.

By developing this new idea of education, reformers sought a remedy for the crises that beset rural communities. Their reforms were not limited to education per se; they attempted to redefine the identity of the rural in a modernizing and industrializing society by cultivating an alternative model of the subjectivity of a farmer.

Reformers turned to pragmatism and its theory of action to seek a new model of the subjectivity of the rural person. The contexts that worked as the receptor for pragmatic ideas were different between in the United States and Japan; for example, the discursive preconditions present in Japan, of *shuyo shiso*, or the discourse of self-improvement, played a large part in determining what aspects of pragmatism were accentuated and absorbed into Japanese educational reforms. Nonetheless, the

fundamental logic of action that reformers in two societies adopted was the same; practical agricultural education provided a justification that the "acting" subject was a desirable quality in a member of society, and made farm work the means to achieve that goal. The goal of education now was shifted from the infusion of abstract knowledge mediated through the built-in faculty of the learner, to the creation of agents of action who constructed their integrity in the concreteness of the first-hand experience of the learner in activities, especially in the engagement of farm work.

Caution should be taken, however, not to get lost in this language of contrast between the abstract and the concrete. The contrast between abstract "thinking" and concrete "action" with which reformers often portrayed their reform agendas should not be taken at face value, as if traditional education was in fact rooted purely in abstracted knowledge, while practical agricultural education was based solely on the immediacy of the child's experience.

The language of contrast itself, between the abstract and concrete, was construction of pragmatic reformers. When reformers constructed the dyad between the abstract and the concrete, by designating the traditional education to the realm of abstraction, the pragmatic reforms constructed the realm of the "immediate experience" of the child as an educational device, a new category to establish the novelty of their reforms.

As Dewey himself argued, the construction of experience as a device of reform does not mean that there was no experience whatsoever before pragmatic education (1935, p.15). Nonetheless, reformers demarcated the new qualities of experience they regarded useful for the reform. The experience that pragmatism constructed was a

breakwater for the abstraction of the existing social order. Also, experience became the logical justification to position farming as a practice that fortified and nurtured the "national" and "professional" farmer.

In order to create a new identity for the farmer in a rapidly modernizing society, the construction of experience was essential. The reformers distrusted traditionally defined rationality as the main ingredient of the rural subject. That kind of rationality was much less accessible to rural people, reformers believed, whose everyday lives were mostly consumed in physical work on the farm. But what if the subjectivity of the rural person could be built up from his own experiences in daily activities, their practice of everyday farm work?

Physical work, rather than abstract ideas, as a more effective conduit of learning is succinctly and vividly demonstrated by the slogan of the 4-H clubs—learning not only with the head but also with the hand. The realm of farm work was designated as more approachable to children as well as adult farmers, because it was comprised of elements immediate to farmers themselves in their daily work. Farm work, as opposed to the realm of cognition, because of its proximity to the child's experience, guaranteed more direct access to learning by the learner.

A parallel theme is found in Japanese practical agricultural education, where engagement in farm work was regarded as ultimately educational in building children's character, or the particular "form" in which they conducted their activities. Farm work, for the Japanese reformers, was a potent and effective venue for learning, because learning through physical work could detour consciousness and work directly on the

more fundamental determinant of everyday practice—the general "attitude" (*taido*) with which children carried out everyday activities.

In the process of reforms, reformers essentialized experience as an a-priori category of purity. Reformers regarded experience as an original sphere intuitively found by the farmer in action. It is so intimate to the actor that it is primordial. In both societies, reformers aggressively exploited these qualities. As the *tsuzurikata* pedagogues put it, experience constructed as if it were pure and uncontaminated helped the reform challenge conventional education, the language of authority, the alienating categorized knowledge of science, the separation between the world of the familiar and the process of learning,[1] the mystification of truth, and the suppression of subjectivity of the learner.

