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This exposition utilizes Marxian theory in conjunction with archaeological and historiographic data to understand and interpret the significance of the landscape in the political economy of a mid-nineteenth century farmstead in Battle Creek, Michigan. The Shepard site (20CA104) was a family owned, progressive farm that went through many significant changes between the frontier era (ca. 1834) and the eve of the Civil War. By exploring the political, economic, and ideological aspects of the site architecture, the familial gender divisions of labor, and class relations between the family and non-familial workers, many aspects of the political-economic contradictions between the landscape and social relations are revealed. Therefore, this research contributes to at least three important areas of current academic scholarship: (1) debates on agrarian political-economic transitions in the US; (2) critical historical archaeology, specifically, farmstead archaeology; and (3) Michigan and Battle Creek agrarian historiography.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the last three decades, numerous historians have attempted to explain the rise of capitalism in North American rural agrarian sectors (e.g., Clark 1979, 1990; Hahn and Prude 1983; Hedley 1981; Kulikoff 1992a; Merrill 1977; Nobles 1988, 1990; Osterud 1991, 1993; Parker 1964; Post 1982, 1995). Many of these historians place the rise to dominance of capitalism in the century between 1750 and 1850. When capitalism came to be the dominant political-economic system in a region, community, or household depended largely on when the given study unit was settled. So, for example, former colonies and northern areas east of the Alleghenies generally became predominantly capitalist in the late 1700s whereas areas west of the Alleghenies adopted capitalism later, from 1800 or so till 1850 (Kulikoff 1992a).

These historians argue, as a general rule, that European American communities in rural areas were, during their earliest years, pre-capitalist, or even non-capitalist, political-economic formations. They recognize, usually, that elements of capitalism were likely present in rural communities from the beginning, or at least that communities were economically linked to the capitalist marketplaces in Eastern North America and Europe. However, as the infrastructure, the state, and institutions of capitalism expanded and strengthened, a result was that the general capitalist system began to disrupt traditional rural community lifeways of reciprocity and semi-
subsistence living; these political-economic disruptions pushed rural communities into irreversible capitalist market, exchange, and labor relations (Kulikoff 1992a). After such transmutations in rural communities, through systemic political-economic envelopment, capitalism became predominant. Prior to these transformations, other forms and even modes of production were predominant. Historians who recognize this systemic transformation see this dynamic political-economic period as the “transition to capitalism.”

Other historians interested in rural areas during the same time period argue that such a transition to capitalism never did happen (Osterud 1990). Rather, they argue that capitalism was always present at some significant level and to some degree since the founding of the colonies. These historians argue that the capitalist political economies in various northern rural communities changed throughout the 1600s-1800s (e.g., Appleby 1982; Rothenberg 1981, 1985, 1988) but they did not go through a transition from non-capitalist or pre-capitalist political economies to capitalism. In short, this view argues that the historical presence of capitalism in North America is not in question but rather only the intensity of its influences.

The purpose of this study then is to contribute to this ongoing debate using historiographic and archaeological and landscape data. These latter sources of information have largely been ignored by historians in these discussions of political-economic transitions in historical agrarian America. However, historical archaeology can potentially contribute pertinent and important information to these issues that typical historiographic sources (e.g., censuses, diaries, wills) lack; it is possible that
the use of material culture, as an analytical and data resource, can bring in a different perspective to the largely two-sided debate. To achieve this, I will use landscape and archaeological data to argue that material culture, the landscape, and space-use had a significant effect on labor and social relations during the years 1834-1865 at the Shepard farm in Battle Creek, Michigan. The use of the landscape, space, and material culture at this particular farmstead, it will be argued, played a major role in the perpetuation of gendered divisions of labor and non-capitalist labor relations amongst family members and extra-familial workers throughout the 1840s and 1850s.

Specifically, in the macro-perspective, external market pressures, the creation of non-subsistence producing classes in non-rural sectors, and the hegemonic rise of the global capitalist economy allowed farmers to adopt capitalist and progressive uses of space surrounding their houses as well as in the domiciliary spaces in these houses (McMurry 1997). These pressures, it is argued, then actually put the Shepards and extra-familial laborers in the political-economic position to avoid wage-labor relations on the micro-scale. These strategies of wage-labor avoidance then allowed residents to avoid a total transition to capitalism. Thus, in many ways contradictions were constantly afoot in the political economy of the farm as capitalist pressures promoted and yet aggravated essential non-capitalist work and labor relations. Obviously though, the historical lack of true capitalism does not mean that the farm had a staid political economy.

Thus, this exposition will argue a view not typically championed in the debates regarding the transition to capitalism in agrarian America by using data that
gives interesting testimony to the causes of the contradictory agrarian political economy. This view is that capitalism at one scale promoted and maintained non-capitalist relations on a smaller scale. What is critical though is that the two major conduits for these constant macro-scale and micro-scale contradictions were the capital-influenced use of the landscape and the system of space-use that created the farmstead itself. Thus, material culture and landscape was critical contributor to the changing political economies of agrarian sectors.

Farmers, like Shepard, may have participated in the external markets by intensifying their use of the means of production to increase their amounts of surplus. Roughly speaking, this intensification of surplus production, in turn, helped perpetuate and expand non-rural productive efforts and manufactures through feeding non-subsistence producers and capitalists in other areas (e.g., industrial and urban areas) within the macro-economy. On individual farms, the increase of production efforts also, quite often, resulted in the bringing in of extra-familial laborers to work the fields and live on the private property in order to facilitate the surplus production process (Schob 1975). Therefore, the domestic economies and production strategies of individual farmsteads had to accommodate the consistent, if seasonal, presence of non-familial hands in the yards, fields, and homes.

However, the increased allocation of private property space for farm families on individually-owned farms meant that they, in effect, circumscribed their non-productive living to tightly nucleated spaces (i.e., farmsteads). The intensification of space-use in such relatively small areas of landscape by numerous people (i.e., family
and non-familial workers) intensified the influences and meanings of personal, political-economic (e.g., class), and gender-based contradictions in daily living. Families then were forced to deal with and accommodate these daily aggravations and contradictions. This exposition will show how one family, the Shepards, worked to avoid the aggravations of intensified class and gender contradictions by attempting to maintain non-capitalist relations on their farm. Thus, they cannot be described as having gone through a total transition to capitalism, even by as late as 1860.

In Chapter II, I will combine various theoretical concepts that will develop a political-economic framework for historical analysis of the Shepard farm. This framework will be heavily informed by Marxist theory but it may be broader in scope than some traditional Marxist approaches. In Chapter III, I will discuss briefly the methods and data used in the research of the Shepard site. In Chapter IV, I will discuss applicable history at three scales: state-wide, local, and site-specific. In Chapter V, I will combine theory and documentary data to look at the nineteenth-century landscape of the farmstead as well as some limited archaeologically recovered materials of the period. From this, I explore the dialectics between gender, public/private dichotomies, and class; their contradictory manifestations, relations to material culture, and recursivity with historical space-use will be detailed. I conclude the study in Chapter VI by underscoring the significance of the analysis, its contributions to our understanding of capitalist transformations, and some possible avenues for future research.
CHAPTER II

MARXIST THEORY AND AGRARIAN TRANSITIONS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY NORTH AMERICA

The Basis of Marxist Analysis

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production (Marx and Engels 1973:67).

The material conditions, or mode of production, of any historical era and geographical range have profound and undeniable power in determining the historical lives of individuals and communities within its boundaries (Berlin 1963:108-111). As the words of Marx and Engels above clearly indicate, individual natures (and one therefore assumes that this holds for groups of individuals) “depend” on the material conditions. This reading is a well-known aspect of Marxist economic theory (Breisach 1962:35) and critics of Marx have certainly attacked this portion of the doctrine (e.g., see Russell 1959:351-356; Schumpeter 1976:11-48; see also Lukacs 1971:1-30) in order to discredit his philosophy and general analysis as being merely a brand of vulgar materialism (James 1985:146-147). However, Marx and Engels (1977:175;
see also Marx 1956, 1973) do seem to suggest in the statement above and elsewhere that the material conditions, the materially grounded “practices” (Althusser 1969) or elements do not define the total life of any individual. Rather, the mode of life, the *modus vivendi*, that individuals experience is thoroughly entwined with a mode of production but is at the same time distinctive and worthy of its own name.

Furthermore, the mode of life is, or at least contains, in some sense, the facet or dimension of individual and collective agency of a mode of production. By agency I mean that people have the ability to do “purposeful activity” (Marquardt 1992:104) as individuals and collectively. Agency exists because people “experience...their surroundings in terms of enculturated cognitive categories and make decisions based in part on their interests” (Marquardt 1992:104; see also Gramsci 1971:406-433).

People have agency if by no other means than through their engagements in daily discourses or “…systems of possibility” (Philp 1985:69). Individual lives are laden, or even structured, with relative amounts of power and control. Due to this contradictory existence people have, wherein they are forced to contend with determined conditions and “use” their own agency to manipulate their relative surroundings to some degree, they, “…make their own history...” within the material constraints in which they are born (Marx 1994:15). It is thus important to note that historical phenomena on individual or social scales are not outcomes that are determined by only agency or the historically contingent material conditions. Rather, each moment must be seen, conceived rather, as being an interdependent dynamic that is a result of, and incorporates, elements of both agency and political economic structure.
Both of these aspects of human existence—agency and material conditions—seem to find their place, as well as a macro-scale analogue, in the classical Marxist schematic framework of a mode of production. In this conceptualization the primary division is between superstructure and the base or infrastructure (Atkinson 1982:58; Berlin 1963:110; Marx 1977:175). The superstructure is composed of primarily political elements, elements that can also be seen as aspects of the mode of life that allow for, and are perhaps by-products of, agency: religion, law, government, politics, aesthetics, philosophy, etc. As Atkinson (1982:62) suggests, "...features of the superstructure...[can] escape economic determination and exert an independent influence of their own—even an influence on the development of the substructure [or base] itself." Although the superstructure "...mirrors the foundation on which it is raised [the base]..." (Heilbroner 1964:120), its components are not passive aspects of and in a given mode of production; the superstructure can have causative influences on the base (Hobsbawm 1989:20; Trigger 1993).

The base, then, is made up of social, economic and material elements. This infrastructure is further bifurcated into two parts, the forces of production and the social relations of production. The former is made up of the means of production (i.e., all technology, all utilized resources, and all technical and scientific knowledge) and the organization of production (i.e., the division of labor and labor management). The social relations of production are the ways that people relate to others in order to access and utilize the means of production and thus include property and labor relations. These social relations of production "denote specific patterns of ownership and
control of the forces of production and hence different forms of access to the products themselves" (Trigger 1993:163). Although the superstructural component is seen generally as the non-material elements of a historical moment, the production of such phenomena may actually have roots, albeit perhaps partially, in the material conditions found in the forces of production and the social relations of production (see Orser 1994:177). Thus, as in the dichotomy between the mode of production and the mode of life, both components are interdependent and each may have causative influence on the other.

What is absolutely critical is that these various components of the base and superstructure exist dialectically. In another way, there is a contradictory synergy that governs the relations between the various elements within each part, and between elements of the base and superstructure, at any given historical moment and over time (for discussions of the theory and ontology of dialectics see, for example, Edgely 1982; Lukacs 1971; Marquardt 1992; McGuire 1992:93-99; Novack 1971:15-29; Oilman 1993). Indeed, looking at these interdependent components dialectically insures that one actually “puts them back together”; the nature of the dialectic relationship demands that all facets of a given contradiction be looked at simultaneously and in conjunction with each other to bring back, in the final analysis, the “totality.” This was, and still is, the revolutionary essence of Marxist materialism, as a science, method, and ideology (see Lukacs 1971:27-29). To take a classic example (Heilbroner 1964; Marquardt 1992), one cannot analyze only a slave or only the master...they only make sense when both are looked at simultaneously because those
contradictory historical categories (i.e., slave and master) were developed and understood in relation to each other.

The synergy of contradiction forges a nature of "inherent change" in any given mode of production (Heilbroner 1964:119; see also McGuire 1992:91-114). The interdependencies, the necessary relationships between entities, are the most important phenomena in the examinations of antithetically posed entities; when dialectically existing foci of study are kept separate and related simply in a dualistic discourse, the risk is great of subordinating one aspect or element to another and thus positing one as more important or significant (Jennings 1993:111-126; see also McCloskey 1993:69-90).

As there are contradictions within a given mode of production, there is also the possibility of contradiction between two or more simultaneously existing modes of production. Furthermore, there can be portions or elements of one mode of production existing dialectically with other elements of a different mode depending on the historical moment or era. Thus, as there were and are different simultaneously existing modes and certain modes fuel and follow any historical geographic expansion, a given area or region may be effected by two different modes operating simultaneously; also, one mode may be dominant while elements of other modes operate within the dominant one (Allan Zagarell, personal communication, 1998; see also Hobsbawm 1989:108-110). In theory and in practice modes of production are not placid.
Although my above description of the Marxist framework may be an example of what Hobsbawm (1989: 18) calls "vague generalisations about dialectics..." and the relations of the base and the superstructure, it has served to illustrate the basis of the necessarily dynamic political-economic framework that will clarify other Marxian concepts (e.g., class relations, the state, power, and alienation). The description, then, is of the general idealized Marxist framework of the material and political apparatuses within which the majority of humans have historically lived; modes of production, material conditions, agency, the mode of life, and contradiction seem the basis of every society.

However, with that basic understanding the task remains to add historical flesh to the framework. Human existence is always historically contingent and any period, epoch, and even moment is unique and has its own political-economic "characteristics." Thus, Marx and subsequent historians have understood and analyzed numerous modes of production throughout the past five millennia (e.g., the Asiatic or Oriental Mode [e.g., see Godelier 1981; Southall 1988], the Classical Mode [e.g., see Marx 1989:147-177], and the Lineage Mode [e.g., see Rey 1975]) that have characterized the political-economic and social formations of various states and regions. As this analysis is interested in understanding the political economy of a early to mid-nineteenth-century frontier and agricultural landscape in Michigan, of particular interest is the Capitalist Mode of Production (CMP). With the framework discussed above in mind, it seems now prudent to define what this term means in its most basic sense.
Although capitalism is theoretically a mode of production, and implicates a confusing, "...cluster of economic, social, political, legal, and cultural relations" (Bernstein and Wilentz 1984:172), most political economy-minded theoreticians and historians probably agree that there are central and imperative tendencies (Kulikoff 1992:13-27; Schumpeter 1976:21-156). Post's (1995:391-392) basic Marxist definition and description seems a good starting point. He suggests that capitalism is a, form of social production in which capitalists, a class of non-producers, own and control productive property (land, tools, machinery and so on), buy the capacity to work (labour-power) of wage workers, direct producers who do not possess means of production, and organise the latter in a labour process to produce commodities (products for the market).

A fundamental set of results or processes of these historical material conditions, Post (1995:392) continues, is that,  

[w]hile capitalists pay the wage worker the value of their capacity to work (the monetary equivalent of those commodities that the workers need to survive day to day and reproduce themselves inter-generationally), capitalists are able to extract a surplus product (surplus value) through their command of the labor process, which allows them to force workers to produce commodities in excess of the value of their wages.

The concomitant emphases in this definition are critical, however seemingly basic and typical, to political-economic analyses of capitalism. Social labor as a productive form and a social process, the commodification of materials and laborers through wage-labor, the production of surplus values by capitalists through commodified subalterns, the resultant class schisms, and the importance of the daily reproduction of the laborer, are hallmarks of capitalism. Numerous historians have analyzed

So, in capitalism the wage-worker and the physical labor s/he performs for the capitalist are actually commodified; the wage-worker literally sells his/her labor-power, energies, and body to the capitalist, like it were an object or commodity in the market (Tong 1989:41). That which is produced by the laborer is intrinsically linked to market demands (e.g., consumers) for those products through the power, fiat and capital of the owner of the means of production. Therefore, the material culture and subsistence goods produced by the worker at the behest of the capitalist are absolutely critical in the perpetuation of the system itself and directly reflect and participate in that system (Paynter 1988:414-415). Furthermore, the existence of a market links the laborer, the capitalist and the consumer to the world capitalist system of exchange relations (Tong 1989; see also Mintz 1985).

The ability of the capitalist to extract new profits by accruing surplus value (i.e., capital) and controlling the organization of labor by virtue of her/his ownership of the means of production (e.g., land, productive technologies, and capital), is significant to say the least (see Nassaney and Abel 1998). The power of the capitalist to do so comes, in part, from the capitalist's domination in the sphere of the relations of
production via her/his relative economic and political power. This dialectic between the two main classes in the CMP (i.e., owners of the means of production vs. those that do not own any productive means) is indeed one of the main sources of exploitation and alienation inherent to capitalism (Aptheker 1965:21; Meszaros 1970; Schacht 1988).

The final imperative of capitalism is the general accumulation of capital by the capitalist; this, "...is capitalism's historic mission...and its central dynamic" (Byres 1995:564). Furthermore, capital accumulation, "is the driving-force of capitalist transformation" (Byres 1995:564). Through the perpetual accrual of surplus capital through the power s/he has in owning the means and controlling the various aspects of labor (including the laborers themselves as commodities), and to some extent the market, the capitalist helps maintain the contradictory political economy of the CMP. Therefore, given the dialectical nature of their relationship, the worker and the consumer are critical to the maintenance of this contradictory mode as well.

In addition to the dominant relations and material conditions in capitalism discussed above, critical relations also include gender relations vis a vis the gendered division of labor and patriarchy (e.g., see Barrett 1980; Hartmann 1981; Jennings 1993; Kulikoff 1992a; Mitchell 1984; Osterud 1993, 1991:139-202), the role of the state in the historical processes of capital monopolization, expansion, and hegemony (e.g., Johnson 1999; for general discussion of theoretical state dynamics, see Gailey and Patterson 1987), and the role of ideologies (e.g., McMurry 1997; Rezneck 1932). Finally, the recursive relations of people to the material world, landscapes, and per-
sonal possessions are also very significant (e.g., see Johnson 1996; Leone 1988; Orser 1991, 1995, 1996; Paynter 1982, 1988). I will discuss some aspects of these issues at various points below. However, I now turn the discussion to political-economic transitions. This will bring into this developing theoretical framework a historically-rooted basis for understanding the political-economic period of change within the CMP that this exposition is ultimately interested in.

Political-Economic Transitions

In Marxist studies of history one of the intrinsically interesting and potentially informative concepts and frameworks is that of the political-economic transition. Political economic transitions are historically contingent, and unique, periods of dramatic transformation, alteration, contradiction, and change between two or more modes of production or between political-economic facets (i.e., components) within a given mode. Furthermore, during such transitions, the cultures, societies, modes of life, and ideologies that are enmeshed within, and compose, the changing political-economic infrastructure are also greatly effected and altered as struggles for new forms of social and economic power come to dominate the everyday activities of individual agents and groups.

Although there may be a temptation for the historian to attach the approbatory notion of “progress” as a justifying ideological appendage to the concept of a transition (e.g., Nisbet 1980:258-269; see also, Hobsbawm 1989:11-14), there is in reality no necessary relation between progress and political-economic transitions (see Wal-
lerstein 1995:95-110). Rather, from a Marxist orientation these are actually theoretically anticipated, or predicted, dialectical periods of transmutation between various aspects of the base and superstructure of a given mode of production that result in, and from, tensions and political-economic upheaval. That new form of production to which the mode of production changed was not necessarily better than the replaced quondam mode of production or aspects of a mode that characterized the prevenient historical epoch or period.

Historically, political-economic transitions seem to have been one of two broad types. One was the political-economic transition between one mode of production to another. An obvious example is the historical transition from Feudal Mode of Production (FMP) to Capitalist Mode of Production (CMP) in Europe; the FMP was a mode of production that was based on peasant agriculture and commodity production by independent guild artisans. In this case the wealth of an elite few formed through usury and commerce (Marx 1976:452, 915). During the “long” sixteenth century (ca.1450-1640; after Stern 1988:830), the transition to the CMP in the Euro-Iberian core saw a transformation of the labor and social relations into surplus value-producing commodity industries and free-labor systems whereby money was transformed into “manufactorial” and industrial capital (Wallerstein 1983). Over the course of the transition in the core, elements of the FMP existed alongside the nascent CMP developments until eventually the CMP became the dominant mode (although not the only mode of production) as most vestiges of the FMP were eliminated (Marx 1976:915; see also, Wallerstein 1993:138-151). In regions that were peripheral to
the core during the period, non-capitalist modes existed alongside the expanding and enveloping CMP.

However, political-economic transitions have also occurred that did not involve shifts from one mode of production to another, like the transition from the FMP to CMP. These other forms of political-economic transitions seem to be integrally related to the geographical expansion of the core capitalist system to relative outlying areas. Immanuel Wallerstein suggests (1993:141) that historians have used the term “transition” in three ways, often lumping these meanings together and creating a certain amount of confusion. These three meanings, although used in the context of discussing the European transition from the FMP to the CMP, may have implications for our discussion of the later agrarian economic transition America.

The first use of the term “transition”, according to Wallerstein (1993:141-142), describes the overall transition from FMP to the CMP. Wallerstein’s suggested other two uses of the term “transition” are related to the aggressive expansion of the CMP throughout the rest of the world. As he suggests, “[t]he second use of ‘transition’ is to refer to the subsequent incorporations of outside non-capitalist systems into the ongoing and necessarily expanding capitalist world economy.”

This second understanding of a political-economic transition really refers to the actual geographic expansion of the historical core-periphery system and the envelopment of other economies by that expanding system. Wallerstein’s description then suggests that two or more competing modes existed in the same area(s) simultaneously and that capitalism ultimately came to dominate. Obviously, Wallerstein’s
use of the term “incorporations” is a very static and “sanitary” image of what would have happened at the fronts of colonial and imperial expansion, the periphery. At any historical moment, these areas would have been points of coevally chronic acquiescence, confrontation, aggression, resistance, change, accommodation, contradiction, and general political-economic volatility as the general studies by historians and anthropologists do show (e.g., Berkhofer 1979:113-175; Chatterjee 1989; Pedersen 1991; Nash 1982:29-140, 223-298; Nassaney 1989; Sharp 1952; Silverblatt 1987; Stern 1988; Wolf 1982; Zinn 1980:1-23). This idea of expansion as part of a basic framework of analysis must be included in any discussion of a historical US agrarian political-economic transition or transformation. However, it needs to be refined to include, amongst other ideas, other more specific critical theoretical knowledge on social relations and economics of a particular set of historical circumstances.

Finally, the third type of transition, “...refer[s] to the extension of the proletarianization of labor and the commercialization of land within the capitalist world economy to internal regions still utilizing other ways of paying labor or assuring control of land” (Wallerstein 1993:141). This supplies a very useful distinction for analyses of economic transitions; it is essentially a laconic statement about how the CMP came to be dominant and its political-economic effects in expansionist territories. Also, the description is perhaps the most explicitly social and political of the three. In this case it is suggested that after the actual expansion and “incorporation” of other economies (i.e., transition type 2), internal social processes continue to work and change the relations of production of (and between) the incorporating and the in-
corporated people. The enveloping capitalist system expands its proletarianization (i.e., through the commodification of people's labor and the resultant alienation of people themselves) throughout the potential labor-force within its geographic parameters. Importantly, the implication is that the methods of remuneration are critical. As capital becomes a motivating force in the relations of production (in this case labor relations), traditional ways of exchanging labor for something else become dominated by cash payment for work (i.e., human labor becomes a commodity). The commercialization of land, or the assurance of private ownership of the means production (i.e., private property/land) by capitalists and bourgeoisie through commodification of the land, occurs after the geographic expansion as well. Theoretically and historically, as these processes occur or occurred, commodity production—perhaps the underlying basis of all historical European and imperialist geographic expansion (Arendt 1979:124-127)—can begin, or began, in earnest.

In essence then, this third notion of transition underscores the idea that after the geographic expansion, the people and land within the expansionist areas undergo a series political-economic changes that alter their relations to one another and to the land (and space). Importantly, these processes occur over time, and eventually establish the CMP base (e.g., the commercial market, commodity production, wage-labor, etc.) and various superstructural elements (e.g., the state) within the geographic and landscape space overtaken. These transformations occur variously in time and character throughout the "incorporated" areas.
Furthermore, as the transitional type 2 was historically an ongoing process that kept creating new frontiers, transitional type 3 would have essentially created the semi-peripheral, or quasi-developed and capital-dominated, areas. These would have included erstwhile frontier areas that had begun going through processes of commercialization and proletarianization. Thus, at any point in time, a given geographical place may have been going through transition type 2 whereas another was going through type 3. Finally, it is also, it would seem, theoretically possible that any given location could have simultaneously gone through both types. For example, as a given community was at the periphery or frontier and competing with, for example, native, kin-based political economies, they may have at the same time brought elements of the CMP with them and began the processes of proletarianization and commercialization. In general, the 2	extsuperscript{nd} and 3	extsuperscript{rd} types of transition may be useful in understanding the nature of agrarian political economies and their transitions in expansionist US history.

In the following, with the above discussion of the nature of the modes of production, particularly capitalism and the dialectical periods of political-economic transition in all their forms in mind, I discuss the obvious theoretical relevance of agrarian social formations and production to the transition to agrarian capitalism. The discussion will bring into this understanding of nature of the CMP some of the issues surrounding agrarian production within that mode of production with an emphasis on petty commodity production (pcp). The discussion will thus finalize the theoretical framework I will use to analyze the political-economic history of the Shepard site.
The Agrarian Question

The discussions of US agrarian transitions to capitalism are rooted in a major analytical question that has interested numerous historians and theorists since Marx (see Byres 1995. Also see Banajali 1990; Luxemburg 1968; Post 1995:389-393; Patterson 1998). This so-called “agrarian question” is really more a set of questions centered on the centrality of agriculture in capitalism. How capitalism develops in agrarian sectors (Mann 1990:1), how agriculture effects the CMP in all of its stages and states, how capitalist agriculture differs from industrial capitalism, how significant the countryside is in capital accrual within the total system (Byres 1995:566-568), and, what the dialectics between industrial and agrarian sectors are within capitalist modes of production (Patterson 1998) are all critical. Such figures as Engels (e.g., 1990), Marx (e.g., 1977, 1963) and Kautsky (1988) devoted much energy to fleshing out the importance of agriculture to the rise and workings of capitalism, as well as to the social and class ramifications of changes within, and transitions to, capitalism in agrarian sectors (Patterson 1998). For example, in his book The Agrarian Question, Kautsky, “sought to explain why the development of capitalist agriculture was proceeding at a different pace and taking a different form from industry, and how capitalist social relations coexisted and articulated with pre-capitalist relations in the countryside” (Patterson 1998). These pre-capitalist relations are often understood as being based on some form of petty commodity production. As one of the emphases in discussions of American agrarian transitions is the role of domestic
or household production and manufacture (e.g., Clark 1990:121-191; Merrill 1977, 1986), it seems worthwhile to explore it more thoroughly.

Petty Commodity Production

In general, Marxist scholars address often, and quite consistently, the prevalence of home-based, commodity-producing enterprises in all parts of the world. The general importance of home production is stressed at various historical moments for both the resistance to, and the rise of, the hegemonic infiltration of capital and the CMP around the globe (e.g., Binford and Cook 1991; Kahn and Llobera 1981; Lem 1991; Taussig 1980). As these social and production formations were often historically antithetical to capitalism, as well as dominant relative to capitalism, they were points of historical contradictions. Therefore, domestic-based forms of production are often central to discussions of political-economic transitions (Friedmann 1980:159).

Known variously as petty commodity production, Petty Commodity Mode of Production, simple commodity production, and domestic production, the relation of historically ubiquitous home-based production systems to the CMP is complicated and often rather tenebrous and abstruse; I will use the first term (as “pcp”) throughout the remainder of this exposition. As I have already discussed, one of the critical aspects of the CMP is that the laborer is essentially purchased for a wage (i.e., the cost of day-to-day survival of the worker) and commodified by a capitalist. Thus, when scholars observe historical moments where laborers were not commodified (or not
totally commodified), even though the CMP was present and even dominant, certain questions arise as to the significance of that non-capitalist system of labor relations. Given that pcp tended and tends to occur in homes or within family or kinship groups, it is generally composed of non-waged labor, and women perform much of it. Thus, there is also a significant set of questions centering on the role of unwaged laborers, gender relations, and the role of patriarchy in its prevalence and/or demise.

