Feminist Economics

ISSN: 1354-5701 (Print) 1466-4372 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rfec20

Margaret Gilpin Reid: A Manitoba home economist goes to Chicago[1]

Evelyn Forget

To cite this article: Evelyn Forget (1996) Margaret Gilpin Reid: A Manitoba home economist goes to Chicago[1] , Feminist Economics, 2:3, 1-16, DOI: 10.1080/1354570961000170736

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570961000170736

Published online: 24 Jun 2010.

MARGARET GILPIN REID: A MANITOBA HOME ECONOMIST GOES TO CHICAGO[1]

Evelyn Forget
Department of Economics, The University of Manitoba

ABSTRACT

This essay offers a documentation of Margaret Gilpin Reid's early academic career and develops an analysis of how her home economics training may have influenced her career as an economist. It explores the links between home economics and economics in the early twentieth century when departments of home economics served as points of first entry to the academic world for many women, as sources of training in consumer economics and the operation of markets and as places of employment when women academics were not assiduously courted by regular departments of economics.

KEYWORDS

Home economics, history, Margaret Gilpin Reid

Margaret Gilpin Reid's birth coincided with a new wave of immigration into western Canada, as the wheat economy boomed and Winnipeg emerged as the administrative, commercial and cultural center of a vast hinterland. It was widely believed, as the *Canadian Annual Review* reported in 1910, that "Winnipeg's responsibility [as a commercial center] is identical to that of Chicago two decades ago" (Ruben Bellan 1978: 108). Chicago has always been a bit of an icon for Winnipeggers. The enthusiasm accompanying economic growth led to the expansion of the Manitoba Agricultural College and the development of a degree program in Home Economics in Winnipeg, as it did throughout the American midwest. But at the same time, it is essential to remember that homesteading on the Canadian prairie at the turn of the century involved a pioneering life of almost unimaginable hardship.

These factors created a set of circumstances that propelled Reid into an academic career of considerable renown. Her path and success is singular, but at the same time she is emblematic of an entire generation of young women who, because of the home economics movement, found their way into an academic environment dedicated to the blending of knowledge

from many disciplines to address the very pragmatic needs of households. Accessing economics via a department of home economics influenced the kind of research that Margaret Reid undertook and the amount of energy she dedicated to mentoring students. Perhaps by learning a little more about the links between economics and home economics early in the twentieth century, we can better understand the simultaneous drift of women away from the discipline of economics and the slow changes in the orientation and subject matter of economic analysis. The next section of this essay examines the early life of Margaret Gilpin Reid. Then, the intellectual relationship between economics and home economics is considered. Finally, the ways in which Reid's work reflects the ethos of the home economics movement is examined.

MARGARET GILPIN REID: THE EARLY YEARS

The early life of 25-year-old Margaret Gilpin Reid, a graduating Gold Medallist in the home economics program of the Manitoba Agricultural College, was so typical of that of her classmates that the editor of *The Managra* (the college magazine) described her as "one of the real Manitoba girls," before listing her accomplishments in scholarship, debate, student government and basketball (1920–21: 29). Born in 1896, she spent her childhood on a farm on the prairie near Winnipeg then trained at the Normal School in Regina and embarked on a career as a school teacher. A degree program in home economics was established at the Manitoba Agricultural College[2] in 1915, largely designed to train teachers of home economics for the growing high school demand, and Margaret Reid began the five-year course of study the following year. In concert with its sister programs at American and eastern Canadian universities, the introduction of home economics college training in Manitoba had three very significant effects: it expanded employment opportunities for women academics in many fields; it created a socially acceptable opportunity for the university education of women; and, it created an opportunity to experience a unique kind of education which was inherently multidisciplinary, ethically oriented and applied.