Furthermore, pragmatic reforms made the new model of subjectivity approachable to everybody in rural society. If experience is primordial, its access is uninhibited by any intervening elements. Everybody can find access to it, in the very mundane activities of daily life. Locating the realm of education in everyday activities also meant that in-school education that reformers envisioned was no longer targeted at an uncontexualized body of knowledge but was expanded to the every possible corner of children's lives, including their private lives at home. This was more evident in the case of the Saitama reform, where teachers proposed the goal of school education was the improvement and control of everyday practice (*seikatsu no tosei*).

---

[1] This is strictly from the point of view of the rural reformers, since the first case of implementation of pragmatic reforms did take place in the Dewey school in Chicago, where the student body was from the privileged urban middle-class.

The incorporation of the experience of everyday activities into educational agendas gave education a grater scope in students' lives, by consolidating all aspects of learners' lives as the object of education. This expansion of education to everyday life, however, was not caused by an expansionist intention of schools and reformers to place everything under their supervision and challenge the autonomy of life outside of school. Rather, the inclusion of children's daily lives outside of the classroom in educational agendas was justified by the core notion of the reform that mundane activities were pedagogically valuable.

In both Japan and the United States, the construction of the sphere of experience bred anew idea of everyday practice based on the mutually constructive relationship between the actor and practice. In this new relationship, the acting subject is formed in the involvement in physical activities, as an gent who makes meaningful connections among them through his own capacity to process it as a whole, coherent experience.

In the case of the 4-H club, the constitutive nature of the relationship was manifested in its motto, "thinking is action, always action." By making farm work the central element of learning processes, it reversed the traditional formula that thinking determined action. The 4-H club manifested that being a good practitioner of scientific farming was the goal of new agricultural education. In Graham's presentation of the learning process, there was no presumed a-priori fixed faculty in the child that served as the initial requirement for learning to happen—the child became a good farmer by the fact of making a "rounded experience" out of his farm work practice.

Although it manifested itself in a slightly different manner, in Saitama, the pedagogy of writing and the diary-keeping movement were the equivalent of "thinking is

action." The pedagogy of writing was aimed at establishing an intimate connection between the child, the practice of writing for self-reflection, and everyday activities. In this triad, through the act of writing as a self-reflexive device, the complete circle of action-reflection was created, where the actor engaged in everyday practice, reflected on it in diary, and went back to everyday practice again to further improve it. The pedagogy of writing also attempted to create the writing subject as a figure who emerges in the process of this circle as a master of everyday practice, one controls and disciplines it.

External and Internal Position of the Actor in Schema of Practice (Chapter 3 and 5)

In both contexts, a new schema of everyday practice emerged as a result of educational reforms in which engagement in banal physical activities by the experiencing individual became constitutive of the criterion for being a good member of the rural community. Each society had a unique schema of practice, and a different definition of what the "good acting subject" pointed to.

In the American case, the "outdated" way of farming came under attack. Reformers focused their criticism on the relationship between the actor and action, in terms of the degree to which the actor was reflexive of the structure of his own action and the match between action and its consequence. The existing way of farming, based on the implicit, unspoken, and embodied knowledge of farming, or merely "knowing how to farm" was deemed inadequate to creating a model for the sort of actor that the reformers were aiming at. Instead, scientific farming advanced the new model of farming, which was characterized by a consequential relationship and connections among components of activities, and a projected link to the consequence of action. In this schema of practice, the farmer was a master at threading together the pieces of activity, with a full awareness

of the relationship among the pieces, able to synthesize them into a scientific undertaking. The connection thus established within practice, according to Ohio reformers, was the only kind of action that would be conducive to farming as profession, and agriculture as a site of practice to manifest the integrity of the farmer as an actor.

The American reforms defined the subjectivity of the farmer in the synthesis of individual pieces of practice. Threading the fragments of activity into a "whole" experience, however, was not necessarily an act of meaning-making. Pragmatic reforms did not implement the notion of integrity coming from the actor attaching meanings and significance to an external value, ethics or moral. The farmer who threads together components of farming practice made formal connections among pieces, to make farming as a whole unit of practice coherent.