Friedmann (1980:159) suggests that, "[h]istorically, the most common unit of agricultural production has been the household, in which the domestic group jointly provides labour, possesses at least part of the means of production, and may dispose of at least part of the product of its labor." The household, then, is the starting point of analysis and is seen as having its own micro-scale political economy. Although this ignores the fact that the basic unit of the household is in itself dynamic and worthy of further deconstructive analysis (Thompson 1978), it does point to important historical characteristics of some agricultural production relations.

One is the unique nature of agriculture and farming in the capitalist mode. In particular, in historical northern farm production individuals generally owned the means of production but also labored and lived on and through those means. The farmer who owned the land, capital, and equipment also typically worked with her/his own labor-power on that land to help produce and reproduce the necessary subsistence levels of production. They often even produced limited surplus and marketable goods. Thus, the farmer typically was not commodified (Mutch 1980) because s/he didn't sell anyone else his/her body and energy as a tool for someone else's commod-
ity production. However, the farmer was linked to the external markets through occasional exchanges of goods from his/her farm to local middlemen and/or merchants (farmers were occasionally merchants as well; see Mutch 1979; Post 1995).

Critical as well is the fact that his/her spouse (if married) and children also worked at production and reproduction, albeit often in different circumstances and at different locations on the farm, and their labor was typically not commodified. Either way, both served a productive and reproductive set of functions. Although the owner may have used extra-familial help, s/he still worked the means of production alongside the worker. Marx considered the general class of private land holding farmers/owners to fall into the category of petite (or petty) bourgeois (Miller 1991).

Thus, the agrarian petty bourgeois relation to property and labor is starkly contrasted to the way that the capitalist and wage-laborer related to industrial, and manufactory production and mercantilist exchanges. In industrial and manufactory production, the owner of the productive means seldom worked the means of production himself/herself but rather relied on the wage-laborers to do so. The mercantilist situation was actually a service and exchange oriented relation between the owners/producers of commodities and consumers; mercantilists were middle-men or even "parasites on production" (Mutch 1979) in the exchange networks of capital and consumption.

Following Binford and Cook (1991:67), there are a few important characteristics of petty commodity production on which many scholars agree. The first is that pcp involves commodity production for market exchange. Second, these producers
either directly produce some of their own subsistence needs or produce exchangeable
goods to meet their subsistence needs. Third, they partially or completely own the
means of production or are under the immediate control of the direct producer.
Fourth, production is done by an unwaged domestic labor force drawn from the
household; the use of regular waged labor makes such situations capitalist enterprises
(Binford and Cook 1991:70). It then seems that petty commodity production fits well
into the nature of the petty bourgeoisie manner of production.

Importantly for this discussion, it is not necessarily production for market ex­
change that makes a given production system capitalist but actually it is production
through the use of consistent wage labor (see Collins 1991:91-92; Headlee 1991;
Hobsbawm 1989:67). Although wage-labor is certainly not the only important com­
ponent of capitalism—private property, private ownership of the means of production
and capital in general are critical—without wage labor one does not have capitalism.
However, pcp can exist alongside, articulate in some fashion, and help define the
CMP at any given historical moment (Luxemburg 1968). As Collins suggests
(1991:92) pcp relations are, "essential to capitalism as a system and stand in a dialec­
tical and contradictory relationship to waged labor, and take their meaning from their
relationship to the wage."

Petty commodity production is then a political-economic social formation of
capitalism that helps to perpetuate capitalist relations and the general CMP as well as
itself. Further, pcp is a formation that is contradictory to the general wage-labor ba­
sis of capitalism. As farm families and communities maintained a general system of
non-commodified labor relations and production, the actual surpluses produced may indeed have ended up being exchanged through market relations and thus those products entered into the capitalist consumption and production infrastructure. So at once pcp helped perpetuate the CMP through market production but at the same time helped reproduce itself as a non-capitalist social and labor formation.

From this perspective, pcp can be seen as having been necessary to capitalism and must be understood in a conjunctive and historically contingent manner. As Milonakis (1995:329) suggests, "... [pcp] does not contain within itself its own conditions of existence, as does a mode of production...". Therefore, one must understand the external, historically particular conditions of the existence of pcp (i.e., the nature of the dominant mode of production). Alternatively and contrary to the above it can be seen as sufficiently separate at particular moments and areas to warrant being considered its own system of production or even mode of production (e.g., see Mandel 1970; Merrill 1977). In this case, I believe the former conjunctive description seems most appropriate as it seems to fit the historical particulars of North American agrarian political-economy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (see Chapter III).

Thus, it seems that if one is looking for a transition to capitalism in agrarian sectors the major consideration is not market inundation of individuals or communities, their changes in orientation, or adoption of newer technologies. Rather it is the trans-temporally consistent presence of wage-labor that is the basis for capitalist dominance. Whether viewed from the perspective of an individual farm, a commu-
nity, a region or any other, the general proclivity towards wage labor on any of those levels would be the most direct route to understanding the penetration of capitalism in a given historiographic analysis.

This is not to suggest that other factors are at all insignificant to anthropological and historical understanding of capitalism or other modes of production. It does seem to suggest though that one should be aware that not every political-economic facet should be considered a prerequisite for, or a harbinger of, the predominance of capitalism and the CMP. For example, a community may slowly have become more market-oriented through improvements in transportation and presence of more local capital (Luxemburg 1968). However, until a certain level of consistent wage labor was present it may be that it did not become fully capitalist. If simple market-relations, market-indebtedness, and market orientation were lynchpins of the CMP then it seems one would have a difficult time in not finding pockets of capitalism somewhere in the world over the past five millennia.

However, it is not that simple. For example, industrial centers may be dominated by wage-labor and therefore truly capitalist but may exist coevally and recursively with an outlying hinterland agrarian community that is not dominated by wage-labor. How one analyzes, and when and where one finds, capitalism seems to be heavily dependent on their chosen scale and aspect of study. If, for example, one examines labor relations in 1830s Hartford, Connecticut, one may find domination by the CMP as wage-labor may have been common. If one examines rural Connecticut at the same time, the dominance of social, market, and labor relations by the CMP
may be much more obscured or non-existent. Finally, if one tries to extrapolate information about agrarian political-economy through the general presence of capital in the region, or through the workings of merchants as middle-men between agrarian (see Mutch 1980) and industrial-service sectors, then the danger of losing sight of the differences in the political-economies of those sectors, and on other scales, becomes dramatically increased.

As was suggested above, the analysis of the divisions of labor facilitating agrarian production obviously requires an understanding of the gendered nature of the labor relations. This holds for both petty commodity as well as capitalist production. However, the forms of the gendered division in either situation, the meanings, and the ultimate nature of the division of labor are different in either case; there are gendered divisions of labor in both pcp and CMP relations but as with every other aspect of the political economy, they take on markedly different and historically contingent meanings and potency in each. Furthermore, during a transition to capitalism one would expect changes in the gender-based division of labor (Osterud 1991).

A critical distinction in discussing pcp and CMP relations is between the theoretical concept of family and that of household. Although there is overlap between the two on certain levels, they are not synonymous by any means. As Lem (1991:105-107) suggests, “the household” is an economic institution whereas “the family” is an ideological concept. The household, then, “is susceptible to political economic analysis of its relations of production, division of labor, reproduction, and accumulation. It becomes possible to talk about the operation of the so-called ‘family
economy'" (Lem 1991:106). By considering "the family" as an historically contingent ideology (or set of them), however rooted in material and social conditions, it becomes possible to discuss the interaction and contradictorally symbiotic relations in a given domestic unit and the prevalent ideologies and relations that help maintain the household political-economy (Lem 1991); the distinction essentially divides the farmstead into a base and a superstructure. In another way, the dichotomy allows for analyzing the *material conditions* of a production locus or loci (the limited spatial and geographical individual household economy) and the agrarian *mode of life* that is interdependent with, yet distinct from, those material conditions. This approach thus allows one to dissect further the dialectic relations within a household and paves the way for discerning the roles of men, women and non-familial people in that political economy.

The ideologies of gender that existed concomitantly and integrally with the agrarian notions of family, inheritance, and proper work for either sex (Henretta 1978; Osterud 1993) informed and influenced the nature of the economic institution of the household (Fox-Genovese 1977). However, that which maintained and reproduced the household did not necessarily directly or indirectly relate to those people that were included at a particular historical moment in individual notions of the family. For example, non-waged workers who were *not* considered to be *family* may have contributed reciprocal labor from time to time that helped maintain a particular *household*'s pcp system; the family in this case did not supply the total necessary labor-power for household economy and production. By the same token, in relation to
a capitalist family, hired wage-workers may have contributed to the maintenance of a household's capitalist surplus production and its reproduction. So, the family was not necessarily the only contributor to the economics of the capitalist household either. This general, if obvious, distinction will have some measure of importance in the discussion of the role of laborers in the Shepard household production.

However, the general production of a farm at any point in the historical trajectory often relied heavily on family labor whether in pcp or in the CMP. To facilitate household production and reproduction, divisions of labor were required and these historically occurred along blurred, contested, and often antagonistic lines (Bridenthal 1976; Genovese 1982; Rubin 1975). These familial antagonisms stemmed, in part, from the patriarchal nature of capitalism and had a strong role in determining the historical form that such relations took. These divisions of labor occurred historically along gender lines; the divisions of labor was no doubt related to the general male-ownership of private property and was thus also a socially produced (Weedon 1987) and historically contingent (Engels 1891; Sacks 1975) phenomenon. Therefore, in contexts where pcp dominates (keeping in mind that pcp articulates in some way with the CMP), one might expect gender divisions of labor and coeval ideologies to be different from those found in situations where capitalist relations dominate (Lem 1991). In another way, if a transition occurred whereby pcp was eliminated, or changed dramatically as the CMP relations took strong hold of both the notions of the family and the manner of production of a household, we would also expect changes or a transition in the gendered division of labor (Osterud 1993).
With the above discussion in mind, in the following sections I will discuss the general issues that have surfaced in the scholarly discussions of the agrarian transition to capitalism. This will provide the theoretico-historical basis for the subsequent analysis of Michigan and Battle Creek local history.

Historical Frameworks for the North American Agrarian Transition

It comes as little surprise that to Marxist historians in recent years the agrarian question, with its accompanying discussions of social, political and economic transitions and the pcp, has been seen as pertinent to historical agrarian America (Post 1995). As might be expected, these historians have for the most part developed an understanding of America’s agrarian history that is not always in agreement with non-Marxian agricultural historians (Hahn and Prude 1983; Kulikoff 1992a; Post 1995). Indeed, discussions of early American agricultural economy have often led to highly disparate analyses on and within both sides of the continuum (i.e., Marxian and non-Marxian positions) which has taken the form of a debate (Kulikoff 1992a). Although I will not discuss in any great detail the debate outlined in Chapter I (I refer the reader to Kulikoff 1992a; Osterud, 1990; and Post 1995, for good summaries), I mention it to insure that the reader is informed of the existence of multiple interpretations.

It is a widely accepted fact by scholars of European and world economic history that an economic shift began in the late 15th century (Wallerstein 1983:19), that saw a gradual but dynamic transition from a non-global European FMP to the ever expanding global CMP (Braudel 1979). In general, the rise to dominance of the CMP
likely occurred by the middle to late eighteenth century in Europe (Engels 1988; Marx 1988; Wolf 1982: 266-275). This transition wrought immense, significant, and various changes in the lives of those within its domain (Johnson 1996; Wallerstein 1974; Wolf 1982). For example, one of the major changes in agricultural sectors was that the erstwhile feudal peasants, who were allotted plots of land within the demesnes of lords, and exchanged such rights for significant portions of their produce from those lands, lost the security of partial ownership as they were forced into wage labor (Braudel 1979:285-262; Headlee 1991:9-20; Kulikoff 1992a; Marx 1988:211). Without implying that the feudal system was in any sense better or worse than the subsequent capitalist one, there can be no doubt that this would have had telling and significant effects on every aspect of life for the people of all ranks, classes, and geographic regions.

This economic transition was indeed fueled by, and was historically hinged upon, the Euro-Iberian political-economic geographical expansion into “the New World” (as well as expansion into Africa and India [Marx 1976: 915-16; Marx and Engels 1988:210] and China [Loewe 1965:270-275; Marx and Engels 1988:210-211]) through the colonialisat enterprise. This colonial system was essentially contingent upon multidimensional European explorations, settlements, and exploitative quests that made so radically interdependent and dynamically contradictory the lives, cultures, and histories (Asad 1987) of the “colonizers and the colonized” (after Memmi 1965).
North American European political economy also went through dramatic change between 1650 and 1850. During this time, in many of the areas that were variously explored, colonized, and overtaken by the European expansionist countries (e.g., France, Spain, England) throughout the FMP-CMP transitional period in "the Old World," the European populace around the North American eastern seaboard began an intensification of productive efforts in both agricultural and mercantilist sectors. The new territories offered vast quantities of exploitable materials, labor, and tasks for laborers (both Native Americans and indentured/slave labor from the Old World; see Hofstadter 1973). These were critical assets in the transformation of mercantile capital to industrial capital in the 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) centuries. These allowed production and industry to gain a foothold on the North American side of the Atlantic Ocean as merchant capitalists were able to reinvest their wealth in production efforts rather than act as middlemen between commodity producers in Europe and consumers and raw material procurers in the colonies (Marx 1977).

Concomitantly, these communities on the eastern seaboard yielded to multivariate changes in political and social relations that marked and begot the long march to capitalism. This broad-scale social and political-economic systemic transition (Wallerstein's 3\(^{rd}\) type) began in the mid-eighteenth century (Hahn and Prude 1983; Kulikoff 1992a) and appears to have attended the geographic expansionist transition (Wallerstein's 2\(^{nd}\) type) west of the Alleghenies until at least the end of the Civil War (Headlee 1991). Again though, the overall transition (all three types) must be seen as an integral aspect of the rise to global dominance by the CMP (Wolf 1982). Thus, by
the end of the nineteenth-century, according to McIntyre (1995:455), "...virtually the entire planet had passed through the sequence of incorporation, specialization and dependence, that was typical of contact with expanding Europe, and these transformed populations were subject to the peculiar rhythms of capital accumulation."

Interestingly though, in North America it is known that there was no transition from the FMP to the CMP and that very few to no elements of feudalism reached its shores (much less had a dominating role). Some historians argue, however, that the time frame of circa 1750-1860 was a period of significant transition and transformation in the political economy in agrarian regions of the Eastern Seaboard colonies and US. As mentioned above, the transition from mercantile to industrial capitalism occurred during this time, with earlier roots. Concomitantly, a transition from a non-capitalist and non-commercial economy to commercial or capitalist agrarianism also occurred. There can be little doubt that the two transitions were dialectically related (Headlee 1991) and may even have been two aspects of an overall macro-scale transition that effected both the rural and urban areas of the colonies and US.

The Agrarian Transition in North America

Regarding the transition to agrarian capitalism, this period was one of incredible cultural, ideological, material, and political-economic change (e.g., see Henretta 1978) and has been difficult for historians to label and define (partially because the term "transition" does not refer to anything tangible). This period varied in "form" and duration at various locales in the country (typically, earlier in the East and later to

Kulikoff (1992c:3) suggests that,

although colonial America developed out of England’s capitalist economy, the United States was not born capitalist but became capitalist. Capitalist transformation had its origin in the rural American North during the century after 1750. It occurred within both the macroeconomics of regional, national, and world economies and the microeconomics of household, market, and ideology.

There are a couple important points in this statement. One is that eastern colonial North America is to be distinguished economically from the post-Revolutionary United States; it underscores the capitalist nature of the Revolution (Kulikoff 1992b). Colonial America was at the frontier of the European capitalist core but the Revolution in many ways extended the core productive and extractive area. Perhaps the Revolution even in a sense created a new capitalist core within this continent (Paynter 1982), specifically in those Eastern North American colonial areas, like Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia, that were once the peripheral “supply zones” (Wolf 1982:266) of the European core prior to the Revolution. Thus, whereas the colonies were at the periphery of the capitalist core until around the middle of the 17th century, and therefore operated in largely frontier-related political economies (e.g., pcp systems), after that the earlier northern colonies transformed into a capitalist economy with its own attendant frontier regions and supply zones. In this way, although the formulation seems counter-intuitive (Charles E. Orser, personal communication, 1999), the colonies were a development of, or born out of, capitalist-core expansion but went through the transition from peripheral pcp political economies to become a
true CMP; prior to the development of the CMP in the northern colonies their politi-
cal economies were predominantly non-capitalist. I will return to this general idea
below.

The second point is that the shift to agrarian capitalism took about 100 years,
or from 1750 to 1850. Although no particular place or region took 100 years to de-
velop agrarian capitalism, the century itself was a time of major geographic expan-
sion of the colonial government and later, and more dramatically, the United States
government to areas west to the Pacific. Thus, transition-types 2 and 3 took place
simultaneously at different places and at different times throughout the period of
1750-1850. So, one would expect that such significant societal transformations and
transitions occurred to various degrees, at various speeds, and at different locations
throughout the expansion territories.

The third is that primacy is placed in the rural North, in terms of the origins or
rise of capitalism in late pre-Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary America. Even
though the dichotomy between urban and rural is perhaps a false schism (insofar as
there is overlap between them on many levels [see Rotman and Nassaney 1997]), it is
important to note that the agrarian sectors of the new United States were indeed criti-
cal to the rise of capitalism. Often the focus of historical analysis of the period is
placed on primary commodity production and market locales (i.e., within cities [e.g.,
Leone 1988]) and systems (i.e., the rise of mass-production of goods [e.g., see
Schackel 1998]) and the shift from mercantilism to industrialism (Headlee 1991:1-5).
However, to many theorists (e.g., Marx and Kautsky) and historians of the Marxian
persuasion, capitalist transformations in the "countryside" or rural areas were prerequisites to any industrial revolution and industrialization (e.g., Headlee 1991:1-15; Post 1995:390; see also Patterson 1998).

Finally, these transformations and transitions played out on multiple scales. Both the macro and micro levels were all effected by this economic overhaul. This expands the analytical scheme of this debate to include possible political-economic contradictions within both levels as well as between them; the multi-scalar manner of analysis has proven to be informative, as well as important, in Marxian historical studies (e.g., Marquardt 1992). This is, of course, a point not to be ignored by the historian.

If we recognize, at least for analytical purposes, that the original colonies could be considered a new core or more likely a solid and irreversible expansion area of the omphalic European core (see Paynter 1982), then we can organize the analysis of later peripheral and semiperipheral areas of the United States around that simple framework. It would appear difficult to argue that the American portion of the core went through a transition of the same proportion as the European portion of the core (i.e., a transition comparable to the FMP to CMP or between two modes of production), but, there may be room to discuss a century of transitions of Wallerstein's 2nd and 3rd type for the semi-peripheral and peripheral agrarian areas that radiated from that new eastern United States portion of the core.
The Debate in Brief

Some North American agrarian historians regard the last half of the eighteenth century through the first half of the nineteenth-century as a period of a shift (or shifts) from a pre- or non-capitalist mode of production to the capitalist, or, a transition from a CMP with significant aspects and facets of a non-CMP to a total CMP (e.g., see Clark 1979; Faragher 1979; Headlee 1991; Kulikoff 1992a; Merrill 1977). However, others regard the same period as being one that was at most an era of certain capitalistic changes within the capitalist mode of production that had been there long before 1750. They conclude therefore that agriculture had always been in some significant way capitalist and that there was no “transition” to capitalism (e.g., see Appleby 1982; Pruitt 1984; Rothenberg 1981, 1985; Shammas 1982; Sherry 1975).

Kulikoff (1992a) has called those that see a transition to capitalism “the social historians” because of their emphasis on Marxist understandings of the importance of social relations and labor relations in the CMP and in all modes of production. These historians have thus focused on smaller scale data sets and found many forms of social and labor relations that were contradictory to capitalism. In general, while there is a general agreement among the social historians that there were capitalist qualities in the political-economies since the earliest days of the colonies (Kulikoff 1992a), they argue that the predominant political-economies (generally some form of pcp) until 1750 or later were pre-capitalist or non-capitalist.

The group of historians that believe that capitalism was present since the earliest days of colonization has been called “the market historians” because they em-
phasize the macro-economics of agrarian sectors and emphasize the dominance of the mercantile and industrial capitalist market in the lives of all agrarian residents. Thus, they are compelled to find capitalism everywhere as the general commodity market has always played a role in the lives North American European agrarian residents. Importantly, most social historians would agree that the market was present and that the market had some measure of importance in most agrarian communities.

The social historians often emphasize the destabilization and erosion of pcp relations and relative community independence in general as the CMP market and accompanying relations enveloped and altered the political-economy of the semi-independent communities and farms (Mutch 1980). The market historians consider rural agrarian relations to have always been capitalist and emphasize the market-indebtedness of agricultural producers, their market-orientation, and the general profiteer or entrepreneurial zeal that they see in most sectors of rural viand production (e.g., Rothenberg 1985, 1988; Sherry 1975).

However, the above understanding of petty commodity production and capitalism seems to suggest that market-production (and therefore it would seem the orientation) does not make a political-economic form of production necessarily capitalist whereas the consistent use of wage-labor does. Without wage labor, neither the market relations of farmers, families, and communities, the presence of a system of private property ownership, or the general production of surpluses can point to the presence of a dominance of the true CMP. The market historians all but ignore this pow-
erful aspect of labor relations in their studies of agrarian political-economies (Kulikoff 1992a).

Exploring the Social Historian Viewpoint

Again, the debate between the Market historians and the social historians is well discussed. However, the social historian viewpoint seems the most applicable to this study of this mid-nineteenth century southwest Michigan farmstead because the documentation, landscape, and material culture of the site can tell us much information about social and productive relations (Sayers 1998). Therefore, the social historian viewpoint deserves some measure of emphasis.

The social historians are concerned with the myriad ways that rural political-economies were significant in the lives of people living in the northern US (i.e., New England, the Midwest, and the Plains) during the last half of the eighteenth century and first half of the nineteenth-century (Hahn and Prude 1983:1). They tend to disagree with the market historians who suggest that these agrarian political-economies were capitalist, coming to North American shores “in the first ships” (Degler 1959:1; quoted in Post 1995:390). Rather, they argue that agrarian sectors went from a non- or pre-capitalist political economy to a capitalist one over time. They tend to be concerned with questions regarding the extent and character of these rural or agrarian communities’ and region’s capitalist orientations. These concerns thus lead to discerning the relation of the countryside to the encroaching and enveloping capitalist
apparatus and infrastructure. In short, they are concerned with many of the issues of the agrarian question.

The point of entry into the debate for these historians is typically localized and one could suggest, micro-scalar. These scholars rely on data derived from community or site-specific documentation, like census information, account ledgers, and local histories (Kulikoff 1992a; Osterud 1993). These aggregate data sets are then used to make generalizations about the agrarian political economy as a whole (e.g., Clark 1990; Osterud 1991). Perhaps most importantly, the social historians examine the differences in, and role of, domestic, kin, and local/community exchange and labor relations over time. They have discerned that agrarian communities were often very self-reliant (but not totally) and labor was predominantly familial and non-waged (Mutch 1980; Post 1995). Thus, many have seen the pcp as critical to understanding early colonial and US political-economy.

The Marxian or social historians argue their theses from angles and perspectives that are highly variegated. However, there is a general consensus, in terms of a general conclusion, that a transition to agrarian capitalism occurred as a direct result of the broader world capitalist economic market slowly enveloping the European colonies and Euro-American agricultural communities in the peripheral and semi-peripheral areas relative to the original mercantilist colonial eastern seaboard and the Euro-Iberian core. This took the form of individual farmers and rural communities going from more self-sufficient farm production for subsistence to surplus production for market; they eventually shifted from a subsistence orientation to a market orienta-
tion. Eventually capital and cash dominated the general labor systems of the agrarian sectors.

Given the earlier historical absence of dominating wage relations, accompanied by lack of overwhelming market orientation, the social historians have correctly argued that the CMP did not initially dominate many agrarian sectors until later in their respective histories. Rather the earliest political-economic domination was of reciprocal relations based on kinship ties, community bonds and a rural mentalité' (Henretta 1978). Even though the historiographic analyses of the period in general are far from conclusive, Hahn (1985:180) comments that the evidence,

suggests that farm families in a variety of geographical settings well into the nineteenth-century relied upon their own labor, looked to household subsistence before marketing 'surpluses', and were reluctant to embrace improved methods of tillage and animal husbandry.

Mann (1990) has even argued that agriculture in general has to this day never become fully capitalist.

Other social historians do not stress the self-sufficiency of individual farmers and families but rather see interdependency amongst individual families within a given rural community and see that community as being relatively independent and self-sufficient (e.g., Kulikoff 1992a:13-33; Post 1995:397). Again, many historians of the period generally agree with the idea that relative self-sufficiency at either scale or both characterizes much of the rural North in early Euro-American history. Although the conclusions amongst the social historians appear in general to be in agreement with one another, the various analyses of these scholars indicate that there are numerous issues involved in understanding how and why this transition occurred
(see Hahn and Prude 1983; Kulikoff 1992a:1-59; Osterud 1993; Post 1982, 1995, 1997), such as the widespread adoption of new agricultural technologies, shifts in gender roles, relations and divisions of labor, and the changing role of the merchant (Mutch 1980).

With regards to the agrarian transition in North America, a transition between ideologies and gender-based divisions of labor associated with pcp to a gender-based division of labor and set of ideologies associated with CMP appears to have occurred. This appears to have been relatively concomitant with, and certainly related to, the general transition from reciprocal and community relations to wage-labor and market orientation. Historians have termed this aspect of the overall political-economic transition "progressive" agriculture (McMurry 1997) and with it came a transmutation of gender roles. McMurry (1997:3-209) has done the most in-depth analysis of progressive farming and the following discussion essentially is indebted to her work.

Progressive Farming

Progressive farming was, in effect, a major facet of the drastic political-economic transition and appears to have "followed" the general trend towards earlier colonial and Eastern State development (ca. 1780-1820) and later (ca. 1820-1870) Mid-Western and western development; it occurred earlier in the East and later in the West as a general rule (McMurry 1997:x-xi). As capital came to dominate the countryside and many of its resident's labor and business relations, the knowledge of how to produce more surplus, increase production efficiency, and thus maximize yields
and profits became very important to certain farmers. Furthermore, in altering life-
styles and agrarian customs to achieve such efficiency and productivity, gender-roles
and labor assignments also changed.

In a simple way, progressive farming can be considered generally to be a ma-
terially-rooted ideological and cultural aspect to the economic changes in the CMP
and its attendant pcp production in agrarian sectors (McMurry 1997). The progres-
sive mentality and its systems of efficiency arose to overtake and dominate the pcp
form of production. It was thus very influential in creating a burgeoned middle and
upper class of farm-families as certain families and regions became more successful
than others in competing in the agricultural product markets.

The progressive farming movement, similar and related to England’s contem-
poraneous “agricultural revolution” (Strayer, et al 1961:196-197; Tannahill
1973:320-328), relied heavily on technical knowledge from industrial production and
also science (these aspects of knowledge could be considered parts of the forces of
production in a changing CMP). Through these forms of knowledge, technological
advances in the farm implement industry, and other shifts in social and labor rela-
tions, agriculture was increasingly seen as a means of producing surpluses for ex-
panding markets. Also, the surpluses fed the swelling ranks of free-laborers, service
providers, and capitalists who generally inhabited urban areas (e.g., see Dulles and
Dubofsky 1984). In short, farmers found it increasingly easier in many circumstances
to produce viands for profit.
Of course, this overall shift had more than just economic implications. It changed the very nature of farm household production and the nature of the family. Earlier, when community, reciprocity, and pcp were hallmarks of rural and agrarian customs and life, non-capitalist types of relations were imbedded in, and informed through, the daily lifestyles of most rural inhabitants. However, after the changes of progressive farming began to take hold, households became entrenched in market relations, they became ideally private and family spaces, and labor between men and women became very polarized. Men came to dominate market/social relations and production. Women eventually became household maintainers, reproductive agents, and producers of certain limited goods for market and consumption (e.g., dairy products, garden produce, and limited non-food goods like candles). Indeed, the major goal of the progressive “Cult of Domesticity” in the last half of the 19th century was to professionalize the domestic realm and renegotiate women’s power over, and in, the home (Spencer-Wood 1991).

