

## Co-ops for Each and All of the Little People?

R. James Sacouman

Volume 11, Number 1, Autumn 1981

URI: [https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad11\\_1rv06](https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad11_1rv06)

[See table of contents](#)

---

### Publisher(s)

The Department of History of the University of New Brunswick

### ISSN

0044-5851 (print)

1712-7432 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

---

### Cite this document

Sacouman, R. J. (1981). Co-ops for Each and All of the Little People? *Acadiensis*, 11(1), 155–158.

Meadows finds, letting them speak for themselves, would have strengthened this study, *The Discovery of a Norse Settlement in America* represents the culmination of years of archival and field research by the Ingstads and stands as a unique contribution to the history of Atlantic Canada. With the designation of L'Anse aux Meadows as a National Historic Site in 1968, investigations into the archaeology of this site have been continued by Parks Canada and one can look forward to significant future publications chronicling the earliest known European settlement in the New World.

DAVID L. KEENLYSIDE

### Co-ops for Each and All of the Little People?

Recapturing the co-operative movement in English Canada generally and in the Maritimes specifically during its heyday as a vital social force has burgeoned of late. Three recent contributions will be discussed here. Interestingly enough, these contributions are products of three somewhat distinctive disciplinary backgrounds: history, the civil service, and sociology. Yet despite these differences, all three are complementary in their enthusiasm for formal co-operation as a way forward for petty producers and workers in local, regional and national communities. In this respect, these works share with the earliest analyses of the co-operative movement a commitment to the movement's self-help emphasis and its relatively democratic organizations.<sup>1</sup> This commitment gives all three contributions both their substantive strengths and their analytical blinders.

Of the three analyses, Ian MacPherson's *Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945* (Toronto, Macmillan of Canada, 1979) is by far the most comprehensive in spatial breadth, temporal scope, and documented detail, especially in relation to the leadership's struggle to mobilize national support and the movement's uneven organizational growth. MacPherson clearly establishes co-operation as one of many hinterland reform movements in the early part of this century in Canada, linking the movement to European reform traditions. For MacPherson, reforming idealism, or opposition to the dominant capitalist ethic through organizational principles of non-profit, one person one vote, tolerance, and surplus distribution on the basis of participation, distinguish co-operation from other reform movements, from the identified cause of the problems — capitalist victimization of petty producers

<sup>1</sup> For a taste of the early literature in Maritime co-operation see G. Boyle's *Democracy's Second Chance* (New York, 1944), M.M. Coady's *The Social Significance of the Co-operative Movement* (Antigonish, 1945) and J.T. Croteau's *Cradled in the Waves* (New York, 1951).

and workers — and from the feared successes of more radical movements, in particular the various socialist options. Having phrased his argument in terms of the reform ethic as it developed in organizational forms, MacPherson provides an excellent account of organizational struggles in the growth of a nation-wide (read English Canadian) co-operative body. His account of organizational mobilization is quite frankly a 'must-read' for social analysts of this century, especially for those who are concerned with recapturing how the 'little people' in the 'hinterlands' have collectively attempted to make their world. And yet, despite its must-read status in terms of 'what's been did' within the formal co-operative movement, the analysis is marred, or at least made suspect, by its failure to analyze 'what's been hid' in the rise of formal co-operation as propagated by movement leadership and media.

Throughout, MacPherson utilizes a kind of relative deprivation model to account for the successful mobilization of co-operative efforts. In this model, workers and petty producers are viewed as victimized or made rootless by the external forces of capitalist industrialism and urbanization. Upon this base of a ready-to-act mass, "numerous, mostly middleclass leaders motivated by religious convictions, general reform sympathies, and a fear of more radical movements" (p. 3) were able to develop an ideology, programme and network that could mobilize this depersonalizing malaise by both defensive and crusading struggles for co-operative organization: "Quietly, but with remarkable rapidity, co-operative techniques had become a major defender of the hinterlands between 1900 and 1945" (p. 215).

This model is problematic for at least three reasons: First, the actual social origins of the 'little people' are left unanalyzed and thus we do not know whether, in fact, the most rootless or victimized were the most likely membership (a position which has been shown to be wrong in many other social movements). Second, differences between the membership's and leadership's situation and wants are ignored and thus we do not know to what degree the leadership did express the membership's directions. Third, differences within 'the little people' are not considered and thus we do not know, for example, whether or the degree to which proletarian and/or petty producer interests were effected or women's issues dealt with. These 'leftish' considerations are certainly not new in the literature and MacPherson's ignoring of them through a vivid focus on top-down organizational development cannot provide an answer to them. MacPherson's claim that co-operation lost its dynamism because of its very growth, i.e., its growing complexity and necessary bureaucratization (p. 213), remains mere assertion — though an assertion consistent with a reactive relative deprivation model of social movements, *viz.* the iron law of routinization, the impossibility of medium to long-term movement success. MacPherson needs to confront head-on whether there is a general iron law of long-term failure for all reform (and radical) movements or whether the middle road of co-operation failed precisely because there was no viable middle road between capitalist

exploitation and 'socialism'; the movement has become big capitalist business. An organizational and leadership focus alone cannot confront the alternative position.