The Japanese reformers also envisioned the core of the reform in making everyday practice the site of acting out one's control and supervision over one's actions. However, for Japanese reformers, this process did not involve the dissection of action into fragments as in the Ohio case. Action had a meaning to the creation of the integrity of the actor only in terms of the general "form" with which the actor engaged in the action. *Wha*t the farmer did, and what the consequence of a particular action was, were less important than *how* the farmer did it. As long as the actor has acquired "how" and "with what attitudes" he engaged in his activities, his integrity as an actor was accomplished as an educational goal.

The contrast between the American case and Japanese case was evident in that Japanese reforms did not put emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge and technologies of farming as a goal of their reforms. Saitama reformers focused on nourishing certain

"attitudes" in the child in doing everyday work and pursuing projects, which they hoped would ultimately take the child to the stage of "ultimate immersion" in the action, where the unification of the actor and action was achieved. The integrity of the actor first and foremost hinged on how immediate to the core of the actor he could make his action.

Consequently, American and Japanese reformers envisioned everyday practice in different ways. Ohio reformers conceptualized action in its components, or a parts-and-whole structure, in faithfulness to Dewey's pragmatic model of the reflex circle. On the other hand, Japanese reformers focused on the "form" of practice, without delving into the structural definition of everyday activity.

These two different ways of grasping practice and its subjectivity-building function entail quite contrastive understandings of the relationship between the actor and action. In the American reforms, the actor positioned himself *external* to his activities, insofar as the actor was the synthesizer of the pieces of activities through him experiencing these fragments. The actor and action are still in the relationship of the subject of action (the actor) and the object of synthesis (pieces of activities).

On the other hand, in the Japanese logic of teaching the "form" of practice in order to reach the ideal state of the immersion of the actor in practice, the actor in the ideal stage was not to be alienated from action in any way, where the problem of the connection between the actor and action was already overcome and dissipated. The actor in the ideal state was completely *internal to* action, meaning that the actor did not put himself in an objectifying relationship with the action as an object anymore. Not only was the pedagogy of writing, for example, an objectification of everyday practice, but its

primary goal was an improvement of the quality of the everyday actor, where the everyday practice and the personhood of the actor intimately related.

What is a Good Farmer? Consequences of the Two Different Actor-Action Relationship in Farming and Mobilization (Comparing Chapter 4 and 6)

The contrast between the externalized and internalized position of the actor to action in the United States and Japan resulted in differences in how a "good farmer" was defined, and consequently, how the rural population was integrated into the nation-state as contributing members of society.

In the case of Ohio, the dissemination of scientific farming that advanced the quantification of the output value of farming was the major institutional consequences of pragmatic ideas conducive to war mobilization of farmers. I pointed out several moments in which farmers as ideal citizens were defined, and there were all based on how productive and efficient farmers could carry out farming. In the case of the Corn Contest, it was the per acre yield, while in the case of the farm management survey, it bred an individualized form of valuation of farm labor such as man work day, which set the ideal "standard" for a farmer to achieve as a member of rural community.

The measurement of who was a "good farmer" in Ohio was based on the output of farm practice, measured in objective quantities. The idea of the "100 bushel man" speaks to this point succinctly. Ultimately, "how" the farmer was engaged in his practice—or the "internal" relationship between the farmer and labor—was relevant as a criterion of a good farmer only when it led to a visible result.

The quantifiable criterion of good farming practice was applied in the reorganization of rural communities by County Agents. County Agents deemed economic

rationalization of farm operation and economic autonomy as the central components of good citizenship for farmers in modern society. They made the increase of per household income as essential step toward connecting rural communities to the larger society, by turning farmers into consumers as well as providers, and making them autonomous as well as contributing members of the modernizing American society. Being a good farmer/citizen meant meeting the expected output of farming by employing the scientific, improved method of farming. The Corn Contest is a representative example of the connection between good citizenship and the quantifiable output of farm labor, in term of better yield, high efficiency as the criterion of good citizenship; by yielding more per acre, one becomes a highly regarded contributing member of the community.