As the actual space (i.e., the farmstead) that the family occupied began to be considered also the place where profit, livelihood, and social rank/standing was produced, the contradictory divisions between public and private space and meanings became incredibly salient. This was in part because market production (i.e., fieldwork and technical maintenance of equipment) was a male dominated or masculine sphere and thus the spaces accorded to it were also masculine. Furthermore, market production was also seen as a public activity and thus male space also became public space. Most spaces that fell outside of these sorts of meanings (i.e., male, market-
productive, and public) were private and family spaces. Not so coincidentally, these spaces tended to be where women worked, some being outside in the garden and such, and also included the kitchen and other parts of the inner-domicile. Of course, there was some overlap and blurring and all meanings weren't exactly the same everywhere, but, all farmsteads likely followed some general dichotomous use of the landscape and space.

The spaces of the house dominated by women were instilled with private and familial meanings and attributes. As men came to dominate the public and market relations and production, women found themselves (often by choice) working inside the house. Of course, as their work load increased in the house they produced more and more work for themselves and began searching for material and technological ways of loosening their increasing burdens; household maintenance and work also became a science of sorts (Spencer-Wood 1991). Therefore, because men were also approaching field production in the same seemingly efficient and scientific manner, the family-unit generally began consuming more and more manufactured goods from productive sources outside their own home in order to increase their efficiency; this resulted in great markets for everything from complex stove and cooking contraptions to a variety of agricultural implements (e.g., machine threshers). In general these sorts of changing ideologies, consumption habits, and labor relations intensified the meanings and use of the inner and extra domiciliary spaces that families lived and worked in and that guests and neighbors visited. They also had great effects on the landscapes surrounding the house.
The public perceptions of the rank and character of a given progressive farm family were very important. Thus, along with progressivism came an increased use of material culture to exhibit wealth, success, knowledge of scientific agriculture, the family’s moral worth, and general conformity to the increasingly capitalist world around them. Thus, architectural styles, landscapes, fences, outbuildings, gardens, orchards, and fields took on linear and axial qualities that spoke of precision, hard work, and efficiency. Furthermore the use of the land for production dominated privately-owned farms whereas the land given to the house, yard and activity areas associated with non-profit and surplus producing endeavors (i.e., the farmstead) was made relatively limited. This process resulted in the nucleated farmstead, characterized by a close clustering of buildings, outbuildings and associated landscapes to help limit “wasted space” or unproductive (in a profit sense) space (Sayers and Nassaney 1997). These uses of landscape and material culture also existed in recursive relation to residents and would have helped to perpetuate their reliance on material appearances as well as the methods and relations used to achieve such a progressive and efficient lifestyle. Finally, the closeness of the nucleated farmscape elements would have limited excessive and wasteful movement and thus would have limited unproductive time.

As families began producing for profit, many changes occurred that cut across numerous social, ideological, and economic lines. This resulted in heavier reliance on mass-produced material culture from practical, economic, and aesthetic aspects. This, of course, was a major boon to industrialists and urban-economic sectors in
general (see Potter 1992). Another critical point is that this demand for profit helped produce a relatively new class of agrarian people composed of unsuccessful farmers and individuals that hoped to become farmers (Schob 1975). This class was composed of laborers who worked for farmers in various ways; this class included well diggers, drainage-ditch diggers, general hired hands, and field workers (Schob 1975). This is a critical aspect of rural history because once extra-familial help became acceptable to farmers and their families, the spectre of capitalism was not far off in the form of hired wage workers and the variety of exploitative procedures and relations that make up those wage relations. These sorts of wage-relations would have cemented the transition to capitalism, even though elements of the CMP and ideologies commensurate with it may have been already in place. These phenomena ultimately were indicative of the occurrence, albeit variously and partially, of Wallerstein’s third type of transition. Where commercialization of land and proletarianization of labor occur, the CMP is dominant.

It is clear that there were a variety of changes afoot during the general transition period. Agrarian sectors went generally from a CMP dominated by pcp to rural CMP having lost many and perhaps all of the erstwhile dominant pcp characteristics. One cannot point to simply economics, politics, religion, ideologies, knowledge, gender, class, or industrialism to understand the magnitude of this period of change; multiple factors changed and informed the lives of individuals and communities during this period. Furthermore, there was, no doubt, much historical variation in the ways that individual communities and individual farmsteads dealt with these trans-
mutations. Finally, the landscape and material culture of the era had a powerfully
discursive and dialectic influence during these periods of transition.

In Chapter V below, I use the Shepard site to argue that the landscape had a
significant effect on the social relations and political economy in general during the
transition. In fact, it helped to prevent cash-based labor relations from emerging at
the farm and, therefore, it probably prevented true capitalism from ever dominating
economic and labor relations on the farmstead.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Historical Archaeology and Agrarian Transitions

Given the centrality of agriculture to Marxist theory and the US agrarian transition debate, the historiography and archaeology of farmsteads have the potential to be excellent sources of information for these discussions (Orser 1991b). Furthermore, multidisciplinary approaches to farmstead history have the potential to add different and significant insights into the nature of that period of immense agrarian transformation in the northern US (Kulikoff 1992a). Historical archaeology is the branch of archaeology that interprets the anthropological significance of material culture and landscapes that were integrally related to the rise, expansion, and perpetuation of the European-based capitalist world-economy (for similar definitions, see Johnson 1996:1-19; Orser 1988b, 1991b, 1996b; Paynter 1991). Furthermore, it is at its best when it is done from a multidisciplinary perspective (Nassaney and Nickolai 1998:2; Orser 1988a:4).

The historical archaeology of farmsteads, farmsteads being the only "site-type" intrinsically linked to northern agrarian production during this era, seems an ideal means of approaching the transition to agrarian capitalism from a multidisciplinary position. Indeed, the historical archaeology of farmsteads and the historical
analysis of the transition seem to demand such combination (see Orser 1991b, 1994).
Archaeologists should recognize the critical significance and the overwhelming impact that the transitional and transformation period had on not only the country as a whole but also on the various sites we examine of that period, particularly farmsteads (e.g., see Stewart-Abernathy 1986, 1992). It should thus also be recognized that each farmstead can be considered as having been a significant contributor to the overall transition, both in agrarian and urban sectors (e.g., as producers of market surpluses for non-food producers). As Orser suggests (1991b:17),

Once this importance [of the transition] is recognized, historical archaeology becomes directly pertinent to a subject of immense significance to contemporary scholarship: namely, what was the nature, geographical and temporal extent, and social implications of the capitalist transformation in the United States in the nineteenth-century and what did it mean materially.

Indeed, much historical archaeology that has been done in the past few decades has emphasized the relation of material culture and landscapes to the broader political-economy, emphasizing unequal social relations and differential access to power along gender, class, and ethnicity lines. This genre of archaeological analysis emphasizes struggles for political-economic power and meaning by social participants during the capitalist era (e.g., see Ferguson 1992; Leone and Potter 1988; Levin 1985; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Mrzowski, et al. 1996; Orser 1987, 1991a, 1996a; Yentsch and Beaudry 1992.). Importantly, one of the basic realizations in these analyses is that material culture and landscapes are influential and active in creating, maintaining, and altering gender, class, racial, and ethnic political and social relations (Orser 1984; Singleton 1995). Furthermore, cultural ideologies (in the broadest
sense) have specific roots in the conditions fostered by these political and social relations and also manifest themselves in material culture and landscapes (e.g., Hodder 1982; Pulsipher 1994; Shanks and Tilley 1987; see Demarest 1989 for brief discussion of ideologies and archaeological analysis). By the same token, historical ideologies have had a causal and influential shaping power in the maintenance and temporal changing of material culture and landscapes.

In general, these frameworks emphasize material culture and landscapes. Importantly, they demonstrate the multiple ways in which historical material landscapes existed synergistically with the political, social, ideological, and economic realms (e.g., see Johnson 1996; Kelso and Most 1990; McGuire 1991; Orser 1988, 1996a; Paynter 1988; Stine 1990, 1992; Yamin and Metheny 1996). This formulation then bodes well with the earlier discussion that emphasized the complex dialectical relationship between material conditions, political-economic and labor relations, ideologies, and agency.

Archaeologists have certainly not shunned the opportunity to utilize various aspects of the general Marxist analytical perspective (Trigger 1989a, 1989b) and the approaches used in these analyses fit in well with, and inform, the above trends in historical archaeology (see Johnson 1999). Although relatively few “overt Marxists”—analysts who explicitly adopt major aspects of the Marxist framework in their discussions and analyses (after McGuire 1992:55)—currently practice in archaeology (Patterson 1995:136), a lacking that mirrors the recent depopularization of Marxist theory in much of cultural anthropology (see Roseberry 1996), those that do have
produced excellent and important work. These analyses are well-founded in elaborate
theory tailored to archaeological concerns (e.g., Earle and D'Altroy 1989; Gilman
and McGuire 1991; Saitta 1995; Trigger 1984, 1993) and practitioners have site and
theoretical interests that cover the globe and human history (e.g., Kohl 1989; Mar­
quardt 1989; McGuire 1986; Patterson 1989, 1990; Patterson and Gailey 1987;
Spriggs 1984; Zagarell 1986, 1989) including present class struggles in the field of
archaeology itself (McGuire and Walker 1999). In general, then, the multidisciplin­
ary nature of historical archaeology certainly can utilize political-economic and
Marxist theory in order to bring to light the importance of material culture and land­
scapes in the overarching discussions of agrarian transformation and transition in Pre­
and Post-Revolutionary North American rural communities.

The Southwest Michigan Historical Landscape Project and The Shepard Site

The Southwest Michigan Historical Landscape Project is a multidisciplinary
study that utilizes archaeological methods and data, critical social theory, and per­
spectives from various fields to understand the historical role of the landscape in the
social history of southwest Michigan. Its general purpose is to examine “....how the
cultural landscapes and associated material culture of the region became transformed
since...pioneer settlement...[in] the nineteenth-century” (Nassaney 1997:1). Under
the aegis of the Project, researchers have produced much information and critical
analyses of the political-economic, class, and gender histories of numerous historical
sites throughout the region (see Nickolai 1994; Rotman 1995; Rotman and Nassaney 1995, 1997; Nassaney 1997, 1998, 1999). The project has thus far been an explicitly coordinated effort amongst researchers to utilize various sources to gain insights into the role of historical landscapes in the rise and perpetuation of gender, class and other political-economic relations in southwest Michigan’s Euro-American history.

The Shepard site (20CA104) in Battle Creek (see Figures 1 and 2), which has been included in the Project, consists of an extant 1850s Greek Revival house and the adjacent 2-3 acres. It has been the material culture and landscape basis for much historical archaeological research over the past four years (e.g., Kuemin 1997; Lapham 1997; Lynn and Latuszek 1997; Nassaney 1998; Nassaney and Nickolai 1998, 1999; Nassaney, Sayers and Nickolai 1996; Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996; Sayers and Nassaney 1998; Sayers 1997, 1998).

Figure 1. Map Showing Battle Creek in Relation to the Territorial Road, Detroit, St. Joseph, and the Southern Lower Peninsula of Michigan (adapted from Nassaney, et al. 1998).
The research done on the Shepard site has utilized multiple techniques and methods from numerous disciplines (e.g., archaeobotany, archaeology, ethnohistory, geophysics, historiography, and material culture studies) in order to gain a more refined understanding of the site's political-economic and social history (see Nassaney 1998). As a necessary undertaking prior to archaeological excavations at the site (in 1996 and 1998), intensive documentary research was done that focused on the politi-
cal-economic relationships of the people and the material landscape of the site in the years 1834-1875 (see Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996). Although these years were of particular interest to researchers for a variety of reasons at the outset of research, the information gained by the documentary and historical research has nurtured and intensified the initial interests in that period.

Available Documents

The documentary record for the years 1840-1880 is in many ways the most complete period in terms of the overall site or property documentary history (see Chapter IV). As Warren B. Shepard was a pioneer and teacher in the 1830s and further rose to middle to upper class status in the community during the later years of his life, the record of him and the legal history of his property are documented more thoroughly than those of later twentieth-century occupants who were immigrants and/or tenants (see Nassaney 1998; Nassaney and Nickolai 1999). The documents that were used in this initial phase of research included most of the standard primary sources that historians find invaluable in piecing together histories (see Barber 1994: 8-16; 33-41; Conzen 1984; Feder 1994: 53-68; Friedberger 1984; Mascia 1996:154; Rothenberg 1984). These included population census data (1840-1880), church records, county and city histories, newspaper articles, probate inventories, wills, county vital and mortality records, cemetery records, and non-population and industrial/agricultural census data (1840-1870), and family documents (see; Nassaney et al. 1998:27-36; Sayers and Lapham 1995).
One of the documents that has been most critical in reconstructing and interpreting the Shepard site political, social, and economic history is the account ledger that Warren Shepard kept and used from 1843-1858. Warren Shepard’s account ledger (WSAL 1843) is essentially a listing of accounts that Shepard kept with neighbors, local businesses and, after 1848, non-familial contract laborers. The book itself also contains arithmetic lessons, land surveying notes and figures, and a section detailing “secret” handshakes and the alphabet of Freemasons which likely indicates an intimate association with the order on Shepard’s part (Sayers and Lapham 1995). However, the business, neighbor, and laborer accounts have proven the most useful for the present exposition and thus I emphasize that exchange information.

The account system found in the WSAL is fairly simple and straightforward. All accounts are organized starting with the name of the person at the beginning of the account, which is proceeded by a list of debits and credits as they pertain to that person. The sources of debits include primarily goods an individual procured from merchants in town with whom Shepard had credit accounts of his own, services Shepard rendered to that person, and goods or services received from Shepard’s own farmstead (e.g., textiles, produce, rent). Credit generally was gained either through cash given to Shepard, goods given to Shepard, or work done for Shepard. The account ledger details the exchange and labor relations that Shepard had with more than 40 individuals in the community and on his farm between 1843-1858.

In the WSAL, debits and credits usually accrued over a period of a few months or more. They were listed in terms of the monetary value of the debit or
credit at the time and were put into columns that ran down the page. For example, on March 24 1854, a hired laborer, Morrison O’ Neal, had a debit in his account to 14 pounds of pork with a given market value of $1.40. In other words, he took pork from Shepard’s surpluses and was charged the value in cash terms of that pork against his work contract (i.e., $16 per month). Often these individual accounts extend to multiple pages and they represent relatively large amounts of goods that were taken and received. They also record many of the labors performed by workers throughout the period.

In regards to account books of farmers in general, scholars of the non-capitalist and transitional periods of agrarian sectors argue that account books had a largely mnemonic nature and were rooted in rural “custom” (Post 1995:397). These scholars argue that account books were kept, not as an economically capitalist means of tracking the whereabouts, gains, and losses of surpluses but rather as a means of keeping track and reminding a farmer of what was work was done and what goods and services were borrowed. This was a handy means of making sure that there was some measure of certainty regarding one’s social exchange obligations and other’s obligations to the farmer. In the earlier period of reciprocal exchange relations, account books served as reminders of what each person had done for others. Although debits and credits were listed in terms of cash values, the market values were used merely as a means of assuring some measure of consistency and to help maintain the reciprocal nature of these earlier communities. Christopher Clark (1979:173) suggests that in these account ledgers,
When cash was used, it tended to be for specific purposes – to make settlement, to purchase imported goods or to pay taxes. Transactions were entered in account books and assigned a money value, but this was regarded primarily as a convenient method of calculation. It did not mean that money was widely regarded as having value in itself, beyond its uses for these specific needs.

Certainly there was some measure of economic use-value inherent to the account ledgers (Charles E. Orser, personal communication, 1998), given that they were utilized within a political economy of local exchange, pcp, and reciprocity. However, their customary function and mnemonic nature would suggest that the use-value in this interpretation would be different than in true capitalist contexts.

Therefore, historians of progressive farming have suggested that account ledgers that kept track of production and outgoing goods were critical in maintaining the efficiency of capitalist farmstead production (McMurry 1997). In another way, they were, in essence, a capitalist or market-oriented tool for, and means of, keeping track of surplus production and debt (see Rothenberg 1984). So, regarding these two understandings of account ledgers, either account books were written within the political-economic context of customary reciprocal exchange relations or they were written within a market-oriented and capitalist political-economic context. Either way it seems they were direct by-products of, and were a material instrument within, the particular exchange and economic system in which they written.

Thus, if indeed a transition occurred within the time that an account book was written, then perhaps it went through a transition in meaning and function that was a result of the broader political-economic transition. Earlier it was meant as a documentation of reciprocal indebtedness and later, during and after the transition to
agrarian capitalism, it changed to a simple means of keeping track of surpluses, money owed, and work performed. In Chapter IV, I will explore in much more detail the information contained in the WSAL and attempt to link the data therein to the issues involved in understanding the transition to agrarian capitalism and use the data to elucidate the lives of laborers and the Shepards on the farm.

For all the information that the WSAL and other extant documents offer regarding the male-dominated farmstead economic and labor relations, comparatively less direct evidence and information is available about Almeda Shepard, to whom Warren Shepard was married, and their children (see Lapham 1997). Although much secondary historical information is available regarding the economic positioning and quotidian living of North American women during this era (Borish 1991; Dublin 1991; Faragher 1981; Jensen 1986; McMurry 1992, 1997; Osterud 1991, 1993), the primary documentation of this site and its social history demand a great measure of reading between the lines (Lapham 1997).

In regard to the Shepard children, it is known that only two of seven survived to adulthood and both of these were female (Nassaney, Sayers, and Nickolai 1998:20). Although some information is available regarding children of early mid-west farmsteads (see Schob 1975:173-208), they are the least represented in the documentation of this period at this farmstead (although archaeological data may have the potential to shed light on their role in the mid-nineteenth-century at this site [for descriptions of probable children’s objects see Sayers, Nassaney and McMillan 1998:83]). However, details of their particular contributions to the social history of
the Shepard site are beyond the scope of this exposition. Rather, I have included the two daughters who survived beyond infancy in the analysis of domestic contributions because they probably were culturally incorporated into the gendered labor dynamic by they reached young adult age (see Schob 1975:191-208).

Regardless, I am concerned with the documentary and archaeological record of the residents and workers that lived at the Shepard farmstead during the years 1834-1865 for a variety of reasons. One reason is that these years are part of the most thoroughly documented and studied era (i.e., 1834-1880). Another reason is that this is also the era when the extant farmstead was built. Other reasons are that the WSAL was written during this era, the property began to be used for farm surplus production, Warrern Shepard’s wife, Almeda Shepard, was alive, and the most extra-familial people (i.e., laborers and renters) found residency and/or work on the farm. Finally, these are also the years that that we would expect a political-economic transition or transitions, to have occurred in this region (Bidwell and Falconer 1925; Sayers and Nassaney 1997). All of these changes, interrelated and dialectic as they were, would have taken place within the architectural and landscape spaces of both the original and progressive farmstead. Given the general approach of the Project, reconstructing those material elements was also a major concern.

Architectural and Landscape Information

Archaeologists have recognized and shown that by reconstructing historical landscapes they are in an excellent position to examine issues of social power, gender
and class and their relation to those landscapes (e.g., see McGuire 1991; Mrozowski 1991; Orser 1988; Rotman and Nassaney 1997; Williamson 1999). As these are central issues in understanding political economy of this and any period, gathering landscape and architectural information was a research imperative.

The surge of interest in landscape studies in historical archaeology is somewhat recent (Yentsch 1996) but much work has been done (e.g., Johnson 1996:20-118; Garman 1998; also see contributors to Kelso and Most 1990; Miller and Gleason 1994; Yamin and Methany 1996). Although some landscape research is interested in primarily methodology and techniques (e.g., Bevan 1994; Yentsch and Kratzer 1994), much work has been done that emphasizes critical theoretical issues. For example, many researchers have focused on elite-owned and created gardens of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century plantations (Leone 1984; McKee 1996; Williamson 1999). These sorts of studies, particularly in North American contexts, often try to understand certain socioeconomic relations of the period as well as the material influences on, and of, Georgian ideologies (see Deetz 1977). However, all people of all classes perceive their worlds in similar and different ways and, “in so doing...project social relations on to their surroundings and activities, but they do not all do it the same way” (Marquardt 1992:108). Thus, others have focused on non-elite landscapes (e.g., Rotman and Nassaney 1997; Orser 1988) and broader scale (e.g., regional) landscapes to address multi-class, political-economic issues (e.g., Delle 1999; Johnson 1996).

In general, landscape-oriented historical archaeologists look at past landscapes, and alterations thereof, as being a very significant and powerful aspect of the
political-economic and ideological processes that occur in the CMP (Johnson 1996). Importantly, architectural spatial arrangements and the built environment were, and are, often conceptually and culturally contraposed with, and divaricated from, the natural environment (Hood 1996). So, the historical landscape in this view can be seen as any spaces that were manipulated in some manner by humans, and therefore not totally “natural”; in many ways landscapes can be viewed as large-scale and composite artifacts vis a vis smaller portable objects of material culture.

These past landscapes and places helped foster the synergistic dialectics inherent in the cultural reproduction, maintenance, intensification, and disintegration of social, political-economic and ideological systems; thus, they also had profound effects on people’s own sense of being and self-identity (Kryder-Reid 1996:228) and their mode of life. The historic landscapes of farmsteads, or “farmscapes” (Mires 1995:13-24; Small 1996), are no exception to this sort of theoretical and historical understanding. However, northern US farmscape studies are somewhat underrepresented in social theory-oriented, post-processual archaeological literature (although, see Rotman and Nassaney 1997; Yamin and Bridges 1996; also see Mires 1995).

The Shepard farmstead of itself—the nucleated landscape centering on domiciliary and outbuilding architecture and public and private spaces—was most certainly the political-economic and operational hub on the 119.15-acre parcel (see Figure 2) during the last three quarters of the nineteenth-century (see Trewartha 1948). As one of the “...ultimate units of land use...” (Zelinski 1959:14), understanding why it was constructed specifically in the middle of the nineteenth-century and ascertain-
ing what meanings, roles, and importance it had to the family and workers that occupied it is critical. Thus, the reconstruction of the mid-nineteenth-century landscape was of great significance in the initial and proceeding phases of the research (see Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996; Sayers 1997; Sayers and Nassaney 1997). Presently, only the somewhat run-down house still stands. Thus, as much information on the rest of the landscape was critical in framing the research design and formulating research questions for the imminent archaeological excavations (Spring 1996).

Researchers also uncovered limited information regarding the non-domiciliary architecture and the landscape at the Shepard farmstead. Maps of the property (1858; Beers 1873. Also see Figure 2) and WSAL entries indicate that at least two barns were built by 1858 and were located to the southeast of the house but in relatively close proximity to it. The WSAL (1843) and non-population census (1850; 1860) agricultural data also indicate that a garden and orchard were located on the property. WSAL entries also indicate that a walkway (possibly located in the garden itself) and perhaps a private road or driveway were present as well (Sayers and Nassaney 1997). Finally, it seems certain that there was a privy, or necessary, on the farm during the years in question (i.e., 1834-1865).

Thus, initial site-specific documentary research provided limited but very significant information on many facets of this site, both early and more recent (see Nassaney 1998). Further documentary analysis has also refined our initial understanding of the social and landscape history. However, archaeological excavations have also provided much historical information that was available nowhere else but in the
ground. Combined with other sources of historical information, landscape archaeo­
logical data has granted researchers a unique opportunity to study mid-nineteenth­
century political economy of the Shepard site from a multidisciplinary position. The
1996 excavation procedures and site mechanics have been discussed in some detail
elsewhere (see Nassaney 1998) and the same procedures were followed in 1998 exca­
vations.

Archaeological Excavation Methods and Data Collection

In all, over 120 excavation units were dug at the Shepard site. Western
Michigan University field school participants in 1996 and 1998 excavated 50cm x
50cm (shovel test pits), 1m x 1m, and 1m x 2 m units that were located within a grid
consisting of 10m x 10m blocks (see Figure 3). Most units were dug in arbitrary 10
cm levels until features were encountered; in those cases changes in procedures may
have been made depending on the nature of the feature. All of the excavations were
completed with hand tools and the resulting soil matrix was passed through ¼ inch­
mesh screens.

Following the research design for both years (see Nassaney, et al. 1998:25­
49), excavation units were generally located around suspected historical activity areas
surrounding the house or in areas where we thought barns or other outbuildings were
located. For the interests of this thesis, no definite undisturbed remnants of mid­
nineteenth-century outbuildings were found. Remains of one outbuilding and two
possible privies were located and extensively investigated, but little evidence was
Figure 3. Map Showing Shepard Site, 1996 Excavation Units, and Surrounding Architectural and Landscape Features (adapted from Nassaney, et al. 1998:59).
found that indicates a use-period prior to 1875. However, a thorough analysis of one of the privies dug in 1998 has yet to be done.

One unit dug in 1996 (i.e., N110.5 E40) contained part of a mid-nineteenth-century domestic trash midden. This unit was excavated to a depth of 60 cm below datum (hereafter bd) and yielded artifacts until 40-50 cm bd. Therefore, in 1998 two more 1m x 1m units were placed in locations near the 1996 unit. These were specifically dug in arbitrary 5cm levels or until soil changes became visible. The contents of one of these units (N109 E40) has been studied and the mid-nineteenth-century ceramics from it will be used in the analysis in Chapter V. In the following chapter, I will discuss the facets of the history of the state of Michigan, the Battle Creek area, and the Shepard site that are pertinent to my analysis of the transition to agrarian capitalism at this farmstead.
CHAPTER IV

MICHIGAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: MICHIGAN, BATTLE CREEK, AND THE SHEPARD SITE

Non-US European Presence in Michigan

In terms of Wallerstein's definitions and conceptualization of transitions, the history of European colonial Michigan prior to US government formation and Euro-American settlement can be viewed as broadly being transitional type 2. After Euro-American settlement, transitional type 3 took hold of most of the State and continued throughout the nineteenth-century. In the case of the former, indigenous, non-capitalist political-economies (i.e., Native American) were incorporated into the expanding world mercantile and industrial capitalist system of the competing European empires. Thus, much of Michigan's European and Native history prior to the 1820s is one of colonial struggle between dominant empires of Europe (e.g., the British and French) and between European powers and Native American groups.

The earliest European claim to what is now Michigan was by the London Company in 1606 (Dunbar and May 1995:52). However, the French also laid claim early, in 1620, when Ettienne Brule set foot on Michigan soil (Dunbar and May 1995:19). Regardless, the French battled economically and politically with the British merchants and the military for the animal resources found in the waters and on land to supply Old World elite's fashions based on furs (Dunbar and May 1995).
Furthermore, the French and English also struggled to gain and maintain alliances with Native groups who supplied an easy and cheap labor source for fur-gathering and other work (Armour and Widder 1978). Important as well was the constant vying for control of the vast Great Lakes waterways and the access to the interior further west for further exploitation and expansion.

The French were the dominant European colonists until the mid-eighteenth century when they were severely setback by the losses of Detroit, Fort St. Joseph and other outposts incurred during the so-called French and Indian War (Weissert 1920). The British took control of the region and Michigan with the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763 which gave them rights to the lands west up to the Mississippi (Weissert 1920). So for all practical purposes, the British began political-economic domination in Michigan around 1760 although French traders and merchants still lived in the region (Cox 1886:15-28).

It was during this period (ca. 1750-1760) that English colonists were beginning to make inroads into the Ohio Valley from the original Eastern colonies, particularly Virginia (Dunbar and May 1995:54). These long-term settlement processes began an important contradictory political-economic competition with Old World English and French fur interests. The settlers wanted to clear timber, roust the Native groups, and farm in this region whereas the fur traders had a vested interest in keeping the region timbered for the wildlife and in keeping the Native Americans here for hunting those animals. As Dunbar and May (1995:54) suggest, this was, "...the be-
ginning of a war between two competing systems—the fur trade and farming—which would not be settled in Michigan until the 1820s.”

After 1796 the British still had a foothold in this region—the Old Northwest Territory—until the loss of the War of 1812 and their competition was not the French but rather the fur companies, settlers, and state of the newly formed American Republic. Until 1800, the Old Northwest Territory included the eastern half of what is now Michigan and all of Ohio. Within the eastern part of Michigan were the two major outposts of Detroit and Michilimackinac. The western half of Michigan, and other regions fell in the Indiana Territory.