Reid's career path inspires several questions. What exactly was the relationship between departments of home economics and departments of political economy[3] at North American universities before World War II? How did pedagogy differ between the two departments and, in particular, how did the training in economics received by students differ when it was accessed through home economics departments rather than departments of political economy? And finally, would the economic research eventually undertaken by an academic who approached the study of economics through the route of home economics be different in any substantive way from that created by someone trained in a more

conventional fashion? But Margaret Reid is a single individual, of course, and not a social experiment. We can not know with any certainty why she did what she chose to do with her life, nor can we really know what effect her particular access point to the discipline of economics may have had on her subsequent career. But we do know that her career, and her accomplishments, took advantage of a particular combination of social factors that confronted women economists of her cohort, and we do know that the kind of work she went on to do as an economist is consistent with the complex of ideals, beliefs and standards modeled by a home economics, as opposed to an economics, education. In point of fact, home economics and economics did differ in Reid's day, but the differences were much less extreme than they were to become as the century aged.

It is always difficult to engage with the counterfactual: how would the discipline of economics have been different if the links between the home economics movement and political economy had not been severed? Why is economics so male-dominated today when so many women were active in the profession earlier in the twentieth century (see Robert Dimand 1995: 1–24)? It is tempting to suggest that women were marginalized by the discipline as subject matter closer to their own economic experiences, such as household production and consumer economics, began to disappear as research topics. But it is just as easy to argue that the causation might run in the other direction: as women moved away from economic analysis, people stopped thinking about these topics. Did economics become inhospitable to women because analysis increasingly focused on abstract theory as opposed to pragmatic reform, a trend that certainly gained momentum after World War II? All we know with certainty is that women were attracted to other fields of study as both the subject matter and the intellectual style of home economics and economics diverged. Undoubtedly the trends in subject matter and research personnel reinforced one another.

HOME ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL ECONOMY

Ellen H. Swallow Richards, a chemist who was responsible for much of the basic research in domestic science as well as its popularization on the lecture circuit, told the Association of Collegiate Alumnae in 1890:

> We [college women] have been treated for some years to discussions from eminent men as to our mental ability, our moral and physical status, our predilection for matrimony, our fitness for voting or for the Presidency; but the kind of home we should make if we did make one, the position we should take on the servant

> question, the influence we should have on the center and source of political economy, the kitchen, seem to have been ignored.
>
> (Caroline Hunt 1958: 113)

If the kitchen, the domain of home economics, was the "center and source of political economy," it is not surprising that these two disciplines should have had an intimate connection, notwithstanding the fact that political economy was overwhelmingly the province of men[4] and home economics that of women.

Home economics departments have long required training in economics so that graduates could behave, and teach others to behave, as educated consumers and rational managers of the household. Margaret Reid, in fact, categorized household work into two categories: A. Management, which included "choice-making," "task, time and energy apportionment," "planning" and "supervision," and B. Performance, which included "housework" (Margaret Reid 1934: 75–6). The more zealous advocates of the expansion of home economics training were occasionally to claim that not only did the home environment contribute to the productivity of the worker and encourage those habits and virtues upon which the market economy and factory system were based, but that the home itself was a factory designed (as Henrietta Goodrich told the 1902 Lake Placid gathering of home economics educators) for the production of "men":

> Home economics aims to bring the home into harmony with industrial conditions and social ideals that prevail today in the larger world outside the home. This end can never be accomplished till the home in popular conception shall embody something more than the idea of personal relationships to individual homes. Men in general must admit consciously that the home is the social workshop for the making of men. No home, however isolated, can escape the social obligation that rests on it. . . .
>
> (Proceedings 1902: 36)

There was, then, a recognition that the study of economics was a matter of some interest to home economists. It was both a useful tool for the homemaker, and a useful way of understanding the society for which the home was required to produce citizens.

Home economics, however, has always seen itself as an area of study that requires the mastery of several disciplines. At the same Lake Placid conference in 1902, a definition of home economics was suggested:

> Home economics in its most comprehensive sense is the study of the laws, conditions, principles and ideals which are concerned on the one hand with man's immediate physical environment and on the

> other hand with his nature as a social being and is the study especially of the relation between these two factors.
>
> (Proceedings 1902: 70–1)

Margaret Reid's student transcript bears evidence of this interdisciplinary focus. In addition to specific courses in dressmaking, millinery, history of costume, home furnishing, household management, foods and dietetics, she studied economics, economics of the household, economics and rural sociology, psychology, English, "book reviews," composition, art history and public speaking. She supplemented these courses with study in the sciences, specifically chemistry, and other courses such as "demonstrations"[5] designed to increase her effectiveness as a teacher of home economics (a burgeoning career opportunity for graduates since home economics was expanding rapidly at the elementary, junior high and high school levels in Manitoba).