On the other hand, a "good farmer" in Japan was defined in terms of the internal relationship between the actor and the practice; the farmer found himself in a intimate, reciprocal relationship with practice for its improvement. It is not that the output of the farm was not a concern at all for Japanese farmers, but farm output was seen only as derivative of the degree to which the state of "immersion in practice" was achieved and perfected. Therefore, a good farmer in Saitama was not necessarily a farmer who produced the largest amount of rice or soybeans, but it was rather a farmer who demonstrated most faithfully the desired form of practice.

This relationship was even more reinforced in the implementation of the diary- and account-keeping movement. The diary-keeping movement set the introvert relationship between the writer/actor and the reflection of action, therefore distracted the definition of a good farmer from the result of one's action. The act of writing as a method

of reflection concerned the reflexive relationship, not the externally observable result of the action.

These two ways of involving the actor in practice—two different definition of a "good farmer," point to the different mechanisms of engagement in "patriotic action."

The mobilization of American farmers was first and foremost observed in terms of their increased production of foodstuffs as an index of collaboration with the state and Federal agricultural policies. I also pointed out in chapter 4 that the various agricultural events that prompted increasing yields, such as the Corn Contest, which gained prominence in the mid-1910's, was in synchronization with the agricultural policies that culminated in the wartime emergency agricultural policies.

The Corn Contest was a particularly important institutional venue for realizing the war participation of farmers by increasing corn yields in Ohio. Importantly, the zeal exhibited in the Corn Contest developed in tandem with the schema of practice. This schema combined two elements; farming as a site of rounded experience to build the subjectivity the actor, and the farming whose quantified result and consequences were the indexes to measure the quality of that subjectivity. Now, production of maximum yields became the way to express the best of farmer's quality as an acting subject. The permeation of this model in the Ohio rural communities built up a new definition of the "worth" of a farmer based on the externalized valuation of agricultural labor.

In the Japanese case, war mobilization also hinged on the schema of practice cultivated by pragmatic reforms. However, how the schema worked in mobilizing farmers was quite contrary to that in the case of Ohio. The mechanism of mobilization utilized the logic of practicism, the complete immersion of the farmer in action itself—

through various pragmatic practices, such as the farm record movement and farmer *dojos*, farmers maintained tighter and more mutually reflexive connections with farming. Practicism, action as the aim in itself, served as a powerful device for war mobilization, because it provided a model of practice as a cultural infrastructure to get farmers to engage in farm work solely focusing on the internality of the action-actor relationship, rather than the aim or outcome toward which practice was geared. Thus imagined practicism was the essence of the slogan of wartime mobilization, "labor without reason (*rikutsu nukino roudou*)."

Even though the mechanism of mobilization was different, practicism suggests that the wartime participation of farmers was not directly caused by nationalism or imperialism as ideology. While the idea of ideologically motivated action explains that the actor is manipulated by externally imposed and sublime values, both cases of Ohio and Saitama suggest that wartime mobilization did not require ideology. In Saitama, practicism made such an external element of ideology redundant. Since practicism is a closed circle between practice and the actor, a value or ultimate goal is not necessary. Ideology is a superfluous element in this schema of practice. In Ohio, farmers when collaborating with the regime agenda increasing yields, what they were practicing was not nationalism but scientific farming. The increased yield as a result should be explained not by their compliance with ideological beliefs but with the model of practice they employed in their daily work.