US Settlement of Michigan

The above discussion of pre-US European colonization was intended to set the backdrop for discussions of the political-economic and cultural transformations caused by US occupation of Michigan. The pre-US colonial presence was an important part of the region’s history but it is important keep in mind the significance, in the long-term, of specifically the US expansion and settlement. In the words of Kenneth E. Lewis (1988:105),

Portions of the present State of Michigan have been visited, claimed, and exploited by Europeans since the mid-seventeenth century, yet massive occupation by permanent immigrant settlers did not occur until after 1800. Colonization, primarily by farmers, took place late and was concluded within a relatively short period. In contrast to the European presence of the previous 150 years, however, the effects of this development were much more profound. Not only was much of Michigan’s southern Lower Peninsula settled and its aboriginal inhabitants scattered, but the region was brought within the larger economic and social, and political milieu of the expanding United States.
This underscores the sharp political-economic differences between pre and post-Revolutionary European occupation. This contrast has to do with numerous factors but perhaps the most salient is the nature of the political-economic, settler, and governmental intent; the earlier non-US colonization was largely political and resource extractive in orientation. However, the US colonization involved intensive subsistence farming, settlement expansion, eventual industrialization, massive demographic shifts, Native American demise and transplantation, and assorted entrepreneurial enterprises (Lewis 1988:106). In terms of Wallerstein’s transition types it was perhaps the beginnings of the third transition type in the territory and state; the intensification of capitalist material processes that reorganized labor relations and systems and commodified the people, land, landscapes, and cultural spaces of the area.

Post-Revolution US settlement of the Ohio Valley region south of present-day Michigan began in earnest and settlers built numerous towns along Ohio rivers and on fertile plains and prairies. What is critical is that this development marks the beginning of large-scale subsistence in the Old Northwest. Whereas the non-US colonial period saw Europeans exploiting fur-bearing natural “resources,” Native American knowledge (e.g., hunting skills), and labor, and some farming and subsistence living, US involvement in the area entailed agricultural production and timber harvesting on large scales. By 1796, 5,000 white males lived in the Territory, the majority of which appear to have concentrated in what is now Ohio (Dunbar and May 1995). Because of this population boom and the political agendas of the Federalists and the Jeffersonians, most of present-day Ohio was granted statehood in 1802. All of present-day
lower Michigan was considered part of the Indiana Territory from 1802-1805 (Cox 1886:15) and after that Michigan and parts of Wisconsin and Minnesota were finally considered the Michigan Territory.

By this time, though, Michigan had not been the locus of a population boom like regions to the south, such as Ohio, had been. For all practical purposes, Michigan was still really a frontier or peripheral outpost region and still a contested territory. Numerous forts, not really much more than trading posts, dotted the waterways of the interiors and coasts of the Michigan peninsulas. The more strategic and critical ones were located on coasts, namely Michilimackinac and particularly Detroit (Cook 1974; Lewis 1988, 1991).

Although already some 200 years had passed since the first European contact with the region, not much in the way of interior development, settlement and permanent government had reached these parts. Even Detroit was not incorporated into a town (an American one) until January of 1802 although it had been a fort and outpost for over 100 years (originally founded by the French 1701). In 1802 it was for all practical purposes a fort that was surrounded by a small European-American village that was further surrounded by wilderness and its denizens.

Even though most of Michigan was US territory, the British were still attempting to control Great Lakes access and waterways; the boundaries around the Great Lakes were as yet not firmly established and thus both the British and Americans occupied parts of Michigan at the same time (Armour and Widder 1978). It was not until 1828, some 16 years after the War of 1812 and the Treaty of Ghent (signed
in 1814), that the British finally left their last outpost on what is now US land; this was located at northern Michigan’s Drummond Island (Cook 1974:96).

Small numbers of Americans had been inhabiting Michigan since the late 1700s (Lewis 1991:9), but, the great westward migrations of European-Americans into Michigan really only began in the last half of the 1820s and bloomed in the first years of the 1830s. Prior to, and during, this period, the territorial government had taken some measures to clear the way for westward expansion and settlement. As early as the 1820s it had enacted legislation to fund construction of a series of territorial roads that extended into Lower Michigan’s interior; the main one eventually extended from Detroit to Lake Michigan in the west. Also, it opened land offices across lower Michigan at Detroit, Jackson, and Bronson (Kalamazoo) amongst other places. These were the establishments through which people would purchase their land, before or after they moved to Michigan. The government established a minimum price of $2 per acre in 1818 and by 1820 that price per acre was decreased to the fabled $1.25 (Dunbar and May 1995).

Another major function of the government was to promote and fund the land surveys that noted natural resources, and, delineated counties, townships, ranges, sections. This was done largely on the cadastral grid-system of land allocation (Schlereth 1983) and management. This rectilinear land subdivision, of course, did have telling effects on private property (see Johnson 1974; Schlereth 1983). Also, the general practice of the government of selling only parcels that were measured in even-numbers (e.g., 40 acres, 80 acres, 100 acres) insured such geometrical parceling
As a result, when the masses moved into Michigan and purchased land within these state-ordained boundaries, the landholder’s property boundaries tended to be squared or rectangular unless natural obstacles prevented such geometrical shapes.

Finally, of course, the federal government had problems in the form of the Native Americans who still considered Michigan their traditional home. Thus, from 1795-1842 11 major treaties were signed and implemented that variously eroded the Native foothold in the interior regions of the area that is now the state of Michigan (Dunbar and May 1995). For example, the Detroit Treaty of 1807 gave the US rights to a large piece of land surrounding Detroit to the north, west and southwest. The Chicago Treaty of 1821 gave the US a huge acreage that composed the majority of the lower central and lower western parts of the Lower Peninsula; this land included what would shortly become the locations of Jackson, Battle Creek, Marshall, and Bronson to name a few. Although these treaties gave the US self-serving legal rights to the land, Native groups still stayed in these areas for decades after the signing of the treaties with some staying on indefinitely in the hinterlands and on reservations (Dunbar and May 1995; Weisert 1920).

Thus, the Territorial Government of Michigan performed the theoretically anticipated duties of the state which were namely to serve the interests of capital and the bourgeoisie (see Miller 1991). The government apparatus was used to promote and fund land surveys, to assess the availability of extractable products and resources, to assess land qualities, and, to begin the construction of internal improvements for
transportation. Further, it unified the land under a system of subdivision that was consistent and easily measured. This system certainly would assist in establishing some uniformity and expediency in times of taxation and census taking.

Concomitant with the above, and subsequent to such initial assessments and infrastructural “improvements,” the state promoted land sales to settlers who would in the process expand the boundaries of the state itself further west. It also sold land to railroad companies for profit. This, of course, was also profitable for the exporters of goods to the new markets. Finally, the military, state, and legal systems did what they could throughout the 1820-40s to eliminate the Native American obstacles (see Luxemburg 1968) as well as those posed by other competing empires (i.e., England). This set of geographical and political-economic transitions (types 2 and 3) would have made the region generally safe from aggressive resistance from natives and livable for settlers who in turn would have expanded the market and established a broader and wider range of consumers.

This process, as well as the transformations in the political-economies of the East discussed earlier, set the stage for the land profiteering of speculators. These were the wealthy merchants and nascent capitalists back East who used their clout, money, and power to buy up huge, optimal tracts of land in the frontier for nominal sums (Dunbar and May 1995). They would then sell these to “pioneers” and other speculators for a handsome profit. Land-hungry speculators bought up quite a bit of land, quite often without seeing the acreage, which forced many less-wealthy pioneers to less desirable tracts. Wealthier immigrants might have been able to afford
the speculator’s prices but often only small tracts, particularly when they bought tracts located in platted towns. Finally, other factors were perhaps at work regarding land purchasing, such as the state purchasing land from the Federal Government, squatters staking claim to land before it was for sale, and railroad companies buying and selling land. These may have had positive or negative effects on the relative prices of acreage in many areas of the Mid-West (Ankli 1974), including Michigan.

However, the cost of land that resulted from these and other government related enterprises did not hinder migration into Michigan to any great degree, although other factors (e.g., bad reputation for soil quality and Native American threats) may have stunted Michigan migration in the 1820s (see Lewis 1991). Numbers of people began coming to Michigan by 1830; there were at least 29,000 European-Americans living in what was to become the state of Michigan.

Known as “Michigan Fever” the first major settlement boom spanned the 1830s and, generally speaking, these people settled in an east to west direction. So, for example, areas on the southeastern part of Lower Michigan, where Detroit is located, were bought up earlier in the decade whereas southern and central western Michigan, the region served by the Bronson/Kalamazoo land office, had its boom as late as 1836. Also, population densities clustered around the main Territorial Road that ran roughly due west from Detroit; the densest populations were found in the southeastern part of the state (as they still are to this day). By 1840 some 212,000 people lived in the state, the majority of whom resided in the southern regions of the lower peninsula with a density of 18 people per square mile (see Fraser Hart
1972:261); and all of this land buying with the depression of 1837 figuring into the equation!

In 1837 Michigan also officially became a state. It was during this period that Detroit developed into an entrepot to the rest of the state; merchants, wagon-makers, textile dealers, service operations, and other producers and retailers found good business as people streamed through the town on their way from the Erie Canal to wherever in the state they had bought land or intended to buy land (Dunbar and May 1995). Importantly, Detroit became the major exchange center for the distribution of goods from the East to communities in the interior hinterlands of the state. Of course, it also, along with Chicago, eventually became the center of export for the surpluses of agricultural producers, likely through local merchants who were sort of middlemen in the process (see DeCunzo 1991; Mutch 1978). Thus, the early links back to the eastern US and the world economies were becoming rooted in the periphery.

In the interior hinterland communities of Michigan during the decades prior to 1850-1860, it was not capitalist manufacturing and industry or mercantilism but rather agricultural production on individually owned farmsteads that predominated. Although these farms were not entirely disconnected to the larger national and world market economy, there can be little doubt that individual and community access to goods and products were limited (see Gray 1996). The relative geographic location of communities, and individual political and economic connections with capitalists back East, would have caused some communities (e.g., those close to Detroit) to have tighter connections to markets and attendant commodities (Lewis 1988). However,
generally speaking small rural communities would have been fairly isolated if they were located outside of Detroit and its immediate vicinity.

Furthermore, records indicate that household manufactures, pcp systems, had some measure of import in every established county in Michigan, with every county usually having reached its productive apex in 1850 (see Tryon 1917:308, 351-352). So as farm viand production may have shifted from a predominantly subsistence-level production to surplus market production between 1830-1860, pcp was also common here from the start and began to disintegrate by 1860. This was likely the result of numerous factors such as more people moving to the state, labor for manufactories becoming readily available, and infrastructural improvements reaching the level required to make access and transport of factory produced goods easy and efficient. Throughout the 1850s, the overall improvements to land made by Michigan farmers dramatically increased (Sewell 1985), a further indicator that farm families were generally orienting themselves toward market production, which demanded more productive use of land, and away from the true pcp system of the frontier period.

The majority of pioneers came from New York State and to a lesser extent New England and Ohio (Gardner 1913:15; Gray 1996:1-16; Hart 1972:260). Warren Shepard, born in western New York State, was part of this migration boom. He settled in Battle Creek and it is to the early history of that village and later city that I will now turn.
Not surprisingly the area of Calhoun County and specifically Battle Creek was well-used by Native American groups during and before the contact period. Known as “Waupakisco” to contact-period natives, the area that is now downtown Battle Creek was a place of gathering, ceremony, and war preparation (Weissert 1920:266). It is known that this area was a place of permanent settlement to some groups. Extant Native narratives of their history in this area, and many an individual’s refusal to leave in the 1830s and 1840s, suggest it was indeed an important location for them (see Weissert 1920:208-218). Also Native American mounds are recorded on an early 1830s map (Schoolcraft 1838) and burial sites are attested to in early 20th century local historical sources (e.g., Weigmink 1930); these are also possible indications of long term Native American use of the area. However, Native groups were ousted throughout the 1830s and 1840s through military force sponsored locally and by the State (Weissert 1920:208-218).

Although some vague claims “on paper” were made by the Spanish, French and English of ownership of vast regions that contain what is now Calhoun County as early as 1540, no intense colonization appears to have occurred until the 1800s (Weissert 1920: 257-260). As part of the generally contested Great Lakes region throughout the colonial period, this county certainly shares that past. However, it is not likely that there was much actual colonial activity in Calhoun County save explorers and missionaries that may have passed through (e.g., Father Marquette in 1675 and La Salle in 1679 [Weissert 1920:257]). Irreversible settlement occurred
when the County was surveyed and put up for sale by the US Territorial Government in 1830.

As with Native groups, the area that is now Battle Creek was very attractive to early European-American speculators and migrants in the pioneer/frontier period for a predictable variety of reasons (Dunbar 1965:253; Fuller 1917:335; Glazer 1950:193-195). The natural landscape centered upon the confluence of the Kalamazoo River and Battle Creek; it was therefore a well-timbered place of numerous streams and springs, fertile soils, and interspersed prairies, like the Goguac Prairie. Also, it is located approximately 120 miles due west of Detroit and was connected to it by the Territorial Road (surveyed in 1829 and constructed in the early to mid 1830s) that ran between them. The natural landscape elements certainly appealed to agriculturally minded settlers; relatively flat topographic relief, easy water access, timber for house and fence construction, and fertile and arable soils. The rough, but negotiable, Territorial Road afforded them the opportunity to actually settle so far west of Detroit and tap into the interior’s bounty.

Entrepreneurial migrants who had capital from sources back East also found some interest in the area, specifically at the confluence of the two main water systems (Lowe 1976). The earliest interests in the site of the confluence were definitely business and market minded. In 1831 a group of investors, among whom was Sands McCamly, an esteemed pioneer in Battle Creek history, purchased a large tract of land around the location with the intent of harnessing the water power for to supply would-be businesses (Gardner 1913:19; Straw 1938). However, McCamly did not
plat the area as a village until 1836. For unknown reasons, the use of that land for the water power project did not happen for 4-6 years after the purchase.

The first settlement of the area was an agricultural one a few miles away on the Goguac Prairie in 1831 (Gardner 1913:20; Straw 1938; Weisset 1920:266). In general, the earliest years can be described as having been certainly a frontier period; squatters were present, log cabins were the architectural and domestic norm, and residents were few and far between. However, subsistence farming likely occurred from the beginning and most, if not all, residents engaged in such activities. Furthermore, the community appears to have engaged in collective and reciprocal labors, in the form of “bees,” that helped to make permanent the dwellings and settlement (Lowe 1976).

Interestingly, Native American labor was enlisted in these community efforts from time to time (Fuller 1920:296; Rust 1869:86). An old pioneer of Battle Creek, A.D.P. Van Buren, actually defines the “bee” as “...the voluntary union of the individual aid and strength of an entire community, to assist a settler in doing what he was unable to accomplish alone” (Fuller 1920:294). He goes on further to say that, “Hence by bees the pioneers raised their houses and barns, did their logging, husked their corn, quilted the bed coverings and enjoyed themselves in frolic and song with the girls in the evening” (Fuller 1920:294-295). Obviously, the reciprocal and community-based bee was a significant element in the lives of the early settlers and was not limited to construction of buildings only. Many daily tasks were likely performed
through them that would have helped maintain a community-oriented exchange system.

Even at this early stage in Battle Creek European-American history, the rudiments of the industrial/urban versus rural/agricultural landscape dichotomy were present (see Straw 1938); the confluence of the waterways was becoming the mercantilist and industrial core whereas surrounding acreage (e.g., Goguac Prairie) was devoted largely to agricultural pursuits. Thus, characteristics of capitalism were brought here with some of the investor settlers like McCamly. However, that fact does not imply that all of the individuals who lived around, near, and in Battle Creek were involved in capitalist relations from the beginning. The collective and reciprocal nature of labor, perhaps only outside of the manufacturing and service sector, suggests that labor was done on a relatively equal basis and not done for a wage or pecuniary payment.

The large initial migration boom spanned the decade of 1830-1840, but 1833-1834 saw the largest influx for a given year in that time period (Rust 1869). This influx at this time was helped in part by the construction of the Territorial Road around 1834 (Rust 1869:83). The majority of these pioneers were farmers or aspiring farmers with some performing the roles of mercantilist, blacksmith, teacher, and mill operators (Gregory 1986). By 1838, 400 people lived in the township, and some worked at and owned the saw mill, two grist mills, two taverns, two smithies, the saddlery, six stores, the brick manufactory, machine shops, cabinet making shop, and banking institution that were present (Weissert 1920:261). Obviously the majority of
settlers worked outside of these productive and service-oriented domains and probably were engaged in farming and agricultural activities. Given the geographic distinction between rural areas and town already mentioned and the presence of these service and production sectors, it seems that by the close of this decade that seeds of class division were already being sown within the community (Nassaney, Sayers, and Nickolai 1998:10).

The 1840s may have been the beginning of a transition from a frontier and perhaps non-capitalist settlement and colony to a market-entrenched settlement and capitalist community. This process and transition seems to have led to dominance of the market and urban production in the 1850s (Rust 1869). Again though, this transition may have been predominant in the growing nucleus of Battle Creek while the peripheral agrarian areas continued to operate in non-capitalist ways.

In the early 1850s, the first sustained newspaper went to press indicating that the number of advertisers needed to subsidize its production were present in Battle Creek and in the surrounding areas. The ability of the newspapers to stay in business indicates that enough steady capital was present and that enough consumers used the services of the town to allow service and production companies to prosper; advertising is something of a luxury. Also, Battle Creek was legally incorporated as a village in 1851 and as a city in 1859 (Rust 1869:93-94). Finally, by 1850 many more factories and specialized services were at work in Battle Creek, including two woolen manufacturers, a furnace and machine company, a few carriage makers, two shoe
makers, and a few lard oil and candle manufacturers to name a few (Products of Industry Census 1850).

By 1860, the frontier and "simpler" days were over. On February 14th, 1860, residents of Battle Creek, Michigan held, "an old settlers celebration" to commemorate the lives and accomplishments of the founders and early pioneers of the town (Battle Creek Moon Journal, 1860:3). It appears as though it was a rather anticipated and formal event, with an admission charge (75 cents) and an invitation to the whole town to attend. There were several committees formed to help organize and run the celebration, including a "committee on toasts." The honorable Moses Hall, a pioneer resident, was the president of the soiree and a group of 17 vice-presidents were assembled as well. This group included only pioneers, including Battle Creek's "founding father" Sands McCamly and the town's first schoolteacher Warren Bronson Shepard.

This celebration, as an historical event, would not normally surprise the researcher unless one considers the fact that it was a social glorification of the lives of so many people who had colonized the area only 20-30 years earlier (1831-1840). This betrays the fact that before 1860 the world and lives of the residents of the area were being transformed and irreversibly altered. Indeed the people, town and world had changed so much by then that the living pioneers were already representatives of an age seemingly long since past. One such person was Warren B. Shepard, only one of many people who interacted at what is now called the Shepard site.
Warren Shepard (b. 1809) was educated in western New York at the Aurora Academy. By the age of 18 (ca. 1827) he had graduated and began teaching in Sardinia, New York, a job he held for two years. He appears to have been overcome by "Michigan fever" and headed west to the state with his teaching papers ready. He resided in Emmett Township in Calhoun County (Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections [MPHC] 1910:682) and later, in 1834, moved to Battle Creek Township. Although little is known regarding what he did in Emmett Township, he likely came to Battle Creek specifically to fill the role of the village's schoolmaster. The community had already built a log cabin school, knew of Shepard (which may suggest either that he had already been teaching in Emmett or that he applied for the position) and needed a teacher by the fall/winter of 1834-1835 (MPHC 1904:265).

In November of the same year that he moved to Battle Creek (1834), he purchased a parcel of land that contained 79.15 acres. This land was located in Section 13, a mile or so south of the village. Although he is fondly remembered as the "first schoolmaster," that position only lasted that first season (Sayers and Lapham 1996). He did not fill the position the following year but rather appears to have begun brick manufacturing with another local pioneer, John Champion. Little is known about the amount of time Shepard spent in these manufacturing pursuits and even less is known about the amounts of production, the market for bricks at the time, and how long Shepard did this work. It is known that the men got their clay near the banks of
nearby Goguac Lake (Roberts 1930) and that the nature and productivity of this business warranted the use of a laborer, Chester Phelps (MPHC 1911:134).

It seems that the bricks they were producing were either being exported to other locales or being used locally, perhaps for construction of public buildings. This usage is suggested by the fact that in 1840 there were still no houses made of brick in Battle Creek township nor any other township in the county (Non-Population Census Schedule, Michigan: Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturing 1840:4 [hereafter, Non-Population Census 1840]). Furthermore, the total value of manufacturing that may have included bricks in Battle Creek Township was only $200 by 1840 (Non-Population Census 1840:4). Considering that the total includes quite possibly many other small-scale manufacturers, it seems likely that the business of Shepard and Champion was not a flourishing one; the business was definitely not profitable enough to support two propertied family men. Although John Champion continued making bricks into the 1840s, it is likely that the business was a bit premature and thus had little market success, perhaps because of the frontier conditions. Shepard likely got out of brick manufacturing between 1840-1850 (Sayers and Lapham 1995).

In 1838 Shepard wed Almeda Davis and in the same year purchased a 40-acre parcel of land located south of the 1834 parcel but contiguous with it. They thus had a combined total of 119.15. During this decade Shepard was also an active Jacksonian /Van Burenian Democrat. He was elected as County Assessor and Overseer of Highways in 1836 and used his log cabin in 1838 for a pre-election political rally
spearheaded by Martin Van Buren, whose father was the President's cousin (see Kestenbaum 1990; MPHC 1910:241; Sayers and Lapham 1996). Thus, during the frontier period (ca.1834 to 1845) Shepard no doubt solidified many business and social ties through his entrepreneurial brick manufacturing and political activism. His teaching, however short it was, perhaps also led to some public notoriety which would have helped to build socioeconomic alliances. Certainly his politicking would have gone a long way toward helping his cause.

Development of the Operable Means of Agrarian Surplus Production

By 1840, the Shepards worked some portion of their acreage agriculturally. The 1840 Population Census of Michigan indicates that one adult was involved in agricultural production in the family. However, one adult was also involved in manufacturing although what specific type is not indicated. Although it seems logical to conclude that this indicates that Warren Shepard was still producing bricks (Sayers and Lapham 1996) it may also very well indicate that Almeda was involved in home production of textiles and the like. As discussed above, pcp was a common enough practice amongst farmwives in the frontier eras (DeCunzo 1995; Merrill 1977; Tryon 1917). Even though the Non-Population Census (1840:4-5) indicates a surprising lack of domestic-type manufactures, this dearth in production must be a reflection of the fact that most of these home-produced goods were meant for home-consumption and little went out to the market, particularly in such a new community. Therefore,
census data gatherers for this business and commerce census may have found pcp goods comparatively unimportant, economically speaking.

In 1843 Warren Shepard began keeping track of his farm production, his personal consumption, and the work that he and others did, in an account ledger (i.e., the WSAL 1843). The earliest entries indicate a rather classic involvement in reciprocal relations with merchants and neighbors in the area. For example, Henry Willis, a Quaker merchant/farmer/potter who was also Shepard’s neighbor (Map of Battle Creek Township 1858), took some 500 feet of lumber, 6 bushels of oats, and some straw on April 25th, 1843 (WSAL 1843:2). Then, on November 28th of the same year, Willis is credited with giving Shepard some 1 ¾ yards “sattinett [sic]”, 2 ¾ yards (cloth) lining, some powder and shot, thread and book, and wicking. On the same page, Willis is listed as also having received from Shepard some straw, more lumber (amount unspecified), 4 cords of wood. Finally, an entry dated October 1845 suggests that Shepard did some work for Willis, namely hauling some clay (perhaps for Willis’ pottery production). There is no indication of cash exchange between the two and they appear to have been exchanges in kind, or reciprocal exchanges, as best as they could estimate.

Shepard also dealt with other locals in similar ways. For example, in an entry dated December 25th, 1845, John Lowry borrowed numerous products from the Shepard farm, including butter, potatoes, apples, and pork. Furthermore, Shepard hauled wood from Dickenson’s Mill for him, worked for a half day on his pen, and appeared as a witness (for unknown, but presumably legal, purposes). Interestingly,
Shepard listed the housing of a man named Hodges against Lowry's account on three occasions. Lowry paid back Shepard with cash and goods while borrowing goods and services.

However, as the theorists regarding the transition to capitalist agriculture suggest that such reciprocal relations were eventually replaced by capitalist market and cash-based ones, it is not too surprising that the beginnings of strain on this system can be seen by the mid-1840s in the WSAL. Throughout December of 1843 (WSAL 1843:4), Shepard gave Joseph Fry numerous "loads" of wood, including one hauled in the previous month. Also, Fry took pumpkins from Shepard the previous fall, which Shepard listed finally in his ledger that following December. However, there is no indication that Shepard ever enjoyed any reciprocation with Fry. Another example of these seeming one-sided exchanges comes from an entry pertaining to Daniel Clark's account dated December 1845 (WSAL 1843:6). Clark evidently borrowed Shepard's horse and sleigh twice, had a butter account, took "whips," "satts" (satinett), some tea, some wicking and alum, tallow, raisin molasses, and "tobacco and cord and pipe." However, Clark is not listed as ever having done anything to pay back or reciprocally exchange the goods given him by Shepard. Although it is possible that these men did eventually exchange obligatory goods or cash with Shepard, it seems unlikely that such reimbursement would go unwritten given that Shepard listed other people's debits and credits during this time. Thus, by the late 1840s, Shepard began bringing in people to work full-time, as opposed to relying on people who might not reciprocate debits with work or goods.
The Shepards' steadily increasing transformation of unproductive acreage into economically viable spaces on the farmstead probably also helped cause, and was effected, by the shift from reciprocal exchanges of goods and labor to bringing in full-time workers. By 1850, they had improved 50 acres out of the 119.15 acres. In 1850 they had invested heavily in Merino sheep, at least partly for wool, and were producing Indian corn, oats, and Irish potatoes in good quantities along with other produce and livestock in smaller quantities (Non-population Census 1850:138). He even produced beeswax, no doubt for domestic manufactures, like candles.

The intensified use of the available space, as well as increases in production, were also helped along by the $100 worth of implements and machinery that they had by 1850 (Non-population Census 1850:138). Although it is certain that Shepard had a plow and related technologies (e.g., WSAL [1843:11] indicates a debt to Shepard for "plough handles"), and two working oxen (non-population census of 1850), he may have had more complex machinery, like a thresher. The Nichols and Shepard Company was already producing such machinery in the Village of Battle Creek (Products of Industry Census 1850). Even though widespread adoption of these advanced technologies of agricultural production did not occur until the mid-1850s (Headlee 1991:61-82; Olmstead 1975:327-352) the very local availability of such machinery in Battle Creek may have made such adoptions cheaper and more likely in the area.

Reciprocal labor and exchange relations worked well when subsistence production was occurring in rural communities. Thus, the system worked well for
Shepard and others during the pioneer and frontier periods and perhaps a bit beyond. However, when market surpluses began to be produced and relied upon by individual farmsteads, like Shepard’s, individuals likely began refocusing their energies on their own production and began seeing reciprocal relations as being unproductive. So, the reciprocal system that Shepard was involved with may have disintegrated because of individual responses within that network that went against its fundamental nature; these non-traditional reactions included not behaving reciprocally in terms of exchanges and work relations. These responses were likely the result of individuals choosing to labor on their own marketable produce instead of “wasting time” working to make goods or just working to pay back obligatory debts. Thus, the ensuing competition amongst landholding agriculturists eventually would have helped create two classes of agricultural workers: farming land-holders and laborers (McMurry 1997; Schob 1975).