The pamphlet printed for the fiftieth anniversary of the School of Home Economics at the University of Manitoba, a celebration during which Margaret Reid was the recipient of an honorary degree, notes that:

> The very incomplete records available to us, indicate that more than one hundred graduates have obtained Master's degrees from other universities in Canada, the United States or Great Britain. A number of our graduates have proceeded to the doctorate level.
>
> - Over 100 Manitoba graduates hold Advanced degrees.
> - Nutrition and Textiles fields selected by the majority.
> - Other fields chosen by smaller numbers:

Education	Fashion	Economics
Foods	Clothing and Art	Chemistry
	Social Work	

> Large numbers of graduates have continued their education in hospital or commercial internships, in securing diplomas in education, in social work and in laboratory technology. The home economist's background in science and applied science has proved to be the basis for a career as a research worker or laboratory assistant in a testing or research programme for an impressive number of graduates.
>
> (Anon. 1960: 43)

This suggests that home economics was an inherently interdisciplinary, and even multidisciplinary, area of study from its inception.

Political economy was, itself, more open to influence from other disciplines in 1921 (Margaret Reid's graduating year) than it has since become. The consumer economics that so preoccupied home economists was an important area of empirical research for many economists, accounting for a very large proportion of articles published in journals,

doctoral dissertations written, and commissioned reports undertaken. Nevertheless, important differences existed between undergraduate training in political economy, as opposed to home economics, programs.

How would Margaret Reid's undergraduate education have differed if she had registered as a student of agricultural economics at the Manitoba Agricultural College or a student of political economy at the University of Manitoba?

Agricultural economics had been taught at the agricultural college in Manitoba from 1907, and "this was a remarkable course, for it was offered by G. A. Sproule, a member of the English Department, and its calendar description was as follows:

> That section of the course devoted to the Economics of Agriculture will include the consideration of such subjects as: the production of wealth; distribution of labor; rent; interest; wages; trade unions and cooperation; money (metallic and paper); credit; foreign trade; taxation; functions of government; law of supply and demand; regulation of prices, etc."
>
> (H. Claire Pentland 1977: 4)

This does not seem too different from what one might expect from any department of political economy, although the appointment of a professor of English as instructor adds slightly more of an interdisciplinary twist than might be expected and the fact that it was all in a single course seems a mite ambitious.

A. B. Clark, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, was appointed to the newly established chair in political economy at the University of Manitoba in 1909, a post he occupied until his retirement in 1934. He was, if the book lists of the courses are to be credited, a great admirer of Joseph Shields Nicholson who was a scholar of some reputation who occupied the chair at the University of Edinburgh from 1880 to 1925. Clark taught most of the political economy courses himself, with part-time assistance from 1917 (provided by Lily McCullough who was the only one of the three members of the department with three degrees) and one full-time colleague from 1922:

> The courses offered in A. B. Clark's Department of Political Economy smacked more of John Stuart Mill than of Marshall or Taussig. . . . There was attention to Economic History – of Britain – drawn particularly from the works of Ashley and Cunningham. Clark's main interests, however, were in the quasi-institutional areas of Money and Banking, Trade, Public Finance and Taxation. . . .
>
> (H. Claire Pentland 1977: 3)

The only other courses in political economy offered locally in 1921 were

offered through the various church colleges which eventually merged with the University of Manitoba in 1924.