The Irony of Pragmatic Reform

While Japanese farmers were mobilized through a schema of practice that promoted total immersion in action, Ohio farmers participated in war efforts by devoting

themselves to the maximization of the output of farming practice. The contrast lies in how the actor positioned himself vis-à-vis practice between the Japanese and American schemas of practice. Despite the contrast in the logic, the two cases contained the same irony of pragmatic reforms. The pragmatic educational reforms started out as an attempt at unmediation. It was an endeavor to challenge the abstraction of knowledge and the image of the learner in the existing education. In order to achieve this, educational reformers turned to the immediacy of everyday experience as a source of uncontaminated sort of subjectivity. The actor's experience was sought in mundane everyday farm work as the essential context for learning.

An intriguing as well as ironic aspect of pragmatic reforms lies in how this project of pragmatism that constructed the quality of immediacy and concreteness of everyday experience ended up creating the schema of practice that eventually drove rural people to participation in an entity as abstract as national body. After all, what happened as a result of pragmatic reforms was the integration of farmers into the nation state. Why did the attempt to construct the unabstracted subject through mundane work feed into another abstract system?

One possible explanation would be the gap between people's involvement in everyday practice as an immediate object of action and its consequence. What people do in their everyday practice may happen to be in synchronization with the agendas of the regime. However, we cannot deduce the process from consequences. In mobilization through the schema of practice, it is not a prerequisite that people understand the demands of the regime or intend to collaborate with it to act as if they were patriotic.

Pointing out the "gap" between the agents of practice (farmers) and the agent of ideology (the State) and postulating the autonomy of farmers' practice from the State-infused ideology means more than simple appropriation and co-optation of practice by the State. Rather than assuming the State as the sublime Subject over social spheres, and imagining society/people at mercy of State's appropriation despite their seeming autonomy, I would like to suggest that the seeming "co-optation" of the results of the pragmatic reforms was inherent in the way reformers envisioned their agenda using categories such as everyday experience, action, and the actor.

The reformers in both societies relied on the property of immediacy in farmers' experience in farm work to propose an alternative relationship between the actor and everyday practice. American reformers envisioned that the process of experiencing a sequence of fragments of action enabled the farmer to thread them into a comprehensive, "rounded" experience that constructed the integrity of the actor. Their Japanese encounters believed that everyday practice should resolve the separation between the subject and practice, leading to what they called a "state of total immersion."

When reformers incorporated the quality of immediacy of everyday activities as an essential ingredient in a new model of the rural subject, they anchored their new vision of subject in that immediacy, allegedly free from invading abstraction. For this, reformers regarded the experiential subjectivity as automatically reaching toward the quality of autonomy. However, the self-sufficiency of action in the schema of practice was not in its own right immune to the possibility of being appropriated by larger political purposes. This is because the autonomy of the subject within his or her everyday action preserved room for collective control to which the actor was still subjected; while autonomy in

practice could be achieved within the intimate realm of his own experiential activities, to what direction this action was geared, was left as an open question.

The limited autonomy of the subject within his practice was in fact part of the design of educational reforms by Dewey himself, in his notions of social control and freedom. For Dewey, the cultivation of rounded experience in pragmatic education was aimed at the creation of a democratic subject who was capable of self-control (Dewey, 1916). Dewey conceptualized self-control as an internally existent authority. Dewey's notion of self-control pointed to a subject who voluntarily coordinated and limited his range of freedom vis-à-vis the collective and the group. Therefore, Dewey's notion of freedom and autonomy presumed existing conditions that would limit their range. In other words, the autonomy of the experiential subject in practice contained a built-in element that made it welcoming to the external entity to which its autonomy was subordinated.

Pragmatic reforms followed a similar path. Cultivation of autonomy within the relationship between the actor and practice did not address the relationship between the actor and larger authorities. Autonomy within practice did not automatically ensure that the actor was freed from co-optation by spheres outside and beyond practice itself, which made it a prey to co-optation by the State, all while the idea of the experiential subject was preserved intact.