In 1848, the construction of a mill-dam north of the Shepard property resulted in a flooding of some of his land. Dam or millrace construction, and the resultant flooding, commonly occurred in nascent communities established near or on rivers as early capitalists and investors vied for control over water-power (Kulik 1983; Kulikoff 1992a; Steinberg 1990). Being very common throughout the U.S., this blatant disregard by the state and capitalists for the private property rights of farmers located upstream of these dams, so as to promote manufacturing and industry, resulted in much social strife and many lawsuits (Steinberg 1990). The Shepard case was no exception to this. Although the investors began crediting Shepard in goods from their
stores as early as 1849 in return for the damages (see WSAL 1843:12), it evidently was not beneficial for Shepard. Thus, he sued the group of investors in that dam project in the 1850s, which resulted in a legal win for Shepard in 1852 (Sayers and Lapham 1996). Although it is not clear if he ever actually received total compensation for the damages, the court appears to have awarded Shepard $2000 to be paid back by the group of investors (the court did not demand that the dam be destroyed). Legal notes indicate that he received some of the money (Calhoun County Circuit Court Records 1852: case #491) but it is not clear if he got all of it (Nassaney 1998).

However, there can be little doubt that the cash he did receive was at least partially responsible for the beginning of construction of the extant, brick, Greek Revival farmhouse in the following year of 1853-1854. Although there is some uncertainty about the exact year of the construction of the house, tax records for 1853 and 1854 (see Table 1) indicate a marked increase in property value of the 79.15 acre parcel on which the Shepard farmstead was built. Furthermore, account ledger entries indicate that laborers were hired in 1853 and 1854 for “work on house” and brick-laying (WSAL 1843:42-44). Needless to say, the building of the house was a major event in the history of the Shepard property. It also increased the value of the property; in 1850 (Michigan Population Census 1850) Shepard’s property was valued at $2000 and by 1860 (Michigan population census) his total value was $11,000. Interestingly, for state tax purposes Shepard estimated the value of his property and personal estate in 1849 at $535 and in 1860 at only $2390 (see Table 1). Although it is tempting to suggest that Shepard intentionally misled the tax assessor by giving him
Table 1
Warren B. Shepard Tax Records 1844-1849; 1853-1854; 1856-1860*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value of Parcel**</th>
<th>Value ($) of Personal Estate</th>
<th>Total of Both Values ($)</th>
<th>Total Taxes Paid ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>A: $280</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>A: $240</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>A: $221</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>A: $258</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>A: $300</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>A: $255</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>A: $500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>A: $1280</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>A: $1600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>A: $1800</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>34.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>A: $1700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>A: $1600</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: $500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>A: $1600</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Sayers and Lapham 1995
**A=79.15 acres; B=40 acres
amazingly low estimates of the property values, the reason for the discrepancies between census estimates and tax records remains a mystery. It is possible also that he overestimated the value of his property to census takers for image and status reasons (or for some combination of both fraudulent estimation and image and status reasons).

Certainly though the surplus agricultural produce he began growing in the middle 1840s and the other marketable surpluses he produced also helped to accrue the capital he needed to build the house in the first half of the 1850s. Thus, it seems that the rise of a more capital-oriented farmstead occurred in the last half of the 1840s. However, the decade of 1850-1860 seems to have been the decade of the cementing and crystallization of this transformation to progressive capitalist agricultural production. During this time, the areas of agriculturally productive acreage (i.e., improved) increased to 90, with 29 unimproved acres. This was an improvement of 40 acres since 1850 (Products of Agriculture Census 1850:138; 1860:21-22). Also, the levels of production skyrocketed in a few productive areas. Although production remained fairly diversified, increases in wheat production, Indian corn, orchard production, and barley indicate an intensification in production in each. At the same time, the progressive ideologies of the owner of the means of production, Warren Shepard, and his family must have also guided and helped the rise of this surplus market production. Finally, Shepard was grafting fruit (WSAL 1843:50), which was a progressive and scientific agricultural pursuit (McMurry 1997).
Distaff and Domestic Production

Thus far, though, one third of the story of the political economy of the Shepard farmstead during the years 1834-1860 has been explored. Although I have mentioned Almeda Shepard (Davis), her influence and power in this rise of capitalist agriculture on her own farm has yet to be determined. I have discussed the theoretical and historical roles of women in the transition or transformation of rural agriculture to capitalism. With those ideas in mind, we will now turn to Almeda Shepard as a historical figure and seek her contribution to these changes at this site.

As was stated Almeda Davis married Warren Shepard in 1838. It seems that, within two years of that date (Federal Census of Michigan 1840), she gave birth to the first of the seven children that she was to bear throughout the next two decades (Calhoun County Probate Court Records 1897). One of the unfortunate aspects of the site history is that only two of the seven Shepard offspring survived into adulthood, Amanda (1842-1919) and Emily (1852-1937). The others apparently died in youth, though not all at neonate ages (see Oak Hill Cemetery Company Records lot #198; other records indicate the presence of an older child “Maria” [WSAL 1843:9]). Infant mortality was high in the frontier and pioneer areas, particularly those near standing and running water where diseases were prevalent (Dunbar and May 1995). Given the Shepard’s proximity to the Kalamazoo River, the creek running through the northern quarter where their old cabin likely was located, and the flooded land in the area of the northern quarter of the property caused by state and capitalist sponsored millrace and pond in 1848, it is not too surprising that they had experienced such a high rate of
mortality and general sickness. Perhaps Shepard’s own writing offers testimony of this; in 1845 he wrote a “receipt for making Cobb’s Anti Relax Billious [sic] Pills” which was supposed to alleviate pain from “cholic [sic] in the side” and dysentery (WSAL 1843:5).

Documentary evidence of Almeda’s contribution to the economy of the farm is detectable in data of the 1840s. Indeed, prior to the late 1840s, goods and produce that were likely, at least in part, a direct result of Almeda’s labor are quantitatively abundant in the account ledger. When general food production is combined with those objects and goods that indicate domestic-manufacturing, it is her labor that is actually the most obvious in the first entries of the account ledger.

Although it is technically impossible at this point to prove that Almeda was responsible for butter, milk, and egg production (of course, in the case of dairy production the animals were also major players in the production process), it seems justifiable to assume that she played a significant role in the total process (Lapham 1997). Women were often responsible for dairy production in the first half of the nineteenth-century; this was a major component of the distaff facet of the gender-based division of labor (Borish 1995; Osterud 1991), particularly before the rise of progressive capitalist farming (McMurry 1997). Although there certainly was flexibility between the Shepards’ in regards to what was “women’s work” and “men’s work,” most definitely in the years prior to the hiring of laborers and during seasonal production peaks (see Osterud 1984), it is probable that traditional women’s work was, at least in part, performed by Almeda. As Faragher (1981:540) suggests,
Without question women's work was essential to successful agriculture. Indeed...from colonial times through the nineteenth-century, Euro-American women engaged in from one-third to more than one-half of all the food production on family farms...[a]side from food production, women were solely responsible for all food preparation, all house-hold chores, all textile and clothing manufacture, childcare, and all work obviously necessary to the re-production of the farmstead."

For example, the WSAL (1843:4-5) indicates that butter and eggs were taken to merchants in town in 1845 and 1846 respectively. It is likely that Warren Shepard was responsible for the social and economic acts of trading the products (Sayers 1998), but Almeda may have been responsible for the actual on-farm maintenance and performance of the production sequences (or at least some of the sequences). Further, she may have had help from neighbors and associates and in return helped them with similar chores and tasks; again, relations of reciprocity in these earlier years (Ulrich 1984).

Another important aspect of Almeda's work was the home manufactures that she produced. Numerous entries in the WSAL indicate that in the 1840s Almeda was producing finished clothes for her family and the wider community. One example, given above in our discussion of Warren Shepard's reciprocal exchange relations, indicates that he procured numerous textiles and items from Henry Willis in return for goods that he had taken from the Shepard farm. The yards of cloth, thread and book, and wicking all point to home production of basic necessities; clothes and light sources. It seems a probability that Almeda was given these raw materials and then transformed them through her daily labors into working and serviceable products for home-use, trade, and/or perhaps even the "putting-out" industry (i.e., taking raw ma-
erials from a capitalist, transforming them into finished products, and returning those products to the same capitalist for a wage [see Dublin 1985, 1991]). Other examples include two entries (WSAL 1843:7;9) from 1845 and 1846 that list the expenses of Warren Shepard. In October and December of 1845 Warren debited himself with some 93 yards of various types of cloth, lining, and batting, including 7 yards of alpaca wool. Other goods included silk trimmings, a pair of boots, pictures, and “sundries.” In the January-March 1846 entry another 31 yards of cloth, some thread, tea, sugar, saleratus (baking soda), and indigo were also recorded amongst other things.

Almeda obviously had her work cut out for her in the winter of 1845-1846. By this time she was responsible for 2-4 children, cooking, butter and egg production, and the manufacturing of clothes. Quite possibly the proceeds and/or credit from the butter that Shepard sold in December of 1845 went towards the purchasing of or the trading for the goods obtained in January 1846. So, Almeda’s labors and products in one area (butter production) resulted in different labors and products in another area (domestic manufactures). This was probably a common dynamic in these earlier years. Candle-making was also probably part of her work. The entries that show debits for wicking and wax that was derived from bees (non-population census 1850) suggest this. It is apparent then that Almeda was in fact a strategic producer of numerous goods and products during this decade.

Looking strictly at the WSAL, it seems that much of her work, with exceptions for some eggs and butter, produced goods that stayed on the farm or left the farm as a direct repayment or loan to another individual. So, for example, butter was
given to a few individuals and they were debited for it (WSAL 1843:6,8,11). However, it is also possible that Almeda Shepard kept track of her own sales and trades and perhaps even had her own credit accounts with people. It was not unheard of for women to seek some measure of independence through managing their own economic affairs, particularly in the form of being responsible for tracking their own productivity and managing their own money in the progressive era (McMurry 1997). Although it appears that the true progressive era had not quite enveloped the social and economic relations of the farm by the early and middle 1840s, the advent of account ledger itself in 1843, the nascent gender-based division of labor, and her domestic manufacturing pursuits may point to its origins.

By 1848, hired laborers appeared on the farm and much change was afoot. Throughout the 1830s and 1840s, Almeda was producing goods for the family, for trading, and for limited market sale/credit. Furthermore, she also no doubt had a host of chores related less directly to production and directly to reproduction like child rearing and healthcare, cooking and cleaning. However, by the early 1850s she had that workload expanded to accommodate the laborers that began eating meals and taking farm products as part of their remuneration. Even though the majority of goods taken by laborers from the Shepard farm do not necessarily indicate Almeda’s labor (e.g., meats, grains, potatoes), they did take some butter, eggs, milk and home manufactures (e.g., candles).

The general drive for increased production also led to expanded butter production. In 1850 Almeda produced 400 pounds of butter and milk but no cheese.
Interestingly, the census indicates that no “home-made manufactures” of any value were produced. Although it is possible that she stopped producing these goods completely by 1850, it seems more likely that none of them ever made it to market; they were used on the property and given to workers as payment. Indeed, WSAL entries (e.g., 1843:15[1849],18[1850]) from the early 1850s do indicate that such goods were being produced and were available to workers. Clarissa Jones (WSAL 1843:18), the only female mentioned in the account ledger, is debited for 16 yards of calico and less than a yard of batting. Although not necessarily domestic manufactures, as they could have been gotten through a merchant like those in the mid-1840s, the fact that they were available for Jones to take indicates that Almeda was still producing finished clothes.

However, by the middle of the decade it appears as though Almeda had almost completely stopped producing textile-based goods and home manufactures beyond that needed for familial consumption (although she may have stopped producing for the family too). The last laborer’s account to show debits for candles appears in 1856 (WSAL 1843:62-68). The 1860 Non-Population Census indicates that no beeswax was produced by that time, although the household may have switched to tallow for making candles. Also, after the 1850 Clarissa Jones account, no cloth was taken by laborers as remuneration or for any other recorded reason.

In 1860 Almeda and probably her daughters, Amanda (b.1842) and Emily (b.1852), upped the farm’s butter production to 700 pounds. In the same year, they added 150 pounds of cheese to this output. It also appears in this year that fruits from
their orchard became a source of direct income from the market; orchard goods yielded $150. Finally the garden produced a tidy $30 from market revenue. The latter three sources of income were not listed as such in the 1850 census. Furthermore, they do not account for any income in 1870 (Non-Population Census 1870), two years after Almeda died. Although the garden and the orchard were not entirely a distaff domain (see section below), their sudden rise to obvious economic import and subsequent fall after the death of Almeda indicate that she may have played a significant role in the production sequences of each. Little doubt exists that gardens, and often orchards, were considered women's areas unless a farm was specialized in orchard or garden production (McMurry 1997). This expanded production in the distaff domain seems to relate to the rise and continued maintenance of progressive ideologies at this farm.

Periods of Extra-Familial Labor Relations

Given the seeming capitalist orientations of the Shepards' agricultural production and the shift away from reciprocal exchanges indicated above, might we expect the WSAL accounts to indicate a steady trend towards capitalist-type relations (i.e., cash exchanges for goods and labor, increased demands for more output/productivity by laborers, etc.)? The answer in short is that it partially does. In other ways it indicates a certain constant maintenance of owner/laborer relations that at once appear to retain elements of reciprocity. The years 1848-1860 correspond with the years of dramatic change on the farmstead and the rise of non-familial labor
at the farm (Sayers 1998). Over 30 laborers came and worked on the farm (see Table 2) along with the Shepards and analysis of their role in the workings of the farm is critical to understanding the mid-nineteenth-century political economy at this site (see Clemens and Simler 1988).

In examining the WSAL entries for all the years indicated therein, there were certain periods of labor and exchange relations between Shepard and people who worked on his property (see Table 2). These periods are distinguished by the appearance of a new type of relation, the difference rooted in what I have called its "description" (see Table 3). Also, Period 3a is distinguished from all the rest in that the representative laborers were worked only for cash. The distinction is found in the methods of remuneration, while its description is essentially the same contract labor of Periods 2 and 3; thus, it is listed as a sub-period.

Period 1 includes those relations that ideally involved the reciprocal exchange of labor amongst members of the community, with no economic profit gained by either party. Period 2 represents a hallmark change in the labor relations at the farmstead. With the rise of Period 2 relations the work effort became focused on Shepard’s farm for the most part. In Period 1 Shepard lent goods from his farm and acreage to go into use elsewhere and he received goods for his own farm consumption; his labor and farm production were part of a local community network of relatively equal exchange. Furthermore, Shepard worked elsewhere or for someone else, with no attendant development of his own farm and others may have come to help him on his farm in exchange.
## Table 2

**Resident, Renter, and Laborer Chronology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Known Date(s) of Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren B. Shepard</td>
<td>1850-1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeda Shepard</td>
<td>1850-1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Shepard</td>
<td>1850-1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Shepard</td>
<td>1852-1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Shepard</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascyneth Shepard</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Shepard</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shepard</td>
<td>ca. 1853-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepard children (2), names unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laborers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Hodges</td>
<td>June 1850-Sept 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa Jones</td>
<td>May 1850-Aug 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hoag</td>
<td>May 1850-June 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Pitts</td>
<td>June 1850-Sept 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Perry</td>
<td>July 1850-Sept 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon Carr</td>
<td>Dec 1850-Dec 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Johnson</td>
<td>1851?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Lymons</td>
<td>April 1851-Nov 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Miller</td>
<td>Dec 1851-July 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1853?-Dec 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1851-July 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca. May 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Bradish</td>
<td>May 1853?-Sept 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1852-May 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Wells</td>
<td>Nov 1852-Sept 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANT</td>
<td>Known Date(s) of Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron? M. Burrell?</td>
<td>Feb. 1853-May 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Feb 1853-July 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lowry</td>
<td>May 1853?-June 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Trask</td>
<td>June 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Brundage</td>
<td>April 1853-July 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Watts</td>
<td>Aug 1853-Sept 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1856-Feb 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 1853?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman Davis</td>
<td>Sept 1953-March 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S.? Crandall</td>
<td>March 1854-Oct 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Neal</td>
<td>Jan 1855-June 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 1854-Dec? 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>Jan 1855-June 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shepard</td>
<td>Oct 1854-1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauncey Warriner</td>
<td>Nov 1855-March 1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin DeWitt</td>
<td>March 1856-June 1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Kost</td>
<td>July 1857-March 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompey Tucker</td>
<td>Sept. 1857?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wheaton</td>
<td>March 1858-July 1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Decker</td>
<td>1860 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishmael? Johnson</td>
<td>1860 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezum Johnson</td>
<td>1870 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fail</td>
<td>1850 Census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

Periods of Labor and Exchange Relations: 1843-1858

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 1</th>
<th>1843-1848:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: reciprocal community labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: none (trade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 2</th>
<th>1849-1853:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: opportunistic labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: in kind and cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 3</th>
<th>1854-1858:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: reciprocal community labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: none (trade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: opportunistic labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: in kind and cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: contractual renting w/opportunistic labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: standardized wage contractual labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: in kind and cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 3a</th>
<th>1855-1858:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: standardized wage contractual labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration: cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in Period 2 people began coming to the Shepard farm, helped with the family's own production, and received, in cash and kind, proceeds from theirs and other's work on that same farm. This indicates that the context of farm production emerged in this period where Shepard, in terms of his relation to his acreage and
workers, became the owner and coordinator of the operable means of production. The type of relations involving workers took two forms (discussed below).

In Period 3, the beginnings of which correspond to the year that the extant, brick house was being built and probably completed, the new type of relation with workers was the renter/laborer. Also, the old reciprocal exchange form, lost in Period 2, was evidenced in 1 account in Period 3. Finally, the standardized contracted wage laborer, paid in cash and in kind, took on a new capitalist form of the worker who took only cash for his work. This happened only twice, in 1855 and 1858 and I have called that span Period 3a.

**Period 1: [1834?]1843-1847**

Based on descriptions of early exchange and labor relations by regional and local historians, the first period of relations at the Shepard farmstead was likely part of a general system of “labor-swapping” between Shepard and other males, likely residents of the local area (Schob 1975). In these arrangements, various individuals borrowed products from Shepard’s property from his emerging farmstead with the idea that the general market value of the goods, services, or wear on the objects would be “paid” back at some point in the future. It seems likely that the Shepards did most of their own work on the farm while production was augmented occasionally by obliged non-familial help. Even so, the reciprocal nature of these transactions meant that, in term of profit-gain, the Shepards did not gain any major advantage by having this occasional help.
There are relatively few entries in the account ledger from this period, and most actually suggest that Shepard was trading goods from his farm to local store-owners. However, even these merchant exchanges (being truck-and-barter type relations) and the few labor exchanges evidenced in WSAL do indicate that the social, exchange, and labor relations that existed between Shepard and others took place within a general reciprocal system. Furthermore, we have already indicated some of the entries that directly implicate these sorts of exchanges (e.g., the Henry Willis entry). This type of labor exchange is considered by many historians to be a hallmark of the pre/non-capitalist agricultural era of rural sectors (e.g., Bidwell and Falconer 1925; Heckscher 1964; Kulikoff 1992a; Post 1995). These types of relations helped to maintain a certain level of self-sufficiency for the community and, by implication, the farm.

The general lack of cash exchanged in this period, the different but largely equal benefits that the owner and worker gained, and the “in-kind” nature of the exchanges are characteristics of this more self-sufficient period. By the time the account ledger came into being this reciprocal system may have been losing its efficacy for Shepard and the larger community as perhaps indicated by those entries that suggest that Shepard lost goods and labor value in non-reciprocated exchanges (i.e. he never got anything in return). If so, certainly other farmers were suffering similar fates which would have promoted the cycle of uneven exchange that would have ultimately been the downfall of the general community reciprocity.
As was suggested above this loss of efficacy in reciprocity had roots in numerous changes, one of which was the increasing drive of individual farmers to produce more and more surplus goods from their acres. Rather than postulate that reciprocal exchanges were intentionally abandoned by farmers, like Shepard, or alternatively, that farmers were reacting to a general disintegration of the system by forces beyond their power and ken, I suggest that elements of both were probably at work and they dialectically forced the abandonment of reciprocity as the major means of obtaining work and maintaining semi-subsistent farms.

**Period 2: 1848-1853**

During this period the rise of both opportunistic labor and contract-based work is evident. As would be expected, concomitant with the advent of these types of relations was the elimination of reciprocal labor relations. By opportunistic labor, what is meant is that some workers labored on the farm without any set contract and worked as the opportunities arose. There are very few of these types evident in the WSAL.

One example is that of the account of Andrew Foot (WSAL 1843:10). In August 1848, Mr. Foot is credited “By 6 days of work” worth 5 dollars. He then took 33 ½ pounds of mutton, some apples, and used Shepard’s horse for 6 days against the value of the labor he had done. The majority of these debits accrued within that month of August, although 2 debits are indicated in the proceeding September and October (1 debit in each month). What makes this different from reciprocal exchanges is that the individual worker labored a set of days for a consistent wage and
then took goods from Shepard thereafter against that wage. He didn’t come to the farm and do a chore or two over time and then expect Shepard to extend him the courtesy of doing similar limited work for him simultaneously or in the future. Rather, he traded Shepard the work he had done opportunistically for products from the farm and use of Shepard’s horse. However, there are some similarities and even roots in the reciprocal exchange system; as opposed to selling his labor for cash he traded his labor for goods.

The contract-based work that dominated that period was in effect a rigification of the opportunistic labor relations. With the contract-based relations a worker was hired, prior to the actual need for work at the Shepard farm based on the knowledge that there would be a production demand for the labors of the worker. However, even though there was a constant cash value assigned to the work, regardless of what form the work took, the remuneration came in the predominant form of goods with some cash on occasion. In conjunction with the rise of these types of relations, payment in goods through credit accounts that Shepard had with a few local merchants became part of the remunerative relations. An example of this type is the entry dated March 25, 1852, for a Frederick Wells (WSAL 1843:30). In this account Wells “commenced work at $13 per month for the season,” beginning on the above date. He then proceeded to take cash from Shepard and goods from stores that had accounts with Shepard through May 8th of the same year. On May 15th Shepard added up what he owed Wells and paid him in the form of a note, probably a promissory or credit note.
Another example comes from an account that was begun in November of 1852 and extended into 1853. In this case (WSAL 1843:35) an Aaron Bunnell agreed to a year’s contract at $11 a month. In this case he did not last the whole year but rather only made it to September 1853. But in that time he took cash, goods from mercantilists/dry-goods dealers and goods from Shepard’s own surpluses against his monthly wage. He settled with Shepard and was paid in cash.

The disparity in wages between the two examples probably relates to the fact that field laborers were in high demand during the planting and harvesting seasons which began in the spring and went through into the fall (Schob 1975). Thus, Frederick Wells was able to get a premium wage for his specific contract which was a seasonal one. Bunnell, on the other hand, agreed to a year-long contract which began and went through the down season (late fall-winter). Although farmers had a variety of ways available through custom to negotiate with workers in regards to their value during the off season (see Schob 1975), they tried to bring in year-round help because this helped to guarantee workers, who were scarce until the late 1850s, for the productive seasons.

Indeed, Bunnell, the only specified year-long contract for this period in WSAL, had one of the lowest monthly wages in the period. Only Jackson Hodges, in 1850, received a lower wage, between $9-10 monthly. However, the latter very well may have been a child/adolescent son of a local businessman or farmer whom Shepard knew [see WSAL 1843:15-17]. Young males were often paid much less than men for agricultural work [Schob 1975]).
There are also unspecified contracts evident in the WSAL. In these cases the wage to be received by the worker was not actually written down in the WSAL. However, one must assume that an agreement was made between the worker and Shepard. For example, "William Turs commenced work" on July 13th 1849 but no mention is made of his wage nor the duration of employment. Interestingly, this is one of the first accounts to indicate that Shepard kept track of absences, further evidence that this was an unwritten contractual arrangement; were it opportunistic labor there would be no meaning really to a worker being absent. Only if it was assumed that a person would or should be working (i.e., contracted) would the absence noting make any sense; thus, Shepard would not remunerate a worker for days not worked.

**Period 3: 1854-1858**

The year that the extant, brick house was built marked the beginning of a new period of labor relations on the farm. It is interesting that in this period the most variety of non-familial work agreements are noted. A few types were also noted in earlier periods but in this later period reciprocal community work "reappeared" (indicated by only one entry) as well as contract renting with opportunistic labor and, in Period 3a (1855-1858), total cash remuneration occurred for two workers in a standardized wage contract.

In the case of the rent-based agreements, Shepard specified at the beginning of a given account that the person was renting a room for a certain amount per week. Throughout that person’s stay, the renter would then work opportunistically to lessen
the amount he owed Shepard for rent. So, in these cases a person was paying for the use of space in the house partially through cash and partially through labor done on the farm as opportunities arose.

The cash remunerated workers (Period 3a) are of great interest because of the fact that this type of labor relation is fully capitalist. Unlike taking goods in kind with occasional cash against work done or a contract, these workers sold their labor solely for money. What is important is that these occur rarely in the WSAL (twice) and one of them is chronologically (1858) the last account entered in the book. Furthermore, the workers' stay on the farm is relatively short and in neither case is it stated that they lived on the farm with the Shepards. So, the first of this type, George Shepard agreed to a year contract but only worked from January 24th through June 21st 1855 (WSAL 1843:55). The other example is Walter Decker’s account. This account indicates that he worked only from March 30th through July 30th, 1858. In each case the duration is short compared to many other workers and as will be shown below, they may have worked for short periods because of the incongruencies and contradictions between capitalist wage-relations that they were demanding and other elements of the political-economic and material landscape.

Discussion

There can be little doubt that after Michigan’s colonial era the territory and state was generally agrarian with quite a bit of capital invested in production, urban development, expansion of the state, private property allocation, and improvement.
The state apparatus, funded by capital and investors back east, expanded to include Michigan within its system and worked throughout the 19th century to open the area to national and global markets and profit for capitalists. By offering such inducements for settlement, the frontier became part of the established economy and became a source for raw materials and labor as it afforded capitalists a whole new area of consumers for their goods. Thus, it is no surprise that elements of capitalism (e.g., cash payments for private property, state regulation of property boundaries, and investors vying for optimal land for future production) were present in Battle Creek at its inception and rose to dominance within the first thirty years of its existence.

However, it is a very interesting possibility that non-capitalist relations were maintained in the earliest years of settlement and beyond in established agrarian sectors. The history of the Shepard site may attest to this. Although Shepard may have himself produced capital or profit for his family from his agricultural pursuits and workers, it is first important to note that he owned the means of production and worked for himself and not for a wage per se. Also important is the fact that the majority of Almeda’s labors were not paid in cash by Shepard (or anyone else) but were actually used within the working and perpetuation of the farm itself, whether viewed as reproductive or productive labors.

Whether in the earlier days of pcp at the farm (self-subsistence and limited market trading) and even after as the farm became progressive and more linked to production and ultimately the market, Almeda generally worked for the farm’s sake. The increase in dairy production, which was part of the increased workload, may
have had some links to profit-motivation and may have afforded her some cash-payment for her labors. However, some dairy products did go towards remunerating laborers and in general represent a small portion of her overall work load that was primarily not waged or cash-oriented. Thus, it seems that the domestic sphere was not decidedly wage-paid but rather was linked strongly to domestic production and pcp.

Therefore, it seems that both Warren and Almeda Shepard’s work and labor became reoriented toward the market in the 1840s and 1850s. However, the social relations on the farm were not capitalist ones (i.e., waged labor) but were rather differentially negotiated relations that ultimately allowed for profit accrual, in part from the progressive division of labor across gendered lines. In another way, the farm became progressive as members of the family failed to resist, or succumbed to, the envelopment of their production by market-relations. Warren Shepard was likely the predominant link between the farm and the broader capitalist-market. But the domestic economy itself, the workings of the system that produced the goods, capital, and profits was not really dominated by true capitalist types of relations.

Thus, the farm was, by the middle of the century, on one hand part of the agrarian system that helped expand and perpetuate the broader capitalist economy through producing surpluses but on the other hand the relations that the Shepard family maintained were not predominantly capitalist. The next question is whether the relations with the extra-familial laborers were capitalist? If not, did they also follow the pattern of non- or perhaps, quasi-capitalist relations. We have argued that
the evidence from the WSAL suggests that they never were quite capitalist because of the relative lack of predominance of cash-remunerative contracts. This is indeed a critical question as the presence of a capitalist workforce would mean that it was a capitalist farmstead.