It sounds, then, as if Margaret Reid's introduction to economics via the home economics degree program at the Manitoba Agricultural College was no odder than any other training she might have received in Manitoba between 1916 and 1921. This, however, is a little misleading. If one examines the calendar of the University of Manitoba for 1920–1, one finds a reading list emphasizing Marshall, Mill, Bastable, Keynes (J. N. not J. M.), Adam Smith, Cunningham, Ashley, Nicholson, Seligman, Taussig and L. L. Price. As anecdotal and nonrigorous as many of these books seem today, they were certainly representative of economic theory during the period. While Clark was somewhat suspicious of the excessive theorizing of Alfred Marshall, he did teach Marshall.[6]

How can we summarize the differences between the education in economics which Margaret Reid received through her training in home economics with that she might have received in a department of political economy? Hers was, first of all, unrelentingly more practical, applied and focused on issues of importance to the household's resource allocation problem. She knew not only the theory of markets and their operation and the theories of consumer behavior, but also had some knowledge of how these theories took shape in the world of the consumer. The clinical distance of the economist was tempered by the experience of the well-trained consumer/observer. The political economy major would have been far better versed in the historical evolution of both the contemporary economy and the doctrine. He[7] would have been more broadly educated in economic analysis, but not necessarily more skilled in the application of basic principles to everyday problems and not likely as broadly exposed to the relationship between economic theory on the one hand and the other social and natural sciences, and humanities on the other. The home economics graduate applied economic analysis to a narrower range of problems, but drew on a broader range of disciplines to augment economic analysis in the solution of these problems. The political economy graduate could tackle a broader range of problems with a bigger box of economic and analytical tools, but the depth of his real first-hand knowledge of the problems he was attempting to solve was necessarily limited.

It is, perhaps, more important to recognize that the greatest difference between political economy education and home economics education was not the content of the courses, the reading lists, or even the distinction between theory and applications, but rather the very different ways in which the two disciplines saw their essential tasks. Political economy, in 1921, sought to describe and understand the world. The course descriptions stress "principles," "methods of investigation" and "the relation of Economic Science to Practice." Home economics always

saw its task as shaping behavior, not describing it, a task fully supported by the Manitoba Royal Commission established in 1900 to consider the founding of an agricultural college:

> Society depends for its character upon the home, and the home for its quality and power upon the competence and culture of women who have charge of it. And when one considers the educative power of the home and its environment and of the homemakers upon the earliest years of youthful life, and when one considers how dependent upon these are the men who support such homes for their comfort and efficiency in working, the best possible opportunity for receiving that education and training which will fit the women for the performance of those duties which may and undoubtedly will devolve upon them, should be given by the Province.
>
> (Government of Manitoba 1903: 499)

Margaret Reid was to take this interest in making the behavior of *femina economica* "better" (or more rational) one step further, and ask whether or not we could make the economy, and in particular, markets "better." Home economics was, at its core, a reform movement and its graduates imbibed the ethic.

Margaret Reid wears her early training in two respects. First, as a trained teacher, one would expect her to take her role as an educator seriously. By serving as mentor to a generation of women graduate students, she acted as a significant link in a chain of women economists, many of whom carried on the tradition by seeking out and helping to educate other women students of economics. The role of women mentoring women in all disciplines is a significant area of feminist research. Its importance in the development of the discipline of economics in the United States is discussed at length by Forget (1995), Mary Ann Dimand (1995), and Alison Comish Thorne (1995). Second, her research reflects those early interests that must have led her to deepen her understanding of the economics of the household in a home economics program.

THE GOALS OF THE HOME ECONOMICS MOVEMENT AS REFLECTED IN MARGARET REID'S RESEARCH

Marjorie M. Brown (1993: 475–81) outlines some of the norms that home economists have, as a professional body, adopted to guide their intellectual activities and service to the public: concern for the well-being of the family through enlightened service; the desire to develop rational knowledge appropriate to the needs of families; the intention of

integrating knowledge from a variety of disciplines; and the desire to develop a professional community. All of these aspects of the home economics movement were apparent in Reid's training and were also reflected in her own intellectual endeavors.