Despite its contention and intentions, pragmatic reforms ended up being a proof of the embedded difficulty of a social reform to create an autonomous subject based on everyday activities and the immediacy of experience. Nonetheless, pragmatic reforms are popularly regarded as a social reform for liberation, a struggle for freedom in learning,

because the reform at least succeeded in permeating the category of experience as if it were a private, and intimate sphere, and the relationship between the actor and experience as inseparable, therefore, natural.

This view that sees experience as an uncontaminated sphere has taken root in our everyday thinking as the source of integrity of practice and the actor himself. Not only in our intuitive thinking of our experience, the idea is incorporated in our sociological intuition too. We never run out of the list of schools and disciplines of intellectual inquiry that heavily depend on the idea of primordiality of experience. A prominent example is the pedagogy of emancipation and its derivatives, popularly called critical pedagogy (Giroux et al. 1994, Apple, 1995). The proponents claim that the role of critical pedagogy is to open the dormant critical consciousness of the oppressed to an awareness of the structure of domination. They seek the possibility of emancipation in the awakening of the subjects' "lived experience." In their claim, the subject of emancipation becomes the subject solely because of him experiencing the world though his or her own eyes uncontaminated by the oppressors' world view. Here we can see the prototypical opposition between the "mystifying" structure and the "revealing" experience, the claim that the genuineness of lived experience will cast light on the structural occultation that is the source of oppression.

The opposition of the authenticity of the "lived" experience against the structure of oppression often ignores another possibility—the "lived" experience itself might be as mystifying as the structure that it is supposed to unravel, or, it might be the very existence of structure that makes us feel the unwarranted authenticity of our intimate experience. In other words, the quality of immediacy of everyday experience that reformers resort to

might be a contrived by-product of the abstraction of the system from the beginning, as is in the case of epistemology of Sociology of the Culture in contemporary social science.

In this sense, the early twentieth century educational reformers and Sociologists of Culture are caught in the same logic concerning unmediation of experience to pursue their own agendas. In the vision of the reformers, farmers became the rural subjects by means of experience, and because of its immediacy, it was accessible and an authentic kind of subjectivity. However, the end result of the reform was parallel to the Sociology of Culture, in that the advancement of the immediate experience ended up enforcing the mutually supportive relationship between the abstract and concrete. When experience was incorporated into the contrived schema of practice, experience was everything but unmediated, while the unmediatedness was a big premise of the reform.

Bibliography

Abbot, A. (2001). Time Matters: On Theory and Method, University of Chicago Press.

Abbott, A. (1988). "Transcending General Linear Reality." Sociological Theory 6(2): 169-186.

Althusser, L. (1971). Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. New York, Monthly Review Press.

Apple, M. (1995). Education and Power. London, Routledge.

Berezin, M. (1994). "Cultural Form and Political Meaning: State-subsidized Theater, Ideology, and the Language of Style in Fascist Italy " American Journal of Sociology, 99(5): 1237-1286.

Berezin, M. (1997). Making the fascist self: the political culture of interwar Italy. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Biernacki, R. (2000). "Language and the Shift from Signs to Practices in Cultural Inquiry." History and Theory 39(October 2000): 289-310.

Biernacki, R. (1995). The fabrication of labor: Germany and Britain, 1640-1914. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). The Logic of Practice. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction : a social critique of the judgment of taste. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). "Social Space and Symbolic Power." Sociological Theory 7: 14-25.

Country Life Commission (1909). The Country Life Commission Report.

Corwin, E. (1947). "Total War and the Constitution."

Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1880. New York, Longman.

Dahl, R. (1971). Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Danbom, D. B. (2006). Born in the country : a history of rural America. Baltimore, Johns

Hopkins University Press.

Davies, S. (2002). "The Paradox of Progressive Education: A Frame Analysis." Sociology of Education 75(5): 269-286.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York, The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). “Experience and Thinking.” In The Philosophy of John Dewey. J. McDermott.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York, The McMillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1987). My Pedagogic Creed. “The Philosophy of John Dewey.” J. McDermott. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Diamond, L. (1999). Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation. Baltimore, John's Hopkins University Press.