Waldo Walsh's characteristically cocky *We Fought for the Little Man: My Sixty Years in Agriculture* (Moncton, Co-op Atlantic, 1978) presents, in the extreme, the ideological stance that petty producers and workers need a concerned and feisty external leadership to fight for them against big bad business and government incompetents. Walsh's book tells many of his favourite stories about how he and a few others in the Antigonish Movement leadership did just that. As always, Walsh's stories are populist-democratic sounding and often hilarious — naming names and not-often-talked-about juicy details in the course of his lengthy career in the Maritime agricultural bureaucracy. There is lots of good dirt for night-time reading but the book must be taken as a character's self-characterization.

Daniel MacInnes' "Clerics, Fishermen, Farmers and Workers: The Antigonish Movement and Identity in Eastern Nova Scotia" (PhD thesis, McMaster University, 1978), argues that the Antigonish Movement was "an instance in the sacralization of identity process" which, in case this sounds like mere verbiage, "means that a particular way of life and interpretation of reality became firmly established as a known, predictable and socially informative pattern of existence within the region of Eastern Nova Scotia during this period" (p. iii). MacInnes' emphasis on religious/ethnic/cultural formation as the principal basis for the Movement's success in the region is stated as a challenge to the earliest studies' emphases on great principles (and thus also implicitly challenges MacPherson's position) and great men (and thus Walsh's view). As well, it challenges those recent analysts (myself included) "who locate the movement within the context of a capitalist economic system and label its efforts as failure because it did not make an adequate response to the structural conditions of capitalist relations of productions" (p. 19). MacInnes marshalls an extensive array of newspaper, archival and human sources to present this dual challenge, presenting along the way the most full-fledged account of Movement mobilization available, and consistently arguing the case for a focus on regional identity formation. As he recognizes in his own conclusions (pp. 421-49), MacInnes' thesis does not overthrow the 'capitalist relations of production' position; it does demonstrate the need for "cross cutting my perspective with the type of questions introduced by economic relations" (p. 433). The significant empirical question becomes, then, what were the precise ways in which class relations and the religious/ethnic/cultural dimensions intertwined? Following from this, to what degree did the Movement's leadership actively attempt to utilize non-economic factors to bury significant class differences among 'the little people', while promoting a fundamentally petty producer-populist programme? Like virtually all dissertation arguments, MacInnes concludes where he recognizes he has to begin.

If the three works reviewed here say anything in general to all readers of this journal, it is the importance of clearly specifying one's theoretical/ideological position in one's analysis. It simply is inadequate for social analysts in the region to hide their own theories under the thoroughly discredited guise that they are letting the facts speak or that others are being too polemical. More than ever we need to join history and the human sciences and neither bury ourselves in 'the facts' nor in the heavens. If the three demonstrate anything specific with respect to the title-question of this review, it is that the question still awaits much more detailed and informed analysis. Serious scholarship cannot accept at face value that

Co-operation is a religion pure and simple. It is something which all your senses recognize and long for in proportion to the good there is in you.<sup>2</sup>

Surely 'good' 'little people' and good little analysts need to ask more critical questions.

R. JAMES SACOUMAN

2 *Grain Growers' Guide*, 18 October 1911.

### An Enterprising Conference

Since the 1920s "regional disparity", as Maritimers viewed it, or "Maritime underdevelopment", as it seemed to many central Canadians, has remained a perennial topic of controversy and concern. Since 1970, however, fresh scholarly interest has added new methodologies, dimensions, and intensity to the subject. Newfoundland has been at the eastern end of this new wave of Maritime or Atlantic studies, and the present volume of Proceedings of the Second Conference sponsored by the Maritime History Group of Memorial University of Newfoundland, *The Enterprising Canadians: Entrepreneurs and Economic Development in Eastern Canada* (St. John's, MUN, 1979), edited by Lewis R. Fischer and Eric W. Sager, underlines Memorial's role in the movement. At the western end are those responsible for the initiation of the modern *Acadiensis*, especially the founding members from the Department of History in the University of New Brunswick. Between these geographic limits, industrial Cape Breton has prompted innovative, class-oriented and Marxist studies of labour's political and social condition and protest. Unfortunately, the rest of Nova Scotia has not been so generously treated, much of New Brunswick even less so, and Prince Edward Island only occasionally. The new Atlantic literature is thus very uneven. Those first on the scene have presented broad syntheses of Mari-