Headlee (1991:2) proposes that three general types of agrarian domiciliary arrangements existed in the North during the nineteenth-century. She argues that a family farm was characterized by family ownership of enough land to support the family and had no more land than could farmed by the labor force of the family. A family plot was characterized by a family owning some land but not enough farmland to support itself. Finally a rare type, the capitalist farm, existed when "...a family had more land than they could operate and they did hire wage labor" (Headlee 1991:2). According to Headlee, the family farm system was the agrarian root of capitalism in the US (Headlee 1991:2).

However, as we have argued, the Shepard farm was characterized by a political economy that was a bit anomalous; for example, its characteristics defy placement into Headlee's schema. It does seem that it was certainly not a family plot and it also appears to have characteristics of the capitalist farm. There was more land than could be worked by the family. Thus, the need for agricultural implements and extra-familial laborers. However, only in relatively rare instances did labor take the form of wage labor. In general, most years indicate a low percentage of cash payments to workers by Shepard, the highest being 1858 when 39.4% of the year's total remuneration exchanges were for cash (see Table 4). The next two highest percents
are indicated in 1852 (35.5%) and 1855 (35.4%). It is interesting to note that in these three years (1858, 1855, 1852) the total exchanges for each year are relatively low. This may indicate that when Shepard had to pay more cash than he wanted to or was accustomed to, he didn’t bring in workers.

Table 4

Contrasts Between Cash and In-kind Transactions With Laborers in the Warren B. Shepard Account Ledger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th># of Cash Exchanges</th>
<th>Exchanges in-kind</th>
<th>Total of Both</th>
<th>% of Cash Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Warren B. Shepard Account Ledger 1843)

Of course, there was remuneration and the value of labor was based on the seasonal value of the work to be done but there appears to have been no real stan-
standardized wage. Remuneration was perhaps negotiated by the laborers (see Sayers and Lapham 1995) and Shepard on a case by case basis. Also, it likely varied based on the age of the individual, and, it is possible that there was a general range of value placed on type of work to be done (e.g., more value placed on threshing than garden work).

Regardless, the general scarcity of cash or true wage hiring throughout the decade precludes calling these relations capitalist. Also, the fact that only two workers out of the more than 30 workers known took solely cash through their duration on the farm suggests that most preferred payment in-kind and receiving goods in-kind through credit. In general, the evidence indicates that the labor relations incorporated elements of reciprocal or kin-based relations and likely maintained preferred elements of the older and non-capitalist political economies of the earlier frontier era. Evidence suggests that the community in general, and Shepard definitely, were indeed engaged in these sorts of relations and negotiations in earlier years (ca. 1831-1845).

These similarities to reciprocal-relations include the fact that workers were remunerated typically by goods and produce, typically from the farm itself but also through accounts of Shepard’s at select business establishments in the Battle Creek area. In another way, they received a portion of what they produced as opposed to the ultimate sort of alienating and exploitative worker-owner relations; these are the cash-for-labor type of relations (see Meszaros 1973; also see Chapter V this text). Of course, the laborers may have ultimately sold portions of the goods they received
from their work on the Shepard farm to local merchants. However, it is equally possible that they themselves were supplying their families with provender and goods; perhaps they lived on family plots or in urban areas where they were unable to supply the necessities through their own production. As a result, these relations with Shepard may have proven beneficial (Schob 1975).

So, it seems that the workers, Almeda and daughters, and Warren Shepard created a political economy wherein no particular sphere was overtly capitalist in terms of the labor relations that it exhibited. Although “capitalist moments” pocket the social history of the site from, perhaps the mid-1840s on, never do the moments become the standard. In this way it seems that non-capitalist relations of production temporally coincided with decidedly capitalist production (i.e., market, surplus, and profit production).

The political economy of the mid-nineteenth-century Shepard farmstead seems then to correspond with the agrarian contexts discussed by historians of the transition to capitalist agriculture. For example, in this case one could look to the farm and wider community from its historical beginning and argue that it was always capitalist to one degree or another. The presence of the state-grounded divisions of land, private property ownership, the initial capitalist interests in water-power, and profit gained by speculators who bought land from the government point to this.

Alternatively, one could look at multiple scales as well as at different facets of the same scale and argue that non-capitalist relations existed concurrently with capitalist ones or within the CMP itself. If the historians and theorists are correct, then
the presence or absence of wage labor relations is critical in discerning whether true capitalism was present at a point in time and space. If the above analysis of the Shepard site history is correct, the question I would like to now address is: Why were these relations that contradicted the enveloping CMP present? In the following chapter, I will argue that the answers to this question seem to point to the nature of and the historical role of the nucleated landscape of the farm, broader political-economic motivations and ideologies of progressivism, and contradictory relations along gender, public/private and familial/non-familial, and class lines.
The history of the Northern and Mid-West states is intricately linked to political-economic transitions and transformations, changing material conditions and ideologies, the emergence of agrarian classes, and the functions of the state. It is thus quite easily understood that the landscapes of historic America reflected, helped foster, and reproduce those same phenomena. This recursive relation between the historical political economy and landscapes existed because people as the agents of these changes lived on, owned, worked upon, identified with, and thought in, and on, these landscape spaces. In short, all human activity occurs in and on landscapes and these socially constructed environments are not neutral aspects within the human domain.

People, as agents living within the domains of historical political-economic systems, and living as participants within those systems, utilized material culture in all aspects of their lives. They often attempted to commandeer material culture as a means of harnessing the socially significant meanings for self-empowerment. Furthermore, the symbolic and ideological meaning culturally inherent to particular landscape constructs (e.g., house style, size, appearance, and surrounding yards) also re-
fleeted such mundane political-economic and ideological relations that individuals
and families had with their possessions, property, and the outside world or public.

The 119.85 acres that Shepard purchased in 1834 and 1838 is what is consid­
ered in this section as the landscape, although an emphasis is placed on the structural
and spatial landscape associated with the central domicile. As we mentioned above,
when Shepard first moved to the property, a cabin may have already existed that was
built by a squatter in the late 1820s. However, the homesteading of this property was
not, at this early date of frontier living, an uncontested and simple process.

Until 1840, Native Americans used this parcel and some surrounding areas
near the Kalamazoo River for a variety of purposes. The landscape was their village,
a ceremonial center, and a burial ground. Indeed, on the northern edge of the Shepard
property there was a feature known in local historiography as “Chief’s Knoll” or
“Chief’s Mound” (Roberts 1930:323, 441, 442). However, it is not clear whether
these names refer to the residence of ranking Native Americans or an actual burial
mound (it was removed by the City in 1954 [Sayers and Lapham 1995]).

As would have been typical of frontier America’s disregard for Native custom
and claims to land, the early squatter’s cabin (which was later Shepard’s) was possi­
ibly built atop the knoll. For the first six years that Shepard lived on this property he
did so with Native Americans in the immediate vicinity, at least part of the time.
They evidently used to camp near the cabin and hold ceremonies at night (Roberts
1930:Fig. 441). Given that the area was important to Natives, it seems unlikely that
they would have yielded the space and land and acquiesced. Documentary evidence
of resistance to the actual presence of Shepard is suggested by the fact that Native Americans would come and “badly” scare him (Roberts 1930:Fig.441). However, whether he was merely afraid of them because of their foreignness or whether they actually threatened (i.e., resisted) him in some way is somewhat unclear in the documentary record. Although there is little information regarding this “contact-period landscape” in the documents, and the site-specific documentary information available is scarcely verifiable, the recovery of more than thirty-five Native American artifacts in archaeological excavations in 1996 (see Sayers, Nassaney, and McMillan 1998:77-110) gives some credibility to that version of history. Also, the general history of Michigan in the Contact period certainly suggests that resistance was known, if not common, during the period (see Chapter IV).

As the above suggests, and Wallerstein’s 2nd type of transition is based on this fact, the transitions in rural America did not just involve Europeans and their own market and political-economic relations. As forced participants in the expansionist transition and contradicting cultural and economic definitions of land and landscapes (e.g., natural vs. private property), Native Americans were very much a part of these transformations. They struggled to maintain their understanding and use of this landscape as Euro-American pioneers, including Shepard, were beginning to forge their own use-patterns and paradigms of land-use. It is perhaps ironic some that Native Americans helped settlers with their initial building projects even though it would ultimately help lead to their transplantation or demise as settlers were able to survive in the frontier.
By 1840, Shepard and his family were utilizing some of the total parcel for both habitation and agricultural production (Federal Census of Michigan, 1840). However, a large portion would remain “unimproved” until past 1850. Although little direct documentary or archaeological evidence has been obtained regarding the frontier landscape, historians of the era in general have suggested that pioneer landscapes were simple and relatively small (Bidwell and Falconer 1925). Generally, these earlier farmscapes were composed of a house (e.g., a log cabin), few pens, and cribs. The land that was improved was often directly related to how much the family needed to cultivate in order to subsist and grow minimal surpluses for bartering (Bidwell and Falconer 1925; McMurry 1997). Furthermore, animals for production of provender, like cows and sheep, were generally allowed to roam throughout the acreage that wasn’t engaged in subsistence and trade production.

The self-sufficient and subsistence-level production engaged in through utilization of the landscape had its effects on the appearance and efficiency of the space used within the landscape (Sayers and Nassaney 1997; Sayers 1997). Bidwell and Falconer (1925:162) suggest that “…one of the outstanding features of pioneer farm economy [was]...its extensiveness...”, or in other words, “…the application of small amounts of labor and capital on large amounts of land...” (italics in original). The extensive use of land is to be distinguished from the later use of intensive practices on landscapes, including, but not limited to, dramatic increases in labor-use and investments of capital in production.
So, in comparison to the nature of landscapes within more capitalist production areas, both agricultural (discussed below) and industrial, these pioneer farm landscapes reflected and promoted subsistence living and relative independence from the market (McMurry 1997; Small 1996). Without the imperative of capital accrual, and with the political economy of community and familial production being foremost, there was no need for owners and families to intensify their use of space and the landscape in agricultural production. The lack of profit motive parlayed into a usage of landscape resources on a small scale although the acreage owned may have been in excess of what was needed to produce needed provender and maintain the family and community subsistence economy.

Although one can point to simply economic relations and gain an understanding of this earliest landscape environment on the Shepard property, our discussion regarding non-capitalist forms of social and economic conditions and relations can add a bit of refinement to this understanding. As was discussed earlier, in terms of social relations, there is very little chance that any significant amount of labor was done on the farm by remunerated non-familial workers. Wage workers, or even non-familial workers, were extremely rare throughout most of the first half of the nineteenth-century on farmsteads (Headlee 1991; Schob 1975). Although Warren Shepard had such individuals under his employ by the late 1840s, his earliest farming needs probably were limited enough to not warrant the use of these types of workers. However, given the reciprocal tendencies of rural communities throughout the northern states during this period, one must allow that productive work may have been per-
formed on the Shepard farm by non-familial people who were participating in such a traditional system in the larger Battle Creek agrarian environs (Sayers 1998). So, for example, in 1840, the Shepard’s had a male, between the age of 11-14, living on the farm (Federal Census of Michigan 1840). Although this individual very well may have been a privately tutored student under Warren Shepard’s charge, it seems likely that he would have helped with chores as a repayment for the education (Shepard worked this type of arrangement with William Wallace Crittendon in 1843 [W.S.A.L. 1843;6]). It is known that Shepard was engaged in these types of reciprocal relations into the 1840s with adults in the community so they likely assisted at various times as well (Sayers 1997).

Given that Shepard married in 1838, and even though Shepard was engaged in brick manufacturing as late as 1840, it seems likely that farming came to dominate the Shepard family’s life and work by the early 1840s. By 1843 Shepard began maintaining records of his transactions with locals (i.e., the WSAL 1843). The accounts in the WSAL tend to relate to and indicate slowly intensifying reliance on agricultural production and thus I would expect the landscape and spaces of his privately owned acreage to begin to reflect those changing agrarian material conditions and social relations. This intensification, I suggest, was a major aspect of, and impetus for, the Shepards’ construction of their new home in 1854 and its attendant reorganization of space and meaning.
The Progressive Shepard Site Landscape

Constructed in a style that was popular in the northern states between 1830-1860 (McAlester and McAlester 1984:177,182; see also Schlereth 1983), the extant Greek Revival domestic structure at the Shepard site is the largest nineteenth-century artifact within site boundaries (see [Nassaney, Sayers and Kuemin 1998:54], for specific measurements of the house). It was built sometime in 1853-1854 and, during the remainder of Shepard’s life, this bi-level brick home was the social and familial center of most non-field work activities of the farm. Even the bricks themselves (excluding bricks used in recent remodeling in certain places) are of a style particular to Greek Revival structures and their popularity period—“the almost modern Greek Revival brick”—that emerged around 1840 (Montgomery Jones 1999:31).

The house, no doubt, had significant meanings for residents and non-residents alike as it was one of the first brick houses built in the area (Mary Butler, personal communication, 1995). Brick buildings were signs of cultural and economic progress away from the old and “primitive” days of log cabin-living and the relative economic inefficiency of extensive use of acreage and landscapes (Massie 1987:59). Although Greek Revival domiciles were not necessarily only for the middle-class or elite (Nassaney et al. 1998:52), the brick materials used, the ornate porch and portico of the period, and the dentilated entablature around the Shepard house were at that time definitely uncommon in the local area and were thus obvious symbols of middle class prosperity (Randy Case, personal communication, 1995).
Built facing west, the Shepard house is located in the northwestern corner of the two contiguous parcels (ca. 119.15 acres) that Warren Shepard purchased in 1834 (79.15 acres) and 1838 (40 acres). The Shepard property is, and has been, legally considered as part of Battle Creek township because it is about two miles south of the present City of Battle Creek; the Kalamazoo River flows adjacent to the northeastern corner of the acreage. The house faces, and is located approximately 20 meters from, what was Coldwater Road in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (it is now Riverside Drive). Also, Coldwater and Territorial Roads intersected at the northwestern corner of the original Shepard property (the 1834 parcel). Both of these roads were major thoroughfares throughout the last three quarters of the nineteenth-century (Weigmink 1930). Thus, Shepard placed his house in a prominent location, where the somewhat heavy traffic going in and out of town on both roads (that ran alongside the western and northern edge of his property) would have had to pass by his abode. This also enabled the Shepards to have relatively easy access in and out of town (Sayers and Lapham 1996).

The present dilapidated state of the Shepard house reflects years of neglect and the fact that it has fallen into a state of domestic desuetude and non-use. However, given a historical understanding of the architectural idiom of the Greek Revival aesthetic, it is apparent that the intentions of the mid-nineteenth-century planner(s) (assumedly Warren and/or Almeda Shepard) of the house went beyond the functional and that the house was a multivalent and powerful construct. It was built in order to create an architectural symbol of some majesty to relay and enforce not only material
messages of financial success (Nassaney, Sayers, and Kuemin 1998) but also to suggest to the public the Shepards' acceptance of progressive ideologies of austere country living and individualism (McMurry 1997; Small 1996).

Furthermore, the Greek Revival style has been linked to the fraternal ideologies of Freemasonry which posit a relation between symmetry of architecture and God (Kennedy 1989:327-328; Roberts 1974:51-52). The knowledge and understanding of the art of masonry and architecture (linked by Masonic legend to the God-given expert knowledge of those ancients who flawlessly built biblical Solomon's temple [Mason 1999:82]) parlayed into a Masonic use and co-opting of the new geometrically harmonious and “perfect” American style (Kennedy 1989). The section of the WSAL that details Shepard's knowledge of the (Free)Masonic alphabet, secret handshakes, and the courtesies that should be granted by novitiates to high-ranking Freemasons, (mentioned in Chapter III) suggests that Shepard was associated in some way with this fraternal order—likely a member given the secret or non-publicized nature of the knowledge indicated in the WSAL (see Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996).

Finally, it is well known that the Greek Revival, brought to this country from France by Thomas Jefferson (who was a Freemason), was an architectural representation of the new “freedom” and independence of the new United States (Tyler 1992:85). The earliest elites of American society found inspiration and propagandistic power in linking the future of the new republic with the past Greek civilization (Anderson and Moore 1988; Tyler 1992). Similar to the Masonic rationale for its use,
it was seen as representative of the ideal of harmony, symmetry, and congruency of the new God-ordained republic. The geometrical and axial aesthetic of the architectural style spoke to both the commoner and elite volumes about the new republican values and ideologies of individual liberty, egalitarianism, and prosperity through public and private buildings (Anderson and Moore 1988). Although styles that incorporated a symmetrical and geometrical aesthetic appear to have dominated American architecture from the mid-eighteenth century up to the Civil War (i.e., the Georgian, Federal, and Roman Revival; see Anderson and Moore 1988:388; Tyler 1992:85), it is not surprising that a new style emerged after the Revolution. To solidify and unify the unstable, neophyte government and the cultures and ideologies that were to be distinctively American, people needed to formalize, materially and culturally, the seemingly different nature of the pre- and post-Revolutionary North American societies. Architecture was an excellent material medium for expressing and perpetuating such a massive cultural, political, and ideological shift.

The connections between political and social ideologies and economic pursuits discussed above suggest that the domiciliary architecture of the landscape did not have a passive role on the mid-nineteenth-century Shepard farmstead. Rather, from this angle the house was a material construction and the center of the landscape that was intentionally designed and styled in a popular vernacular that exuded multivalent messages of status and wealth and demanded public and private exaltation of the Shepard family (particularly Warren B. Shepard) and their place in the community and, by extension, the republic. Also, it helped perpetuate and reproduce the life-
styles on the farm that helped the family to “leave” the frontier period and achieve some measure of success in the first place (i.e., it helped reproduce progressive and capitalist management and ideologies of efficiency).

One of the material results of the rise to dominance of capital-oriented farming throughout the 1840s and early 1850s (for an analysis of this farm construction trend through the turn of the century, see Primack 1965) was the reconstruction of farming landscapes to fit the demand for more productivity (i.e., surplus productivity) for market sales (McMurry 1997). In Bidwell and Falconer’s terms, discussed above, the use of the landscape became more intensive along with extensive. At the Shepard site, the most prominent historical landscape evidence for this change is the nucleation of the farmstead itself.

With the house likely completed between 1853-1854, the remainder of the farmstead was built during the next five years. The rest of the nucleated farmstead contained two barns to the southeast of the house by 1858, some pens, a garden, a walkway, and perhaps a private road (Battle Creek Map 1858; see Sayers and Nas-saney 1997). The farmstead also likely included a few smaller outbuildings for food storage (Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996).

However, there is not much direct evidence regarding the actual layout of the farmstead and the nature of space-use and meaning during this period. In the WSAL (1843), in the arithmetic section, there is a somewhat cryptic entry that may be a description by Shepard of his farmland:
If this actually is a description of the Shepard farm, it is evident that Shepard had his overall acreage compartmentalized (into lots) and that these spaces did have separate uses; this of course would be expected of a progressive farmer (McMurry 1997). The east lot would correspond to the back of the house, the south to where the known barns stood, and the front lot to the west of the house entrance and likely included the front yard. Then the wooded lot, which was often maintained for firewood, lumber, and/or syrup trees was located somewhere on the property. Finally, the plowed land contained 64 acres. However, the total acreage does not add up to the known acreage after the second land purchase in 1838 (119.15 acres). Rather, it totals to 81.90 acres which is much closer to Shepard’s original parcel purchased in 1834 (79.15 acres).

Unfortunately, then, we have no way of knowing whether the list was an arithmetical exercise listing the results of some formulaic problems, an after-the-fact description of the pre-progressive farmland, or a detailed, if erroneous, description of the progressive-era farm layout. It may also be a projected layout of the farmstead as Shepard conceived of it before it was built in 1853-1854. Regardless, the information does point to the fact, though, that Shepard was in the habit of thinking of the landscape (not necessarily his own land though) in terms of separate landscape spaces and perhaps then the farmstead was constructed in a like manner. Furthermore, regardless
of the discrepancies in acreage, the description does follow loosely what we do know about the historical landscape of the farm after 1854.

Given the uncertain nature of the landscape that included and surrounded the 1854 farmhouse, researchers of the Shepard house have recently developed a proxemics model that will allow for predictions of progressive-era landscape features at the site. The proxemics model, derived from the analysis of lithographs of probable progressive farms (for discussion, see Sayers 1997), also allows for a refinement of dialogue regarding the social and political-economic implications of what we do know about the farmstead (Sayers 1997; Sayers and Nassaney 1997).

The conclusions drawn from the model allow for arguments that posit cultural, class, and ideological impetuses during the middle third of the nineteenth-century as possible causes in the development and proliferation of a relatively common set of broad landscape and space-use patterns on farmsteads in southwest Michigan. In short, as progressive farming emerged and helped to birth a middle class of farmers in this area certain general patterns of landscape development on their farmsteads emerged. Indeed it might even be said that this progressive movement gave rise to the classic Mid-West farmstead in itself (i.e., central farmhouse with organized barn and activity areas).

The model suggests that there were definitely three areas of space-use within a nucleated progressive farmstead. One was the true public space in the front of the house. The other two were generally located in areas behind the face, or façade, of the house, to the sides of the house, and side by side to one another. Simply, of the
two non-public spaces, one area held the outbuildings on progressive farms and the other had no outbuildings. The latter also probably most often contained the garden. Regarding the area with outbuildings, further analysis indicates that the largest outbuildings were located furthest from the house with the smaller ones located nearer the house. Also, the majority of nucleated farmsteads faced public roads (Sayers and Nassaney 1998).

The larger and furthest away auxiliary structures were likely storage, maintenance and processing loci and the spaces immediate to these outbuildings were used for most activities associated with field production. This interpretation is augmented by the fact that they generally appeared to abut fields (Sayers 1997). If we consider the general imperative of progressive farming regarding optimal use of space and energy it makes sense that field production locales would be furthest away from the house and near production fields. This practice would afford easy access to fields and buildings instead of, for example, having to travel through the farmstead to put produce in the barn (Bidwell and Falconer 1925). Although many political-economic variables may have produced significant differences in landscape use in different regions and periods (Charles E. Orser, personal communication, 1999), it likely would not have been a great walking distance from the house if someone needed to get something from the larger storage barns, repair machines, or slaughter animals during or after field hours (see Moir [1987:232] and Rotenizer [1992] who suggest a maximal distance of 50 m for major agricultural outbuildings in a studies of Upland South farmsteads).
The buildings that stood closer to the house and the non-outbuilding space were more likely, by similar logical justification as the other outbuildings, used for more house-based production; these buildings, may have been used for example, for meat storage, dairy production and storage, and possibly a chicken coop. So, these outbuildings would have been placed conveniently for use by those working and living within the house. Again the progressive farming mentality of optimal space-use would have called for these types of considerations (see McMurry 1997:10-87).

Within the non-outbuilding space there was little evidence for use indicated in the drawings of nineteenth-century farmsteads. However, researchers suggest that within this space the family garden would have been located (Sayers and Nassaney 1997; Nassaney, Sayers, and Kuemin 1998). Gardens were an important landscape feature of progressive farms and few went without them (McMurry 1997; Osterud 1991; Small 1996).

So, the general functional symmetry of space-use and landscape within the farmstead, at its basic level, seems to have been a “trifurcation” of architectural space within activity areas associated with the nucleated landscape. One area or third of the space of the farmstead behind the front of the house was a landscape of outbuilding architecture that likely had fairly concentrated activities directly related to the overall function of farm buildings. The other area or third would have had been a non-architectural landscape of gardening and perhaps dumping and disposal areas for the farmstead, but still essentially private activity area. Finally, the other third would have been public space as well as display space in the front of the house.
On this level the Shepard farm seems to fit the pattern. The farmstead itself was placed in the northwestern corner of the total acreage that Shepard owned. This placement, influenced by the public-nature of the road intersection discussed above, seems to have forced the Shepards to use space to the east and south for agricultural field production as the majority of acreage in their parcel was contained in these directions from the house. In all actuality, if one drew an imaginary line due east from the southern edge of the farmhouse the area south of that line would contain well over 3/4s of the total arable acreage available to the Shepards. Thus, it comes as little surprise, given the discussion above, that the two barns known to researchers were located to the south and east of the house; the last barn was, then, closest to the bulk of arable and productive land (see Beers 1873). Archaeological evidence from disturbed contexts in locations thought to correspond with the barn placement on the maps suggests that they were indeed located to the southeast of the house. This evidence includes a portion of a cut slat of structural wood with nails and a few fragments of mid-nineteenth-century ceramics (see Sayers and Nassaney 1997 for a more detailed description of these objects).

Unfortunately, there is little documentary information regarding other outbuildings of this period beyond those indicated on maps. The archaeological remains of an outbuilding and a probable privy and a drainage pipe system were recovered in excavations but so far the analyses of these features indicates that they date to later periods, ca. 1880-1940 (Nassaney 1998; Sayers 1998b). Indeed, there may have been no other outbuildings in the 1850s-1870s on the landscape. However, more detailed
analysis may suggest an earlier progressive era origin for either or both of these features; if so, they would indeed follow the pattern suggested by the proxemics model as they are located almost due east of the rear of the house. In some ways, then, the questions regarding the dates of these archaeological features suggest that a refined analysis of them and their associated artifacts is in order. Such an analysis would help make reasonably certain that the earliest representative artifacts do not represent mid-nineteenth-century depositional activities.

Regardless, the non-architectural space at the Shepard site would be anticipated to be to the north and east of the house extending at most approximately 50 meters in either direction. Although documents suggest that there was a garden (e.g., W.S.A.L. 1843:62), it gives no direct reference to the location of this feature. The proxemics model suggests that it would be in the north and eastern area and other secondary sources further suggest that it would be close to the house in any event. Archaeological evidence of an 1850-1875 domestic refuse midden just north of the rear of the house (ca. 15 meters from the northeast corner of the “addition”) also suggests that this area was used for activities not directly linked to field production. The location of this house-oriented feature makes sense given that this is an area that would be expected to be a high traffic area as it would not have been associated with outbuilding architectural space. Furthermore, it seems to follow part of South’s Brunswick Pattern (1978, 1979) of refuse disposal that indicates that people often dumped the refuse from within the house right outside the rear entrances to the domicile (discussed below).
If the proxemics model is correct and there is a general pattern to progressive farms in Calhoun County then it seems likely that the Shepard farm would have exhibited a similar pattern. With the frameworks that the proxemics model and archaeological remains in mind, it remains to be seen how this landscape and architecture played a role in helping to transform and maintain certain major aspects of political-economic and social relations on the farmstead throughout the middle third of the nineteenth-century.

Public vs. Private Organization and Space

I have already discussed the rise of progressive agrarian concerns with social appearance, from bodily dress and style to the material culture with which they surrounded themselves, used, and inhabited. The Greek Revival architectural form, the bricks used in the construction of the house and perhaps other outbuildings, the well-maintained farmstead, the organization of materials within, and of, inner domicile space itself were critical landscape and spatial accommodations of the emergent market-orientation of farm families. These were important, overtly encrypted and salient symbols, status markers, and ideological manifestations of the economic, class, and gender based progressive farm movement. Also, the actual science of farm management and efficiency had a strong effect on the farmstead and its productive acreage. This scientific approach to agriculturally productive landscapes then had a role in the rise and perpetuation of external infrastructural relations and conditions of the CMP. By becoming producers of surplus goods (i.e., foodstuffs), through efficient use of
productive agricultural spaces, farmsteads across the rural North became critical producers for an ever-intensifying capitalist mode of production and market system (Orser 1994; Stewart-Abernathy 1992).

One of the social and ideological aspects of the progressive movement (although certainly not limited to it) was the extreme concern with public space and private space (McMurry 1997:106-122). This dualistic use of space emerged at two locales on the landscape; within the house itself and without it. As was discussed in terms of the proxemics model, most farmsteads appeared to have no outbuildings in locations in front of the façade plane of the house. One would have to conclude that this façade viewing area was considered in view of the public; whether farmsteads were situated near public roads or not they still likely entertained guests and thus would have the front of the farm consistently scrutinized by the public, their peers (McMurry 1997:68).

On those farms near public roads, such as Shepard’s, one might expect even more concern with public appearance as they were under the constant judgmental eye of the passerby or the distant public and were intentionally placed in such close proximity. Thus, for example, Greek Revival farmhouses often had front-entrance porches with Greek columns in the front and less embellishment along the sides and rear. These columns may have supported a roof or been placed around the border of the front door. A photo of the Shepard house, for example, dating from the early 1930s (see Figure 4) shows a remarkably detailed and ornate, albeit weathered and worn, Greek Revival style portico and porch. The condition and style suggest that the
portico and surrounding architectural embellishments date to the construction period or shortly thereafter (Nassaney 1998). Also, it was singularly the most detailed exterior aspect of the house even by the 1930s, although there is also a dentilated entablature. Thus, these embellishments suggest that the Shepards had concerns for public ostentation when designing and building the house that existed, not out of functional concerns, *per se*, but rather through understanding, and relating to, political and social webs of interaction.