Margaret Reid's research, which is discussed in detail in other contributions to this issue, is theoretically and empirically significant. It is also, in its broad outline, consistent with the ethos of home economics education: it was woman-centered, applied and narrowly focused on issues of fundamental interest to consumers. Reid was a reformer, trying to make the market function more rationally, at least as much as she was trying to make the consumer function more rationally in the market. There is a pervasive attempt throughout Margaret Reid's work to begin the analysis with an understanding of why individuals behave as they do, even if they appear irrational, rather than beginning from a belief that if only the theorist's "rational" consumer could be created, then social welfare would improve. Reid was unapologetic about recognizing the relationship between the normative and the positive in economic analysis (just as "science," reform and moral suasion were fundamentally intertwined in home economics programs).

It is a bit ironic, of course, to claim that consumer economics is narrowly focused; Reid notes that:

> Adam Smith long ago wrote: "The sole end and purpose of production is consumption." Often has he been quoted. Yet consumer welfare has remained a vague, mystical idea. It has been enthroned in "theory", but in large measure ignored or only indirectly considered in the work-a-day world, in the busy markets where buying and selling take place.
>
> (Reid 1938: 1)

And, she laments, if the producer ignored the needs of the consumer, the theorist belittled her intelligence:

> The inefficiency of the consumer is a favourite topic. Pitkin in a recent book, *The Consumer, His Nature and His Changing Habits*, describes consumers, whom he appears to assume are mainly women, as "economic imbeciles." Some people with a mixture of scorn and distress point out how unbusinesslike women are in their buying, how little they know about the stores they patronize, how they waste time in idle shopping, and money in careless selection, how they are fooled by advertising, by clerks and by various sales appeals, how by their practices they unnecessarily increase the cost of marketing.
>
> (Reid 1938: 26)

While fully recognizing the desirability of businesslike behavior on the

part of the consumer, she recognizes that the organization of retail markets must share some of the blame:

> That consumers in their market selection are inefficient cannot be denied. Many are very poorly informed, are uncertain in their market selection, credulous and easily influenced, very susceptible to flattery. . . . "Undue" emphasis is commonly given to superficial qualities. Much of the inefficiency is caused by sheer carelessness and indifference. But the causes go deeper than this.
>
> (Reid 1938: 26)

She acknowledges that "in a competitive system, with consumers free to choose, the market in a large measure is literally forced to respond to consumer demand" (Reid 1938: 47), but recognizes that the retail market is far from perfect.

Reid has two solutions, both of which are consistent with the norms of home economics education. The consumer must be trained in efficient market behavior:

> Buying is far from a simple task. To be efficiently done it must be based on a thorough knowledge of the needs of those for whom the goods are purchased; and a thorough knowledge of qualities and prices of goods in the market and their relation to use. An acquaintance with services made available by different stores is important. Choices should be made with full knowledge of total needs, and resources available in meeting these. The evaluation of various alternatives in view of cost must have been carefully done. In every phase, systematic and continual study is very important. Practices and attitudes and general behaviour in the store are also important if one is to get maximum returns.
>
> (Reid 1938: 46)

But turning *femina economica* into *homo economicus* is insufficient because "consumers will continue to be handicapped by the small scale of their purchases and their lack of specialization" (ibid.: 46). Therefore, she advocates a re-examination of "the market system . . . noting good features and defects" (ibid.: 51–2), but that study is to be followed by fundamental reform:

> Consumers, in their efforts to improve the market may act individually and in groups. Group action may be made effective through co-operatives and through legislation.
>
> (Reid 1938: 52)

And reform is the ultimate goal.

All of this is consistent with Reid's pronouncements with respect to normative and positive science. She defines the difference between the

two in a manner absolutely consistent with that of the undergraduate economics textbook:

> As a positive science economics is confined to cause-and-effect relationships without thought of whether results are good or bad, whether any possible condition is better than another. It worships only the spirit of wonder; it aims only at enlightenment. In itself it seeks to achieve nothing. Explanation alone is the goal. A normative science on the other hand is concerned with ideals as distinguished from actuals. It is permeated by the spirit of control, and its goal may be improving the lot of mankind. As such it defines ends and works out the relation of means to these ends.
>
> (Reid 1943: 7)