Dower, J. W. (1987). War Without Mercy: Race and Power in Pacific War, Pantheon.

Dower, J. W. (1993). War without mercy: race and power in the pacific war. New York, Pantheon Books.

Feffer, A. (1993). The Chicago pragmatists and American progressivism. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Fuller, W. (1982). The Old County School: The Story of Rural Education in the Middle West.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism. New York, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Garfinkel, H. and Sax., H. (1970). Formal Structure of Practical Action. Theoretical Sociology; Perspectives and developments. Tiryakian, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Educational Division.

Garon, S. (1997). Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures ; selected essays. New York, Basic Books.

Giroux, H. a. M., Peter (1994). Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies. London, Routledge.

Gluck, C. (1985). Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period. Princeton,

Princeton University Press.

Goldhagen, D. J. (1996). Hitler's willing executioners: ordinary Germans and the Holocaust. New York, Knopf : Distributed by Random House.

Hanks, W. F. (1996). Language & communicative practices. Boulder, Colo., Westview Press.

Hanson, V. D. (2002). Carnage and culture: landmark battles in the rise of Western power. New York, Anchor.

Harootunian, H. D. (2000). Overcome by modernity: history, culture, and community in interwar Japan. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Havens (1974). Farm and Nation in Modern Japan: Agrarian Nationalism 1870-1940, Princeton University Press.

Hirota, T. (1996). Rukugun Shoko no Shakaishi, Seori Shobo.

House of Representatives (November 17, 1941). Further Development of 4-H Clubs.

Saitama Kyoiku IInkai (1972). Saitama Kyoikushi.

Ishida, Y. (1956). Kindai NIhon Seiji Kouzo no Kenkyu, Miraisha.

Ishiguro, S. (1938). Ishiguro Saneatsu no Nosei Shiso.

Itagaki, K. (1992). "Zassi "Ieno Hikari" ni miru Showa Senzen Sentyu ki no Noson seikatsu."

Iwasaki, M. (1997). Nohon Shiso no Shakaishi, Kyoto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppan.

Jay, M. (2005) Songs of Experience, University of California Press.

Joas, H. (1996). The Creativity of Action, University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (2006). "Mind incarnate: from Dewey to Damasio." Daedalus(Summer).

Karier, C., J. (1972). "Liberalism and the Quest for Orderly Change." History of Education Quarterly (Spring 1972): 57-80.

Katz, M. (1968). The Irony of Early School Reform. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Katz, M. (1986). In the Shadow of the Poorhouse, Basic Books.

Kenneth, P. (1973). "The Technology of Japanese Nationalism: The Local Improvement Movement, 1900-1918." The Journal of Asian Studies 33(1): 51-65.

Kharkhordin, O.(1999). The collective and the individual in Russia: A study of practices. Berkeley, California, University of California Press.

Kido, M. (1940). "Kokumin Gakko no Seishin wo Iaksu Tameni." Kyoiku Kagaku Kenkyu 2(12).

Kilpatrick, W. (1917). "Project Teaching." General Science Quarterly 1(2).

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958. New York, Routledge.

Kliebard, H. M. (1999). Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946. New York, Teachers' College Press.

Kokubun, I. (1948). Kodomo wo Toraeru, Shinpyosha.

Kokubun, I. (1974). Tadashiku Surukoto, Yutakani Surukoto, Shinpyosha.

Koschmann, J. V. (1996). Revolution and subjectivity in postwar Japan. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Koschmann, V. and Yamanouchi, Y. (1999). Total War and 'Modernization'. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Lagemann, E. (2000). An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Educational Research, University of Chicago Press.