Figure 4. 1931 Photograph of Emily Shepard and the Shepard Farmhouse Showing Greek-Revival Porch, Ornate Dentilation, and Front Yard Area (adapted from Sayers and Lapham 1996:39).
I suggest, then, that one result the heightened concern with architectural and landscape presentation to the public of symbolic imagery of ideologies of progressivism, capitalism, and status was that the outbuilding architectural area was pushed to the rear of a farmscape so as to limit the public attention to daily work and toil; the gardens likely were put out of sight as well given that they were also areas of daily work. This placement makes intuitive sense; one can scarcely entertain the mental image of the face of a farmstead being preceded on the landscape by a set of outbuildings and a garden. So, the public areas of the farmscape were a significant extra-domiciliary space where farm families presented, to the jury of their peers, the aesthetic material manifestations of their success in the market (status, wealth and class) and their acceptance of certain progressive ideals (ideologies of market-based agrarianism). The rear of the farmstead and the external spaces, as well as certain spaces within the house, were largely where the production of the material means of achieving and maintaining or reproducing that success occurred.

Also these embellishments for the public notification of success and conformity established a constant reminder to the farm family of their identity and their roots in the not-so-distant past. In another way, the material culture that composed the farmhouse and landscape worked to maintain the customs of capital production and the micro-economics within the farmstead that helped give rise to that same material set of manifestations. Most farm families, at least the heads of them, by the 1840-1850s remembered what it was like to live in cabins, on largely unimproved land, and without as much material wealth. As Small (1996:79) suggests of the pe-
period, "the cultural atmosphere was obsessed with improvement." The result was no doubt that the few that could afford Greek Revival farmhouses and the like were seen as emblematic of these improvements by both the public and the families that owned them; the embellishments that appeared to the public also had a private or familial meaning as well.

The inside of the house followed a similar pattern to the external areas. Within the domicile there was a generally distinct public space, namely the parlor or sitting room. Other spaces were indeed in some sense public, such as rooms where laborers stayed and/or renters, so that the only truly private spaces within the house was arguably the kitchen (McMurry 1997:106-122). However, for the moment we will consider the spaces in which families entertained more distantly social guests, like neighbors, church members, pastors, and anyone who may have "dropped by" as the true public space within the house. The spaces occupied by laborers and the like, we will argue, are analytically speaking distinctive and will be the basis for the main arguments proffered below.

It seems that there was little doubt within households as to the areas of true public space, although there may have been spaces that were used on different occasions for both. The parlor was likely used for the entertainment of guests or for other public events. However, a dining room may have been used for feeding guests but this space was also may have been used for familial consumption.

There can be no doubt that the inside of the Shepard house followed a similar pattern (Randy Case, personal communication, 1995). Although it is presently di-
lapidated and much of the inside is more or less gutted, remnants of rather grand and
decorous wall treatments in the front room or parlor give testimony to internal public
space presentation. The walls appear to have been highlighted by a series of faux
Greek columns (approximately 1-2 inches thick and 12 inches wide) of wood that
extended vertically between ornate horizontal molds that ran across the ceiling and
floor.

The ornate public-oriented parlor or sitting room was likely surrounded by
walls and doors to various private rooms (see Nassaney, Sayers and Kuemin
1998:55). One of the rooms was likely a study or library as many farmhouses and
urban dwellings had them; also the Shepards, not surprisingly, had strong affinities
toward education and studying which further points to there having been a study or
library (Randy Case, personal communication, 1995). Another of these rooms,
probably due east of the parlor, was no doubt the eating or dining room that probably
connected a small hallway leading to the kitchen.

The kitchen was thus located in the back of the house on the ground level
(Kuemin 1997). Probable period canning or storage shelves—the dating being based
on comparisons that showed that the shelves were held together by nails with the
same morphologies, characteristics, and styles as those that are found elsewhere in
known construction period elements within the house [Sayers 1998c] — built into the
walls may attest to the kitchen function of the back room. The dining room would
have acted as something of a buffer between the true public space of the parlor and
the true private space of the kitchen (McMurry 1997:85-176). The hallway would
have also further distanced the public from hearing and seeing private kitchen work even if there were non-familial guests sitting in the dining room (Small 1995).

In all, there appear to have been no more than six rooms downstairs and six upstairs in the mid-nineteenth-century Shepard house (Kuemin 1997). The upstairs interestingly would not have been totally private space, as workers and renters would have probably had rooms on the second level (see below). Other rooms, no doubt, would have had particular and altering meanings throughout the period but it seems certain that there were definite public (i.e., the sitting room or parlor) and private spaces (e.g., the kitchen) compartmentalized within the house. Others may have been somewhat blurred, in terms of meaning and use, and these would have been loci of negotiation on a daily or periodic basis made all the more confused as meanings became further dislocated through contradictions arising from other types of relations, such as gender and class relations. Certainly they also were affected by the consistently changing relations of residents to the external economics and imperatives that entrenched the farm in more distancing and capital-minded production and social relations (see McMurry 1997).

Masculine vs. Feminine Organization and Space

I have already discussed some of the gender-based divisions of farm production and reproduction in Chapter II. In this section the intent is twofold. First, I will develop the analysis to show how those same ideologies, relations and economies of gender also had a strong basis in and affect on landscape use and meaning. Second, I
will examine some of the ways that "gendered spaces" (Spain 1992) were critical to the maintenance of the productive and spatially limited farmscape. These gendered spaces were in consistently antagonistic and contradictory relation with the other meanings and functions of the farmscape space, both in relation to perceived masculine and functional spaces. After this section, I will discuss how class relations further confused the meanings and uses of the severely limited activity and social spaces inherent in the nucleated farmstead.

The development of the progressive farmstead was the result of numerous factors, many of which have been discussed above. It was concomitantly integral to the rise of the progressive farm that the male and female or masculine and feminine "spheres diverged" (McMurry 1997:87). Whereas prior to the rise of progressivism in rural areas women and men contributed different but economically important work to the farmstead, after the divergence of the spheres, men saw themselves as the economically important workers and producers on the farm.

Women were pushed into, and even often chose to do, domestic work that began to appear to have little economic value; raising children, housekeeping, teaching morals and maintaining household order (McMurry 1997). In short, men were then seen as productive workers on farms and women were seen as reproductive and productive workers. Women of course did not necessarily see their contributions in this light. Indeed, in the progressive era (1855-1880) women became increasingly agitated at the lack of appreciation for their "domestic work" and even, occasionally, argued that they should be paid for their work (McMurry 1997). Incidentally perhaps,
this also shows that people of the period did see a significant difference between being paid in cash or for a wage and being remunerated in-kind or in trade.

Women were responsible for doing things that earlier facilitated market production and later assisted in maintaining the progressive order (e.g., cooking for men and children, purchasing goods that would appeal to progressive sensibility, keeping house). These responsibilities were understood to include the raising of children who would also hold the values of progressivism and who would be able to work in the system (McMurry 1997:87-135). In short, women's responsibilities were often related to the cultural, social, and ideological reproduction of agrarian progressivism.

This interpretation is not intended to suggest that all women in all farmsteads followed this exact pattern but enough women did these things generally that the there were names that it reached the level of a movement. This movement has been called, "the cult of domesticity" or "the cult of true womanhood" (Welters 1966). Furthermore, it should be remembered that progressive farming was originally a middle and upper class movement (McMurry 1997). So, farm families that were not doing as well economically may not have prescribed to exactly the same ideologies.

The divarication of male and female work and responsibilities on farmstead had incredible power over the allocation of space for each sphere within and outside of the house. As the nature of women's work became strongly contrasted to male work, the spaces within the existing farmsteads developed into identified women's and men's domains. Importantly, houses and farmsteads that were built during the rise of progressivism and capitalism on agricultural landscapes were designed (often
by women themselves) and built (by skilled laborers and masons quite often) to reflect these ideologies and assist in maintaining these gendered divisions of labor. Furthermore, beyond merely reflecting progressive ideo-economic agendas, these architectural and spatial changes were intentionally designed by planners to control and maintain the fluidity of these gendered ideological, social and political-economic spheres within the spaces on the landscape (see Nassaney and Abel 1999).

The gender-based social and labor divisions then had strong relations at most levels (e.g., ideological, social, economic, etc.) to space and the landscape. Domiciliary space and the farmscape were not just used and lived in but also were intended as material means to achieve the progressive ends of production, efficiency, class symbolism and the overall maintenance of the system. The gendered divisions were further understood to be part of the ongoing efficient production and science of agriculture.

As was suggested in discussing public and private dichotomies within and out of the home, it was the kitchen that was seen as being the women’s domain as well as the only spatial vestige of true privacy on the farm during the progressive era. The masculine domain in the house contained within it the spaces that were also seen as public. This overlapping of private space and women’s space should come as little surprise; scholars have noted such interstition of, and dialectics between, gender space and public/private space in many places and periods (e.g., see McMurry 1997; Ortner 1972; Rosaldo 1975; Spain 1992; Yentsch 1996).
In the case of mid-nineteenth-century Michigan, progressive farming necessitated a division of labor based on market surplus production and domestic production of consumables and labor designed to assist in the reproduction of the capital-oriented farm systems (McMurry 1997). As males came to dominate the former social, political, and economic sphere(s) and women the latter familial and private sphere(s) men had a more salient contribution to the public markets and domains. Women often found most of their work destined for the immediately “closed-circuit” of domestic use and maintenance.

When the nucleation of farmsteads became a science in itself, resulting in the construction of the most efficient and productive spaces, the spaces allocated to the public/private spheres on both the inside and outside of the farmhouse took on a decidedly masculine/feminine orientation and meaning (see Yentsch 1996). Thus, we find that progressive public spaces were often also progressive masculine spaces and that progressive private spaces were also progressive feminine space (McMurry 1997). This also led to contradictions between these various interpretations, understandings, and perceptions of space, architecture and landscape meanings. For example, as progressive women came to begrudge their sphere of work for its drudgery and lack of social respect, the associations of them with non-social or solely familial meanings and functions began to contradict how they perceived themselves. They did have public personas and relations which were not exemplified or bolstered in their own homes; rather these women were the exemplars of privacy and family (McMurry 1997).
The Shepard site history detailed in Chapter III, and the above spatial understanding of the Shepard house, indicate that such contradictions were likely occurrences throughout the period in question. Prior to the construction of the house (1854), the landscapes and pioneer spaces likely had less strictly delineated functions and meanings. Afterwards, the shifts in the labor-relations of the family, the construction of the house, and the accompanying landscapes and functional spaces helped to establish and cement the contradictory social and labor relations amongst family members and public personages throughout the transitional period and after.

In the discussions of Almeda Shepard’s domestic work, I noted a general trend; in the early years of the account (the early 1840s, likely the beginning of a transitional period) goods that she was likely responsible for made salient contributions to the external community market. By the 1860s, she was producing mostly goods for in-home consumption and the internal market of labor exchange between the Shepards and non-familial workers. Although it is possible that she produced goods and sold or traded them herself, the point is that much of her work increasingly went toward domestic use in changing labor and familial relations. Furthermore, her work load likely expanded as a result of the intensifying production efforts on the farm. Curiously, as the spaces she had to use within the nucleated farmscape became increasingly limited and compartmentalized, they also became spaces of intensive use when market production became the more important set of activities on the farm. The latter is indicated in the preponderant amount of space allocated to non-domestic-use outbuildings and plow land. Furthermore, public spaces became a large part of the
farmscape and inner-domiciliary space (McMurry 1997). Thus, where reproductive and productive kinds of work increased dramatically, the amount of space open to Almeda and her daughter(s) and feminized domestic work dwindled or diminished. Perhaps as a means of developing and keeping a social and political persona, as well as to create alliances amongst kindred women, Almeda was a member of the ladies group active in her church during the 1830s-1860s (Sayers and Lapham 1996). These sorts of public relations contrasted quite markedly from those she experienced on her farm in her private roles and in the private spaces for which she was responsible.

It has been argued that the Shepard site was a functioning progressive farmstead and that the building of the house in the earliest years of the progressive movement speaks as a testimony of the Shepards' acceptance and approval of many of the ideals, politics, and economics of progressive capitalist farming. As the living and production labor took place on and within the spatially limited landscape, intensified meanings, and use of space emerged stemming from concomitant functional, gendered, and public/private facies. Given these multiple meanings, multivalencies, and various uses, there were multiple contradictions that arose with which the residents of the Shepard house had to reckon and attempt to ameliorate. However, so far we have largely ignored how extra-familial residents, the laborers, would have added further disruptions and contradictions to the already intensified landscape-bound social relations.
Prior to the year that we suspect the house was completed (1853-1854), there is no evidence in the WSAL or elsewhere in the documentary record that suggests that workers lived on the farmstead in any significant numbers. As was said above, an early entry indicates that a boy lived with the Shepards for educational purposes and he may have done some extracurricular farm work. From 1848 until the construction of the house, however, numerous laborers had worked on the farm. Immediately after the construction of the farmhouse, individuals began to rent rooms and work on the farm.

Regardless of whether a given laborer only worked on the farm by day or took room and board at the house as well, their presence would have contributed an uneasy social element to the already exacerbated social conditions centered around the landscape. Given the tensions between public and private and masculine and feminine spaces discussed above, the bringing in of complete strangers and non-family into the house and their presence in the already multivalent spaces would have surely been problematic for the Shepard family if left not remedied. For the purposes of clarity, the following discussion will be divided into discussions of impacts on the use of space outside the house and those inside the house.

Non-Resident Laborers

The laborers that did not live on the Shepard farm but only worked there would have been disruptive to the general divergence of the spheres in a few obvious
ways. One was that they were not “guests” from the public sphere like those who were entertained at the house. Rather the laborers were individuals from the public sphere who were brought in for essentially private reasons and purpose, namely to produce surpluses for the family’s private wealth. These imperatives that ordained their presence within the nucleated farmstead and in agriculturally productive fields also required that they occupy what would otherwise have been private loci within those spaces. Therefore, their daily presence on the landscape and in the house (when they were in it) were essentially public intrusions into private spaces.

A second example of spatial disruption deals more with overt gendered spaces. As I suggested, spaces outside the house and to the back of it were ideally private spaces and would have been likely bifurcated into two areas within the nucleated farmscape; not surprisingly these spaces would have had the masculine and feminine connotations and meanings so familiar to progressive farmers. Feminine work, likely done by Almeda and daughters, would have been performed in spaces in the yard that were relatively near the kitchen that had private and feminine meanings and associations. The outbuildings nearest the kitchen were likely ones that they would have used regularly, like the outhouse (although communal), dairy (if present), and chicken coop. Also, the feminine garden space was also likely located on the north side of the house perhaps near the kitchen. Finally, the domestic dumping area that the household used was also to the northeast of the rear of the house near the kitchen.
However far the domestic space of the farmscape was located from field production and outbuilding areas, the distance was not great. Therefore, laborers who worked in the outbuildings at any point, or came near the house for any reason (e.g., for use of the necessary) would surely have been within viewing distance of Almeda if she were working outside. So, the landscape outside the house to the rear, designed to distance the family and work from the public eye, would have lost some of its utility in that regard as non-familial people constantly walked and worked in the area.

Laborers may have been necessarily non-familial and public actors in the private landscape of the Shepard farm, but at the same time they themselves, by the mid-1850s, were also of a different class than the Shepards (see Schob 1975). They were employed by the Shepards who, as owners of the means of production, controlled many, if not most, aspects of their lives when on the farm and to some extent outside of it. Often, the Shepards had some measure of control over the allotments of goods they received, what they would eat, when eating time itself would occur, where they would work and relax, and to some degree the goods to which they had access in the larger community.

The layout of the extra-domiciliary space may have promoted surveillance of the laborers from both the rear and south of the house where the kitchen was (e.g., from windows to the southeast), as well as from the outbuildings and the work fields (McMurry 1997; Sayers 1998). In another way, the layouts of farmsteads indicated by the proxemics model were almost ideal for surveillance of workers. The familial division of labor, made manifest by the wife working at one set of loci on the landscape
and the husband in another, likely proved invaluable in having a fairly consistent surveillance system present. Through this ability to monitor workers, the familial power holders could either actually watch the workers to catch shirkers and other “irresponsible” activities or, importantly, “threaten” that they were watching. For example, if a laborer did not know for sure whether or not the Shepards were watching at a particular moment, the nature of the progressive landscape itself posed the architectural and spatial threat that they could be seen; the view from the kitchen covered much of one side of the area laborers were likely to be on a daily basis, whereas the view from the field, where Shepard would have been, allowed for a view of many other spaces where laborers would have been.

Thus, the gendered division of labor, manifested often in different space-use and tasks would have simultaneously promoted the differences in power accorded to workers and family as well as class contradictions inherent to owning and not owning the means of production and in hiring workers. As McMurry (1997:63) suggests,

writers of proper farmstead appearance and function, stressed the need for keeping an eye on the hired hands. An architectural solution to the requirement for efficiency, then, lay in visual and spatial continuity between the farmhouse and the farm grounds proper. The farmer could supervise several activities simultaneously, and could ensure that his hired hands did not shirk. Moreover, domestic space blended with the farmgrounds visually and physically....” (emphasis mine)

That farmers took this advice cannot be doubted (see McMurry 1997:62-65).

Thus, surveillance and distrust of workers also were conflated with, or were perhaps part and parcel of, the general capitalist and progressive cultural and economic maxims centering on efficiency. The relation of laborers to the familial
meaning of the landscape contributed to a blending or blurring of the more idealized strict spatial distributions of gendered spaces and functional loci.

With the general dominance of the ideologies of capitalist productivity and efficiency, it makes sense that one of the concerns was labor management and surveillance. However, from the landscape and spatial perspective, it is critical to note that this concern manifested itself in the actual intended use, function, and symbolic power of the progressive farmscape; in other words, the material culture solution proved to be an active participant in these social dialectics and became part of the intended design of the farmscape (as opposed to, for example, an ad hoc or even serendipitous advantage to the nucleated farmstead).

The workers were then at once members of the public who would have assaulted the sensibility of the ideally private and feminine landscape and the meanings it had for the family, particularly Almeda, and also members of a lower class who were to be controlled, watched, and used. The former then was a contradiction wrought by the progressive drive for surplus production and the threat of a failure to adequately maintain the necessary subsequent familial division of the sexes into different laboring spheres. The failure would no doubt have been partially a result of the fact that the Shepards had no male offspring to assist in the fields. To avoid the imminent failure, conditions necessitated bringing in extra-familial labor and perhaps mechanized technology such as reapers and the like.

Thus, the gender-based division of labor and space was maintained but at a cost to the public-private notions that governed the use and conceptions of space.
Furthermore, as public and private space was also gendered, the presence of laborers also would have altered those meanings and uses as well. So, for hypothetical example, if only familial male laborers worked on the farmstead, then their presence alone would likely not have deterred Almeda from doing her daily work outside in feminine space. These males would have been kin and it would have been more acceptable for them to see Almeda doing her work. However, given that the workers were a non-familial male presence the threat that they posed to the progressive feminine sense of private work may have forced Almeda to forego working outside for the most part and perform the majority of chores inside the kitchen. This would be in line with McMurry’s (1997) claim that the kitchen emerged as the last truly private space in the house, and assumedly on the landscape, during the progressive era.

There is evidence to support this interpretation. Agricultural census data suggest that market garden production hit its apex in 1850 ($30) but dropped to no market production by 1860. This might suggest that before the house and landscape of progressivism was built in 1854, before the spaces took on their meanings and uses, Almeda and her daughter(s) were working enough outside to produce surpluses from her garden. However, by 1860, they produced nothing, in terms of surplus market goods, from her garden. Although the lack of surplus garden goods may indicate that garden produce began to stay within the sphere of household consumption and labor exchanges, it alternatively may have ceased to be her garden and became a more male-dominated space where the produce stayed on the farm. The seemingly anomalous hiring of male workers for garden work may indicate that the space of the
garden began to become such a blurred space of both masculine and feminine connotations and meanings (WSAL 1843). It may have even become a male-dominated space. Perhaps Almeda and her daughters came to do most of their work in the house or in non-domiciliary architecture spaces and thus limited the time they spent outside of the house in open-air areas.

Of course, one must fully concede that other factors may have helped in this matter; her giving birth in 1852 to Emily, the general increase in kitchen-based tasks (ironically due in part to more consistent presence of workers who needed to be fed), and perhaps even an increase in social obligations that took her away from the farmstead. But, the dramatic rise in butter and cheese production between 1850-60 ($400-$700 and $0-$150 respectively) indicates that she and her daughter(s) were surely doing incredible amounts of productive work. The difference though is that much of the butter and cheese production sequences could be done within architectural space, in either the kitchen or basement-dairy and outbuilding.

These spaces—the garden as well as inner-architectural spaces—would have been away from the visibility of those lower-class males who may have occasionally occupied and worked in other architectural spaces, as well as on the non-architectural landscape, that were so very close to the house (i.e., within the nucleated farmstead). So, in general, I would argue that the spatial constriction of the farmscapes of progressive farms may have been a contributing factor in the increased in-house and closed door work that women performed (see McMurry 1997) because of the increased presence of lower-class, male, and public individuals. Given the limited
space of the nucleated farmstead, numerous classes and ranks of people were in fairly consistent presence of one another on these farms.

So, as members of a different class, extra-familial laborers dealt with and contributed to contradictions from different fronts. The Shepards were a family who belonged to the progressive class of farmers who, in agrarian life, were seen as successful, wealthy, and prosperous. However, the farm-laborers were likely looked upon as something quite different. According to one scholar (Schob 1975), the laborer was thought of as anything from an integral player in a farmstead’s general productivity and a family’s prosperity to a person of inferior demeanor and position who had to be watched and controlled while at work. Furthermore, the owner’s perceptions varied between individual laborers and often depended on the worker’s (or more rarely, her) habits and work ethic. Given the Shepard’s general and obvious use of the material culture and land at their disposal as symbolic material statements about their place and status, it seems unlikely that they would have treated the laborers as equals. Some may have been treated better relative to others but there was surely a class distance and differentiation constantly presented by the Shepards and their progressive farmscape.

In terms of the extra-domiciliary space of the nucleated farmstead, it is difficult to determine whether there were distinctive laborer spaces—areas marked in contrast to the rest by virtue of their use by the laborers—such as outbuildings for them to inhabit, separate outhouses, and other specialized spaces. However, at the same time all of the working areas of the farmstead would have been infused with a
further dialectic between the meanings of class in relation to the gendered and public/private spaces. The intrusion into ideally family and feminine space by non-familial males was made perhaps more dynamic by the fact that this space was thus *multi-class* and male yet ideally-private and feminine space. The Shepards, as owners, were joined on a daily basis by those economically lower-class non-owners in this already rather disrupted space. Of course, things would have been less tense for the meaning of space while they worked in the fields, but ample evidence from the WSAL indicates that the laborers also lived in the architectural spaces of the farmstead itself.

**Renter-Laborers and Housed Laborers**

The types of contradictions and antagonisms that would have arisen due to the presence of day laborers would have also been problematic in relations involving housed laborers. It is known that some workers on the Shepard farm were housed within the farmhouse itself as part of their contracts for working on the farm during the day. However, those that lived within the farmhouse would have further aggravated the already existent tensions detailed above and brought into play peculiar ones by these further intrusions into the architecturally spaces so representative of the family domain.

Progressive farmers often included in their house floor plans rooms for laborers (see McMurry 1997). These spaces were generally on the second floor to the rear of the house, over the kitchen, for instance. Some actually built separate quarters for
them in the form of outbuildings. Regarding farmhouse-dwelling workers, they often had private entrances to keep their presence minimally disruptive to the nuclear family (McMurry 1997). However, regardless of the spatial arrangement of inner-domiciliary space, the constant presence within the house of a non-family, lower-class, male would likely have caused certain anxieties to recrudesce. Whether or not the Shepard's built into the house rooms that were to be assigned to renters and laborers, they definitely utilized separate spaces for them; this was a great concern to farmers of the Mid-West who employed workers (Schob 1975:209-233).

This spatial distancing of the workers within the house was not entirely effective. In all likelihood, suppers called for laborers to join the family for eating or at least Almeda had to prepare more food for them even if they ate it away from the table. It was also during their off hours that they would have been in the house; although their non-familial status probably worked to quell some of their rowdiness within the house certainly they did more than just sit in their rooms. Perhaps they went out carousing or socializing, came in late, or did things in the room that would have been known by the other residents (Schob 1975:209-233).

In terms of the efficacy of separating the workers within the house McMurry (1997:107) cites the following in the 1850s farming magazine Rural Affairs:

the great mass [of hired men] care little for either cleanliness or culture. They throng the farm-house at noon and in the evening, and often on the Sabbath, so that the wife and daughters have little or no seclusion for conversation, study, or writing, for it is next to impossible to prevent in an ordinary farm-house a pretty thorough intermixture of individuals of all sorts and sizes.
This observation from the period underscores not only the class differences, from the usual patronizing and insulting vantage point of the upper-classes (e.g., they are unclean, uncultured, irreligious, and they are a "great mass" that would "throng"), but also the somewhat frenetic nature of the inner-domicile social scene of the mid-nineteenth-century farmstead. Due to economically and ideological-driven impetuses, some of which we have discussed, the farmhouse became a mixed-sex, multi-class, and quasi-public yet quasi-private, architectural apparatus of labor and leisure. And as I have argued, this highly heterogeneous space, with its accompanying external work and leisure spaces, became a place of contradiction and disruption for owners, both male and female, as well as to the workers.

Understanding the Perpetuation of Non-Capitalist Labor Relations at the Shepard Farm

I have already discussed the types of labor relations that were practiced during the years recorded in the WSAL. As was argued, the types of relations never came to be predominantly capitalist. Although the cash for work contracts between Shepard and an individual worker appeared occasionally (twice, in 1853 and 1858), the use of cash as a medium of exchange for labor never came to be the dominant remunerative process, considering all of the individual transactions recorded in the WSAL. Indeed, cash remuneration never accounted for more than 39.4% of the total exchanges in any year between 1848-1858. Thus, as has been argued, the perpetuation of these non-capitalist labor agreements and relations appears anomalous and contradictory when
compared to other economic, ideological, and social phenomena that can be called capitalist or progressive capitalist.

Also, we can see where, in terms of the debate regarding the transition to agrarian capitalism, one approach could point to the capitalist elements evinced in the documentary record and argue that capitalism was probably always present to some degree locally and perhaps even amongst residents and workers at the Shepard farm. For example, at all scales of historical analysis discussed in this and previous chapters (i.e., state, local, and site-specific) strong elements of the CMP were undeniably present: The State in itself and its investments into improvements and removal of obstacles, the local investment of capital for commodity production around sources of water power, and even the progressive aspects of the Shepard site political-economy, including those individual exchanges that did involve cash and were wage-based, are all indicators of the presence, or possibly the transition, to the CMP.

Another perspective could argue that the WSAL and other sources indicate non-capitalist relations until even as late as 1858 and thus, in fundamental ways, the residents of the Shepard farmstead were resistant to capitalism. The roots of frontier Michigan were in non-capitalist pcp systems and significant aspects of the systems stayed in place long past the time when we might have expected them to disappear. The continuation of the domination of labor relations by non-waged exchanges at the Shepard farm suggests strongly that during the period examined here the total transition to capitalism had not yet occurred.
A third perspective, the one taken in this discussion, argues that both elements of the CMP types of relations and non-capitalist and pcp relations were present to varying degrees throughout the years 1834-1858 and probably well beyond. This dialectic between these seemingly antithetical aspects of a mode of production were inherently sources and causes of contradiction. In the remainder of this section I will discuss how the engagements in non-capitalist or semi-reciprocal relations between owner and workers were vital to negotiating quotidian contradictions that arose in part because of the ideologies, functions, economics, and meanings of the limited space on the farm.