But Reid gives the normative priority:

> In economic analysis it is commonly assumed that productive resources should be put to their most important use and that waste is undesirable. In which case maximum returns from a given stock of productive resources is the accepted ideal or norm. One condition is said to be better than another because it brings a larger product. . . . But maximum production measured in money is a very meager goal. Maximum welfare is of much greater importance.
>
> (ibid.: 7)

If we are to direct productive resources intelligently, norms must be established. Reid notes the role that the experts in household management might play in establishing and inculcating these norms:

> Physiologists and nutritionists certainly would have an important part in setting up food norms. Philosophers and other social theorists would have a part in appraising the relative importance of various objectives. Since life is not wholly a blind, accidental process, the more clearly norms are defined and the more fully they are accepted by society in general, the more likely they are to be achieved.
>
> (ibid.: 8)

And Reid leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that this form of economic analysis that explicitly considers the normative is superior to scientific detachment:

> Much economic analysis is half-consciously directed to a vague concept of general welfare. In this discussion an attempt will be made to keep the objective to the forefront. At all times the standard or norm of welfare should be looked upon as dynamic, not static. It should change as increase in knowledge or change in productive

> resources makes it desirable to modify previously accepted standards. The transition will be toward a more efficient society and a knowledge of positive economics will assist in choosing the techniques to effect the changes desired.
>
> (ibid.: 8)

Reid's own broader study will make room for economic analysis, but it should be clearly recognized that the role of positive science is to serve as a useful handmaid and not to usurp the authority of the welfare-oriented reformer.

But Reid's reform orientation escaped some of the apparently zealous excesses of the early home economics movement, which might be typified by examples cited by Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English (1978: ch. 5). For example, the "friendly visiting" of the Louisa May Alcott Club, a Boston settlement located in an Italian and Russian-Jewish ghetto, was reported on by Isabel Hyams to the 1905 Lake Placid conference:

> We did find, however, in most cases untidy homes, filled with unhygienic furnishings, and the food which was good never served in an appetizing manner. So we decided that for us the serving of the food, housekeeping, house furnishing, and decoration, and last but not least, manners were the most important. . . .
>
> (quoted in Ehrenreich and English 1978: 174)

Reid, by contrast, shows a marked sensitivity by noting that "a program succeeds best when based on an understanding of present practices and procedures which it presumes to modify" (Reid 1943: 6). Make no mistake: the intention was still reform, but not blind reform:

> Between the desirable, as measured by science, and the actual already achieved, a great gulf yawns; they constitute two different worlds with only a limited area in common. Nutritionists in the past have devoted their major efforts largely to telling people what they should eat rather than to discovering what they do eat and pointing out the effect of existing food-consumption habits on health and physical development. Recent studies have investigated nutritional health and actual food consumed; many others are in progress. The deficiencies revealed have been challenging. Something clearly undesirable exists which must be changed.
>
> (ibid.: 5–6)

Margaret Reid represents a significant body of economists in the interwar period: a home economist trained in many of the sciences and

humanities, making use of economic analysis to the extent that it was a useful tool, to effect reform.

CONCLUSION

When one attempts to reconstruct the history of women of ideas, there is a great temptation to focus on the isolated figure, the "great woman" who transcended the socially imposed limitations of her period and achieved something of lasting merit. To some extent, Margaret Reid lends herself to this sort of history. She was a tremendously important economist in the interwar period, not least because of her influence on a generation of women coming into their own as economists. And she did, as other work in this issue of *Feminist Economics* shows, accomplish much even in the area of economic theory, as well as the applied work and textbook creation for which she is better known. But there is room for another understanding of this remarkable woman – an understanding based upon how representative she was of a particular group of people at a particular time and place.