Lincicome, M. (1995). Principle, Praxis, and the Politics of Educational Reform in Meiji Japan. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Lockwood, W. (1968) The Economic Development of Japan: Growth and Structural Change. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Maruyama, M. (1965). Patterns of Individuation and the Case of Japan: A Conceptual Scheme. Attitude toward Modernisation. M. Jansen. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Maruyama, M. and American Council of Learned Societies. (1969). Thought and behavior in modern Japanese politics. London ; New York, Oxford University Press.

Mayer, J. and. Brian, R. (1992). The Structure of Educational Organizations.

Organizational Environment: Ritual and Rationality. J. Mayer, Sage Publishers.

McConnell, G. and American Farm Bureau Federation. (1969). The decline of agrarian democracy. New York, Atheneum.

Mehan, H. and Wood. (1975). The Reality of Ethnomethodology. New York, John Wiley and Sons.

Menand, L. (2001). The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America, Straus and Giroux.

Minechi, M. (1940). Tsuzurikata Kyoiku Hattatsushi.

Moore, D. (2001). ""To make the best better": The Establishment of Girls' Tomato Clubs in Mississippi, 1911-1915." The Journal of Mississippi History 63(2).

Mori, T. (1999). Senji Nihon Noson Shakai no Kenkyu, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan.

Nakano (1998). Taisho JIyukyoiku no Kenkyu, Reimei Shobo.

Nan, S. (2002). Showa Senzenki no Kokka toNoson, Nihon Kezai Hyoronsha.

Nomoto, K. (1981). "Nosonsan Keizai Kosei Undouka no Hotoku Undo." Saitamaken Rodo Undo Kenkyu 13.

Oouchi, H. (1999). Kyoiku ni okeru Seizen, Senji, Sengo. Total War and Modernization. J. V. Koschmann.

Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Garden City, N.Y.,, Doubleday.

Popkewitz, T., Ed. (2005). Inventing the Modern Self and John Dewey: Modernities and the Traveling of Pragmatism in Education. New York, Palgrave MacMillan.

Postone, M. (1993). Time, labor, and social domination: a reinterpretation of Marx's critical theory. Cambridge England ; New York, NY, Cambridge University Press.

Pyle, K. (1973). "The Technology of Japanese Nationalism: The Local Improvement Movement, 1900-1918." The Journal of Asian Studies 23(1).

Rose, N. (1989). Governing the Soul. London, Routledge.

Rubinger, R. (2007). Popular Literacy in Early Modern Japan. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Scheiner, I. (1998). The Japanese Village: Imagined, Real, Contested. Mirror of

Modernity. S. Vlastos. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Scott, R. V. (1971). The reluctant farmer; the rise of agricultural extension to 1914. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Semel, S. a. S., A. Schools of Tomorrow, Schools of Today: What happened to Progressive Education. New York, Peter Lang.

Sewell, W. (1996). "Historical Events as Tranformation of Structuers: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille." Theory and Society 25(6): 841-881.

Smith, K. D. (2001). A time of crisis: Japan, the great depression, and rural revitalization. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center ; Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Somers, M. (1998). "We're No Angels": Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science." American Journal of Sociology 104(3): 722-784.

Stefan, L. (1997). Totalitarian and authoritarian regimes.

Suzuki, M. (1935). Tsuzurikata Dokuhon.

Swidler, A. (2001). Talk of love: how culture matters. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Tanaka, S. (2004). New Times in Modern Japan. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Thayer, H. S. (1968). Meaning and action; a critical history of pragmatism. Indianapolis,, Bobbs-Merrill.

Theobald, P. (1995). Call School: Rural Education in the Mid-West to 1918, Southern Illiois University.

Tosaka, J. (1977). Nihon Ideorogi- Ron, Bunko.

Vlastos, S. (1998). Agrarianism without Tradition. Mirror of Modernity: Invented Tradition of Modern Japan. S. Vlastos. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Wessel (1982). 4-H: An American Idea, 1900-1980, National 4-H council.