Margaret Reid's papers are ensconced in the archives at the University of Chicago, awaiting the attention of an economist or a human ecologist dedicated to understanding the intertwined history of two disciplines. It is a remarkable story, played out in agricultural colleges throughout the midwest, which documents the movement of women into economics on a significant scale. There were other routes into economics for women: through the women's colleges in Britain and the United States, for example. But home economics departments played a very important role in North America: they taught women economic analysis encouraging some to further their understanding of the discipline; they employed women graduates of economics programs, sheltering a very large number of academics deemed inadequate for employment in "real" economics departments; and, perhaps most significantly for a "real Manitoba girl" and her counterparts growing up on farms throughout the American midwest and the Canadian prairie, they provided a socially sanctioned opportunity for women of the middle classes to go to university in large numbers. These are no small achievements.

Evelyn Forget, Department of Economics, The University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 5V5, Canada
e-mail: forget@umanitoba.ca

NOTES

[1] I would like to thank Dr. Ruth Berry, Dean of Human Ecology at the University of Manitoba, for sharing her books, her stories and her insight into the development of home economics in Manitoba, and especially for navigating the

shoals of confidentiality legislation to allow me to see Margaret Reid's student record. I am also grateful to the referees who made helpful suggestions.

[2] In 1924, the Manitoba Agricultural College became the Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics of the University of Manitoba. The degree designation in Home Economics was changed from a Bachelor of Home Economics to Bachelor of Science (Home Economics).

[3] I use the terms "political economy" and "economics" as synonyms, because "political economy" was, in fact, the preferred name in Canada for the subject matter of the entire discipline which we now label "economics." It did not have a "Marxian" connotation, nor did it refer specifically to any kind of class analysis. Even though Alfred Marshall was responsible for the popularization of "economics" before Margaret Reid began her studies, academic departments in Canada were still, and would long remain, departments of "political economy."

[4] It is important to remember, however, that a larger proportion of the work in Political Economy was undertaken by women in the first two decades of this century than had been before or would be again for many years. (See Robert Dimand 1995; Mary Ann Dimand 1995 and Evelyn Forget 1995.)

[5] I am assured by Ruth Berry, the current Dean of Human Ecology at the University of Manitoba, that "demonstrations" do not require the construction of placards or a march to the legislature (which, in any case, was not built until 1920). Students were allowed to practice the not inconsiderable skill of performing detailed handwork while surrounded by mirrors designed to magnify all errors for the edification of an audience.

[6] "However when Reginald F. Jones who taught at Manitoba, 1920–1935 and was basically a sociologist, treated the advanced course on Marshall which he had [been] assigned to teach in his own way – he totally ignored the *Principles* which he did not approve of and dwelt exclusively on Marshall's *Economics of Industry*, which was descriptive and historical – Clark objected violently" (Pentland 1977: 14).

[7] I do use the pronoun advisedly because, of course, most students who majored in political economy at the University of Manitoba in 1921 were male as were most students at the Manitoba Agricultural College who were not studying Home Economics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. 1960. *Fiftieth Anniversary: School of Home Economics. University of Manitoba.* Winnipeg: The Public Press Ltd.

Bellan, Ruben. 1978. *Winnipeg First Century: An Economic History.* Winnipeg: Queenston House Publishing Co.

Brown, Marjorie M. 1993. *Philosophical Studies of Home Economics in the United States. Basic Ideas by Which Home Economists Understand Themselves.* Michigan: Michigan State University.

Dimand, Mary Ann. 1995. "Networks of Women Economists before 1940," in Mary Ann Dimand, Robert Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget (eds), *Women of Value*, pp. 39–59.

——, Robert Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget (eds). 1995. *Women of Value: Feminist Essays in the History of Economics.* Aldershot, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Dimand, Robert. 1995. "The Neglect of Women's Contributions to Economics," in Mary Ann Dimand, Robert Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget (eds), *Women of Value*, pp. 1–24.

East, Marjorie and Joan Thomson (eds). 1984. *Definitive Themes in Home Economics*

and Their Impact on Families 1909–1984. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Deirdre English. 1978. *For Her Own Good. 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women*. New York: Doubleday.

Forget, Evelyn L. 1995. "American Women Economists, 1900–1940: Doctoral Dissertations and Research Specialization," in Mary Ann Dimand, Robert Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget (eds), *Women of Value*, pp. 25–38.

Government of Manitoba. 1903. "Report of Agricultural College Commission." *Journals of Legislative Assembly of Manitoba*, Vol. XXXV. Sessional Papers (no. 17).

Hunt, Caroline L. 1958. *The Life of Ellen H. Richards*. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Kneeland, Hildegard. 1929. "Women's Economic Contribution in the Home." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (May): 33–40.

Morton, William. L. 1957. *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Pentland, H. Claire. 1977. "A Brief History." The University of Manitoba: Department of Economics.

Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference on Home Economics, Lake Placid, New York, 1902.

Pundt, Helen. 1980. *AHEA: A History of Excellence*. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Reid, Margaret Gilpin. 1934. *Economics of Household Production*. New York: John Wiley.

——. 1938. *Consumers and the Market*. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co.

——. 1943. *Food for People*. New York: John Wiley.

——. 1947. "The Economic Contributions of Homemakers." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (May): 61–9.

Thorne, Alison Comish. 1995. "Women Mentoring Women in Economics in the 1930s," in Mary Ann Dimand, Robert Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget (eds), *Women of Value*, pp. 60–70.

Wilson, Johanna Gudrun. 1966. *A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Home Economics Association.

APPENDIX: MARGARET G. REID

Margaret is one of the real Manitoba girls, as she has never known any other province as her home. She spent her childhood on a farm near Cardale, and attended High School in Oak River. After taking the Normal Course at Regina, we find Margaret helping the children with their "Three R's," but in the fall of 1916 she answered the call of [Manitoba Agricultural College] and registered as a student in Home Economics.

In her first year at college she was well known as a member of the "Faction," and from that time on has been considered one of the best all-round students that ever entered the college. She was always ready to help in any line of college activities, and never neglected her studies. In her second year she won the Board of Directors' prize in general proficiency, also debated twice for her class, thus doing her part to win the cup. The following year she won the Isbester [*sic*] Scholarship[a] for highest general proficiency, and the public speaking cup. In her fourth year she had the honor of being Editor-in-Chief of *The Managra*, which is not only a great honor, but also means hard work, and requires executive ability. Her final year found her filling the position of "Lady Stick,"[b] and her executive ability and sound judgment used in this office have won her the respect of all the girls.

In Basket Ball she has taken an active interest and has done great work in the position of jumping centre.

We feel that Margaret's future is a promising one. She is loved by all, and our best wish is:

> I would the Great world grew like thee,
> Who grewest not alone in power
> And knowledge, but by year and hour
> In Reverence and in Charity.
>
> (*The Managra* 1920–21, vol. 14, p. 29)

NOTES

[a] The Isbister Scholarship was the highest academic award bestowed by the College. It was established "through the good offices of the chancellor and the generosity of a native of the North-West, Alexander Kennedy Isbister . . . [and] granted to promising students 'without distinction of race, creed or sex.' . . . [T]he best scholars in the schools of the province and in the classes of the university were the beneficiaries of the man born at Cumberland House on the Saskatchewan, who had risen so high in an old and complex civilization, but remembered so helpfully the raw and growing society of his native land" (Morton 1957: 32). The trust fund, established through the gift of the Manitoban who had starred at the Universities of Edinburgh and London and risen to be Headmaster of the Stationers' School (London) and Dean of the College of Preceptors, disappeared in the "defalcations" of 1932 when "J. A. Machray, chairman of the Board of Governors, honorary bursar of the university, chancellor of St. John's College, chancellor of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, senior partner in the law firm of Machray and Sharpe, investment agents of the University Trust funds, a citizen and business man of spotless reputation and unimpeachable integrity, . . . lost in bad investments the university endowments entrusted to his care" (Morton 1957: 147).

[b] "Stick" is the symbol of office and title given to the president of the student body in each faculty of the University of Manitoba. In those faculties, such as Agriculture, where the student body was overwhelmingly male, "Lady Sticks" represented the interests of women students. The "stick" in question was a walking stick presented as a class gift in 1918 by the first degree graduates of the program and passed from Senior Stick to Senior Stick each year since.