Schob (1975:228) has suggested that, "[f]arm hands in pre-Civil War America were usually considered members of the family, or at least treated on a fairly equal basis." This is an unusual statement in light of what we have said already regarding the multiple roles laborers filled (i.e., public, male, lower-class), but, in independent support of it, a few scholars have argued that class relations were not common on farms (see Headlee 1991; Post 1995). It is also unusual given that Schob (1975:229) seemingly contradicts this idea in the same paragraph when he discusses the precautions farmers took when housing laborers, to the point that concerns of mixing family members and workers commonly "forced" farmers to build extra-domiciliary sleeping quarters for the non-familial workers. If they were family-like and equals why the separate quarters and distinctive concerns about them intermixing with the family?

Rather than being an example of perhaps poor scholarship on Schob's part, this contradictory statement may in fact actually represent the true conditions that
farmhands and families dealt with. Were workers at once considered both members of the family or kin-like and also the seeming opposite, non-familial and economically lower class farm hands? This is a very strong possibility. Furthermore, what was occurring within the political economies of farmsteads that would even allow for such personal relationships to develop on any level? Answers may be found in the landscape and architectural spaces of farmsteads and in the seemingly anomalous semi-reciprocal labor exchange relations so prevalent in antebellum agrarian communities and farmstead economies.

Many of the scholars of the so-called transition have understood that reciprocal exchange relations included community and kinship connotations and meanings for the participants. Given that agrarian farmsteads of the middle and late nineteenth-century arose from the political-economic transformations earlier in the century, it is plausible that certain aspects of those earlier self-reliant and community-based exchange and social relations may have been retained while others were outmoded and transformed by the enveloping capitalist world-economy and CMP. Of course, these situations would have been contradictory to progressive farming as domestic-economy became scientific and public and private distinctions became much more salient; these changes would have also been attended by a more strict delineation of who was family or kin and who wasn’t.

At the Shepard farm, a contradictory political economy existed that is most salient within the two aspects of the means of production. The forces of production appear in this analysis to have been largely commercially-oriented, organized to pro-
duce surpluses for the broader markets, and based on scientific and technical knowledge (i.e., progressive) that helped to reproduce political-economic success. Interestingly, the division of labor on the farm, which would correspond to part of the organizational facet of the forces of production, was rooted in gender divisions of labor and, probably, class-based divisions.

However, the sets of relations—familial and extra-familial labor relations—that are considered essential social relations of production were, not only divided by gender and class, but were also predominantly non-waged and therefore not dominated by capitalism. Although the Shepard’s appear to have adopted much of the progressive and patriarchal capitalist agenda—the nucleation of farmstead space, the publicly advertised material ostentation, the market and surplus production, and the gendered division of labor—the owner-worker and the familial relations maintained a certain “frontier-era flavor.” As was argued above, in some ways the remunerative relations were capitalist and in others they seem to hark back to the more community-oriented and reciprocal exchange relations. This seeming contradiction may make sense when we consider it in relation with the dialectics of space-use and meaning that we discussed.

As was suggested, the Shepard’s likely would have sought ways to ameliorate the tensions and subtle conflicts that arose from the multiple uses and meanings of space within and without the farmhouse. As the Shepard farm found its economic place in the intensifying and enveloping, exploitative capitalist system through progressive farm production and living, the Shepard’s were ironically forced to bring in
strangers to work and live in a very limited set of spaces that were ideally private. This bringing in of extra-familial labor was part of the reason for the demise of true reciprocal relations, so characteristic of the earlier years, as people came to farms to work for someone else.

I argue that this very tense and contradictory progressive living and working situation, which would have been unsettling to both workers and Shepard, was somewhat alleviated and massaged by the maintenance of the more personal and less alienating forms of remuneration exhibited in the WSAL accounts. Through Shepard remunerating workers with some of the general products they produced, as well as through his credit lines, workers would have been empowered with certain choices. These would have allowed them either to stay out of the general market through direct consumption of goods they helped produce or to enter the market through their own selling of those goods. The use of Shepard’s credit lines at stores would have shown Shepard’s quasi-paternalistic trust in them as well as allowed them some interaction in the broader community.

The general increase in the variety of labor and exchange relations that occurred at the farm after the construction and occupation of the house point to the political-economic power that the sequence of landscape alterations had on the farm. In another way, the increase in types of extra-familial labor relations, exchanges, and contracts after the house was built suggests that, rather than being a coincidence, the reorganization of the landscape and architectural space and space-use had a significant impact on these relations. Furthermore, the increase in labor relations-types also
indicates that people and Shepard negotiated their work relations. Most workers chose to take remuneration in the form of goods, some rented a room and worked opportunistically to pay rent, and one even maintained a reciprocal relation with Shepard for a while; this latter example shows that the older ways had not totally fallen out style with the progressive culture.

Two individuals worked strictly for cash and, interestingly, they did not work longer than a few months apiece. Their short work-span suggests that wage-laborers did not have much of a place on the farm. The contradictions discussed above may have been a major part of the reason why they did not stay long.

The long-term presence of an individual laborer on the farm would have set some of the social conditions for the development of closer ties between the worker and the Shepard family. The worker who toiled and lived with, and among, the family members (at least some members of the Shepard family) would have become very familiar to the Shepards. Interestingly, many of the workers who took large portions of their remuneration from the products of their own labor stayed on the farm for a year or more. To understand the connection between the methods of remuneration that laborers engaged in, and their overall duration of occupation at the Shepard farm, it is informative to consult Marx and discuss what he has argued regarding the relations of the worker, as the direct producer of commodities, to his/her product (i.e., the commodities or surpluses produced).

Marx has called the distancing of the worker from the product of his/her labor “estrangement” or alienation (Marx 1988:69-84). This results from the worker be-
coming a commodity, "...the most wretched of commodities" (Marx 1988:69). Ideally, labor is a creative process that gives meaning and significance to human existence. However, when commodified, the products of a laborer are taken away and become objectified and alien to the direct-producer of those goods; the bonds, the "object-bondage," between the worker and the product as his/her creation are torn asunder (Marx 1988:71). The owner of the means of production for whom the product is made and is appropriated by becomes the source of estrangement and alienation. In such situations the worker becomes therefore self-estranged. When a laborer is working for a wage as a total commodity—as an item like any other that is purchased—the place he works becomes distinct from his self-perceived ideal human (non-commodified) existence. Thus, a dichotomy arises (at best) where a major part of one's life, sold work-time, becomes simply alien to the human imperative of creativity and positive labor. Furthermore, that is the best possible result; often the total life becomes altered and negatively influenced by the consistent selling of the body to the capitalist. "Down-time" becomes simply a time to partake of simple pleasures relative to the work-life (Marx 1988; Meszaros 1970).

As production on the Shepard farm became market-oriented, the meanings of production on the farm became much more economic. These new economic meanings began to contrast sharply with the ideologies of the family as the farm residents' mode of life was not so market-oriented. As a means of keeping the two realities of the one farm somewhat distinct, the Shepards and the workers engaged predominantly in non-capitalist work relations; no individual consistently sought a cash wage for
work even though cash was used from time to time and was used often by Shepard in the external market. Thus, no one individual was totally immersed in capitalist and estranging relations.

The reality for the Shepards and workers was that the very limited spaces of the landscape and house, and the gendered and public/private meanings of space, would have been further confused and agitated by the consistent presence of the laborers. Were the laborers totally commodified through payment in cash, the classic antagonisms of class, alienation, estrangement would have created an explosive and untenable situation on the farm within such a limited space supplied by the market-influenced nucleated farmstead. Furthermore, the commodification would have led to very personally felt distances between the family and the workers. By remunerating them through products of their own labor and the system within which their labor was used, the workers engaged in less alienating and exploitative conditions than if they were simply paid in cash-wage.

One way of assuaging and defusing these possible problems was to allow a kin-feeling to permeate the relations between the family and workers through less alienating and more personal forms of payment, use of credit accounts outside the farm, and even interactions with the family of owners. In these ways workers became an important part of the mode of life on the farm, not just a commodified human element in the means of production of the farm. Thus, elements of the older kin and community-oriented relations survived and diffused into the unique remunerative processes and relations during this period of the Shepards’ progressive agrarian system.
However, the gender division of labor and accompanying progressive ideolo-
gies would have likely created more distance between most workers and Almeda and
daughters. Also, regardless of the efforts the Shepards were still, in the final analysis,
the owners of the means of production, had control and unequal power over the
workers, and very progressive in their mentalite. This disparity, however important it
was to alleviate it or even mask it through non-capitalist relations, was still fostered in
many ways, particularly through the use of material culture.

The Nineteenth-Century Domestic Refuse Midden

I have argued that the Shepards sought to alleviate contradictions that were
attendant with the progressive limitations of social space and landscape-use through
certain types of labor relations that exhibited non-capitalist qualities. However, a
feature that was discovered at the site through archaeological excavation affords us a
glimpse into the ways that the Shepards' use of mundane "disposable" material cul-
ture (i.e., ceramics) helped foster the class disparities and, similar to the house and
landscape, actually perpetuated the very same contradictions over time. This feature,
a refuse midden derived from kitchen and domestic activities, shows that although the
Shepards were forced to deal with the disparities, incongruities, and contradictions
along many lines that derived from the capitalist transformations, they also chose ob-
jects that would have set them apart from those non-familials who worked and lived
on the farm in the mid-nineteenth-century.
This domestic midden was located approximately two meters north of the northeast corner of the mid-nineteenth-century Shepard house. It is likely that the rear entrance to the Shepard home was a short distance from this dump (see Sayers 1997). Although there were some non-domestic objects in the assemblage from the feature, I consider it a “domestic” midden for a variety of reasons.

The first reason is the simple fact that this feature was predominantly composed of household and personal refuse (e.g., ceramics, glass, buttons, cut bones) as opposed to architectural or direct agricultural refuse (see Sayers, Nassaney, and McMillan 1998; Sayers 1998b). For the present, I consider objects that one would expect from within a house, not necessarily just a kitchen, to be considered domestic. Some nails and bricks and a very limited amount of window glass were uncovered (Sayers, Nassaney, and McMillan 1998:203-204) but the presence of relatively dense concentrations ceramic and personal items (i.e., domestic objects) suggests that architectural debris in this feature may have also come from the house (e.g., from repairs). The total lack of any definite agricultural items in analyzed assemblages further suggests a primarily domestic refuse source and “function.”

The second reason is that the feature’s location and contents seem to reflect patterns recognized elsewhere at domestic rural sites (e.g., see Andrews 1992:27; Moir 1987:229-231). At early American domestic sites dumping patterns indicate a general residential bent toward convenient disposal out back doors which has left a predictable archaeological signature; this characteristic pattern has been called the “Brunswick Pattern” (South 1978, 1979). Furthermore, in what South calls “Farm
Town Residence Models”, the Brunswick Pattern could be expected to fall within a spatially larger Carolina Pattern. In this archaeological phenomenon, “...a large area to the rear of the house and extending around the kitchen, smokehouse, and cellar hole ruin is expected to be covered with artifacts”(South 1979:223). Although the Shepards did not have a separate kitchen, they did have a cellar entrance just to the west of the domestic dump and may have had a smokehouse (Sayers and Lapham 1995). The general area around the rear of the house and the cellar did yield many probable and definite nineteenth-century objects (see Nassaney 1998; Lynn and Latuszek 1997). Although the fit of the Shepard patterns to South’s is not a perfect one, perhaps because of temporal and even ethnic differences (Charles E. Orser, personal communication, 1999), the comparable characteristics indicate that the Shepards practiced disposal in similar ways. This also accords with the notion that the yard spaces immediately surrounding the domestic structure were the loci of consistent and fairly intensive use by residents. These disposal actions over the years of occupation resulted in the most artifact dense areas—called the “active yard”—relative to the rest of the farmstead (Moir 1987).

One final reason for giving the feature a “domestic midden” appellation, is that it is located within feminine space, which is the general indirect agricultural area I and others suggest existed. If discard activities generally stemmed from the feminine space of the kitchen, then, in the progressive manner, the disposal area needed to be close to the source of debris (i.e., the kitchen and house) for most efficient use of time and energy (see Sayers and Nassaney 1997). If correct, this would suggest that
when considering refuse space, the Shepards did take into account the activities and
closeness to the kitchen, which was probably the room into which the back door
opened (Nassaney, Sayers and Kuemin 1998; Sayers and Nassaney 1997). Moreover,
it implies that domestic use, efficiency, and function were the predominant concerns
when the family "decided" to use this exact location for refuse disposal. The exact
reasons why they chose this place may never be discernable. However, a result of the
repeated decisions to throw detritus in this limited area was that a particular and his-
torically contingent context emerged, on the landscape, for a significant, however
mundane, and repetitive action to occur within the contradictory spaces that com-
posed the farmstead. This use of space had gendered meanings as well as class impli-
cations.

I argued above that, with the rise of progressive ideologies and contracted,
non-familial labor at this farm, Almeda's labors began to become circumscribed and
began to emphasize indoor labor and tasks. The location of this feature may help us
to understand why that occurred. Spatially speaking, the person dumping garbage
would have been visible from the west where the main road passed by the house.
Also, the dumping activities could have still been seen from many areas (i.e., the
southeast, east, and northeast) within the probable nucleated farmstead workspaces
even though the midden area would have been partially obstructed by the house from
onlookers in agricultural and masculine spaces located directly south of the house.
Thus, the person using the dumping area was in true public view and, to a lesser ex-
tent, the masculine work spaces within the nucleated farmscape. However, rather
than walk a good distance from the house and be in view of public, non-familials both in true public (e.g., community residents) and private spaces (e.g., workers), Almeda would have been able to discard refuse from the house or at least with only a few steps out the door. In this way she could have avoided much visual contact by anyone unless she wanted to be seen.

I am not suggesting that people were overly, or explicitly, conscious of these sorts of mundane and abrasive relations with the landscape, space, and the social facies of the farmstead political economy. Rather, it seems likely that many of these sorts of actions and social relations qua the use and meanings of space were negotiated through and took "...place on a level of practical consciousness or knowing how 'to go on' or proceed in a certain situation" (Shanks and Tilley 1987:126). Practical consciousness, in essence, is an agent's semiconscious decision-making process in regards to material conditions and material symbols that go unacknowledged by the decision-maker; they are the actions that are often performed routinely and are based in "...largely implicit and taken for granted knowledge" (Shanks and Tilley 1987:126). In the Almeda Shepard's case the placement of the dumping area was a quasi-conscious remedy for awkward feeling and embarrassment that would have been present when she would have been seen working by the eyes of the public (both true public and the laborers). The results of the decision were in line with progressive ideals of efficiency as it also limited the overall energy she would have exerted during the numerous house-cleanings that she likely did throughout her life in the farmhouse.
Incidentally, the presence of non-domestic debris, if not derived from the house itself, may suggest that workers and Warren Shepard himself discarded objects occasionally in feminine space, perhaps on the way in to lunch or after the work day. This possibility of masculine crossover-use of feminine space of hints at the fact that function (i.e., dumping area) and convenience occasionally overrode and blurred meaning and the feminine-masculine dichotomies of the landscape. Thus, the location, function, and context of this feature seem in line with our discussion of gendered space and landscape use so far. Whether or not all objects came from the house, it is significant that it was located so close to it and in space associated with the feminine and women's work domain (Moir 1987). I will now turn to the contents of the feature.

The domestic midden unearthed in the 1996 and 1998 excavations contained a variety of ceramics that had possible and definite production dates ranging from ca.1790-1900 (Lynn and Latuszek 1997; Sayers, Nassaney, and McMillan 1998; Sayers 1998b). However, certain information allows us to determine that the deposition dates for the objects associated with the feature actually encompass a much shorter span, from 1854 at the earliest to an absolute latest point in the 1880s.

Somewhat different to other approaches to ceramic analyses that do not center on one particular type of ceramic in an assemblage (e.g., Huser 1992; Kullen and Walitschek 1991), in this analysis I will define the ceramic sub-assemblage parameters by their stratigraphic association with one type of transfer print that has a known production range.
The date range derived from this approach is not only relatively short but it also pre-dates by 2-4 years the construction of the farmhouse. This sort of analysis is done for two reasons. The first is that it warrants the assumption that objects associated with the known transfer-printed ceramics were also deposited around the same time and probably saw coeval use with those. The second is that it limits the chronological range of analysis to the time period that the overall exposition is interested in.

Stratigraphic, feature, and artifact information suggest that the domestic middlen feature ceased to be used by a point no later than the 1880s when a clinker driveway that is datable to that decade covered it (Nassaney 1998). Furthermore, the middlen feature itself appears to have a typologically discrete assemblage that appeared in 1998 excavations in unit N109 E40 in the southwest corner at about 23-24cm bd, in what will be called level A (20-25 cm bd). This assemblage "centers" upon the presence of one type of decorated transfer-printed whiteware, the Medici, that was produced in the years 1834-1851 (Williams 1978:333). The assemblage typologically and quantitatively contrasts with objects found between 0-23 cm bd (within the matrix of, and stratigraphically above, the clinker driveway) in the same unit.

A limited number of domestic objects were mixed in with the 1880s driveway (5-20 cm bd). One ceramic fragment, recovered in that clinker lens, was similar to, or the same as, ceramics (i.e., a dark blue transfer-print) that were recovered in association with Medici fragments. This may suggest limited disturbances that moved a few fragments closer to the surface. Generally, though, the ceramics in the clinker lens
were different in type and in all very limited in quantity. Furthermore they are of a more recent production range than the objects and feature associated with the 20-40 cm bd range Medici print.

For example, a fragment of simple white-slipped ironstone ceramic with a partial “Kokus” maker’s mark was recovered between 10-15 cm bd, a level that actually corresponded with the surface of the driveway in some parts of the unit, and its production range is 1895-1910 (Sayers 1998b). So, at the top of the driveway, perhaps deposited after the driveway fell into disuse, a late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century object was deposited. Thus, the location may have been used up until the 1880s for domestic dumping but the variation suggests that the objects associated with the Medici were deposited at an earlier date than the later, and stratigraphically superior, objects.

The general changes in type-use resulting in the observed variation may correspond with the death of Warren Shepard in 1875 and the subsequent takeover of the house by a John Shepard (of unknown relation; see [Nassaney et al. 1998:123-124]). It may even correspond to an earlier date, the death of Almeda in 1868; in other words, upon either owner’s death or possibly in between them, the types of objects used within the kitchen altered dramatically and this change is reflected in the variation. This would not be too surprising as the nature of the kitchen and domestic use probably changed when the daughters took over Almeda’s work after her death (see Rotman and Nassaney 1997).
Below the 40 cm bd and above 55 cm bd, two features (nos. 20 and 21) were uncovered that have been tentatively interpreted as house construction-era features (Sayers 1998b). The 1850s ground surface was found at ca. 55 cm bd, below features 20 and 21 which allows us to argue that objects above it and features 20 and 21 were deposited after the middle of the century. In relation to the construction of the house, this area appears to have been used during and after it was built in 1853-1854.

For this analysis, I will limit the sample to ceramic objects uncovered in 1998 excavation of unit N109 E40 for a variety of reasons (see Chapter III above). Table 5 (see below) shows the variation, production dates, and weight of the types of ceramics uncovered in this unit. A total of 56 ceramics pieces and fragments were uncovered. In terms of number of objects and weight, the Medici print is the best represented (number=14; weight=54.6 g) followed by flow blue fragments in terms of number (11). However, the combined weight of flow blue fragments (9.0g) is much less than Medici. Beyond these, seven different types of ceramics were found all represented by at least one fragment. Also, possible pearlware and plain white ware were present but they, as such, are possibly fragments from some of the nine discernable types. At face value in any case, they are difficult to date with any real certainty and will for the most part be excluded from the remainder of the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Number of Fragments</th>
<th>Associated 5 cm levels</th>
<th>Production and use ranges w/ references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medici</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A,B,C,D</td>
<td>1834-1851 (Williams 1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Flow</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>1825-1855 (Majewski &amp; O'Brien 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobalt Flow Blue</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A,B,C</td>
<td>1820-1850 (Gaston 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobalt Staffordshire</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B,C,D</td>
<td>1820-1850 (Snyder 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue, Hand-painted</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1840-1860; 1830-1850 (Lynn &amp; Latuszek 1997; Majewski &amp; O'Brien 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Blue Transfer</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B,C</td>
<td>1845-1860 (Snyder 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Number of Fragments</th>
<th>Associated 5 cm levels</th>
<th>Production and use ranges w/ references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B,D</td>
<td>1830-1875; 1845 (Majewski &amp; O'Brien 1987; Kullen and Wallitschek 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather-Edge</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1820-1840 (Miller 1980; Majewski &amp; O'Brien 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1830-1880 (Moore 1996; Remer 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A=20-25 cm bd; B=25-30 cm bd; C=30-35 cm bd; D=35-40 cm bd
The Medici ceramics are datable to a fairly specific span (1834-1851) and thus afford significant clues into various aspects of this feature. These fragments will be the central type and motif in the analysis. Our discussion regarding this feature will be rooted in variation observed, is somewhat complicated, and will hinge on this particular transfer print. Therefore, it warrants a discussion.

**Medici Transfer Print Ceramics**

The blue-colored Medici pattern falls into the category of what has been called a “Staffordshire romantic transfer pattern” (Williams 1978:8-9). As there were many types of Staffordshire transfer print produced between ca. 1820-1860 (e.g., see Snyder 1995), there were also many produced with specifically romantic transfer patterns. These types “...did indeed capture the world market for...transfer ware” (Williams 1978:21) and were part of the general rise of mass-produced, relatively inexpensive, and mass-marketed ceramics associated with the rise of industrial capitalism in England (Snyder 1995; Miller 1980, 1997). Indeed, England dominated the American market in ceramics and other mass-produced goods before the War of 1812 (Majewski and O'Brien 1987). The War checked this dominance but afterwards the inundation resumed when the English and American confrontation was finally resolved (Snyder 1995); the English loss in the War reopened the American consumer market for English producers of goods and Staffordshire wares came in this second wave.
Romantic transfer prints generally exhibited images of rustic, exotic, and beautiful scenes usually associated with the past. For example, the Abbey pattern shows an abbey within a picturesque landscape that is composed of lakes, hills, mountains, and tall trees. The rims of the vessels are rather ornately decorated as well. Some images of British Staffordshire ceramics exploited the American patriotic fervor that was expressed during and after the War of 1812 by showing famous American patriots and showing government buildings or war scenes (see Snyder 1995; also see Little 1969). This, of course, is a fine historical example of how economic agendas of capitalists can be rather the opposite of political agendas (of even those same capitalists perhaps) and work in contradiction to them: profit over patriotism.

However, the romantic transfer-prints exploited the general romantic attitudes that Americans had regarding their connections with what they perceived to be the finest civilizations of the past, like the Greek and Roman civilizations. They also capitalized on romantic American notions of the superiority of their present conditions and about the promise of the future (there was also, for example, the ‘agricultural’ romantic transfer pattern that showed a timeless farming scene; see [Williams 1978]). The presence of such a large market for self and country adulating consumption is certainly related to the set of cultural and political-economic influences that promoted the rise of the Greek Revival form that were discussed in Chapter III above.

The Medici pattern is thus a rather ornate and picturesque image. The rim of the pattern is twelve sided and is covered with concentric lines, scrolls, and five dou-
ble-handled urns. The rim pattern ends at the well of the vessel and leads into a white background that then leads into the main image. It has been described as follows:

In the center scene a large urn decorated with dancing figures is set on a stone parapet at left. Flowing vines, a slanted balustrade and tall trees are behind the urn. A stream divides the picture and at right there is a stone railing surmounted by two statues. A tall elm grows behind the railing. In the distance at right there are the towers of a castle and a large triumphal arch (Williams 1978:333).

The Medici fragments unearthed at the Shepard site likely represent a complete set that was purchased by the Shepards around the time of the building of the extant house (Lynn and Latuszek 1997). The pattern itself seems to bode with the progressive idealism that worked its way into the Shepards’ mentality. Although not completely a Roman motif, the urns evince thoughts of Greek/Roman culture and the idyllic scene underscores the progressive dichotomy between work and relaxation or contemplation; as eating (but not the process of cooking food) can be associated with such periods of relaxation, the motif exemplifies relaxation.

Regardless, the fact that it was probably purchased as a set is significant, given the context of the time of its purchase and the political economy in which it was used. However, before I discuss the significance of this and the other ceramics found in the assemblage, I would like to take into account the variation in general which will then allow for a discussion of that variation and its significance in the political economy of the Shepard site.
Non-Medici Ceramics

As was stated above, the Medici fragments were found within a temporally and stratigraphically discrete sub-assemblage (relative to the contents of the entire unit) within a midden feature that was found in all three units excavated in 1996 and 1998. Field notes and observations regarding stratigraphic and artifact consistency indicate that unlike many areas of the site, this feature was not disturbed by subsequent landscape modifications and land-use activities (Nassaney 1998; Sayers 1996, 1998b). Given these facts, it makes sense that those objects associated with the Medici fragments in that sub-assemblage were also deposited more or less contemporaneously.

Production dates for Medici were 1834-1851; other information suggests that the feature is above the old 1850s ground surface and that it also overlaid features that could be associated with the construction of the house (1853-1854). Therefore, it is probable that the Medici set was purchased toward the end of, or even after, that range (i.e., between ca.1849-1853). For example, lag time between production in England, transport across the Atlantic, distribution to Battle Creek, and the final purchase or trade by the Shepards may have actually allowed the set to be incorporated into the workings of the Shepard kitchen after the final year of production of this type (see Majewski and O’Brien 1987).

Miller (1980, 1997) has argued that transfer-printed ceramics were the most expensive type until about the mid-nineteenth-century. Even after this point in time, they were still upper-end in terms of price but undecorated wares often were equally
as expensive (Miller 1980:4). These facts have led many archaeologists to conclude that an archaeological prevalence of the transfer type at given sites up to the 1850s and after is generally indicative of the higher economic status of their historic owners (e.g., Mansberger 1986; McBride and McBride 1987; Thomas 1988; Torma 1991).

With this generality in mind, and knowing that the Shepard’s were relatively prosperous between 1840-1870, it is not surprising that the discard of transfer-printed ceramics was common at the site after the construction of the house. And as was mentioned above, verifiable undecorated ceramics were relatively uncommon. Although the Medici was the dominant type, others like the flow-blue, the light-blue transfer of unknown style, the dark-blue Staffordshire, and the mulberry flow found their way into the midden as well. However, their limited numbers compared to the Medici may indicate that these non-Medici transfers were not purchased as a set but rather through a piecemeal approach over time (Lynn and Latuszek 1997).

In terms of dating the transfer-prints, as a very general rule it can be said that the dark-blue styles (i.e., the dark-blue Staffordshire and the flow-blue) were likely produced (and purchased) before the light-blue styles (Mansberger 1988:41). In her discussion of flow-blue, Gaston (1996:10) suggests that, “[t]he degree of darkness of the blue is sometimes thought to be the main criterion of age, for the early blue printing was very dark... [but] through time, lighter shades of blue were perfected and desired.” This general rule appears to hold for other non-flow-blue, transfer-printed motifs as well (Little 1969) including non-flow blue, historical Staffordshire; Snyder (1995:33-35) suggests that, “[t]he early deep cobalt blue color, so popular in
the 1820s, was changed around 1845 when coarser synthetic blues were introduced.”
This seems to suggest that lighter blues and perhaps darker royal blues came a little later than deep cobalt blue in transfer-printed ceramics in general. Thus, with regards to the unknown dark, cobalt-blue Staffordshire, it seems likely that it was produced and purchased between 1820-1850 whereas the lighter blue transfer was probably produced and purchased between 1845-1860.

Although the small size of the flow-blue fragments recovered in N109 E40 prohibits certain, definite and specific identification, the extant fragments have partial motifs that strongly resemble a complete and identified vessel (in Gaston 1996:59, plate 68). This motif of this container has been called the “Circassia” and was produced by John and George Alcock in England between 1839-1846 (Gaston 1996:21). This production range is not surprising given the expected flow blue popularity dates and it is also not surprising that its production dates overlap with the earlier production dates for the Medici pattern. As Medici is light/powder blue this suggests that the fragments of flow-blue and dark blue Staffordshire were produced (and perhaps purchased or acquired) prior to the Medici.

The other styles represented in the midden are a bit less definite in terms of establishing dates. This inability to date these fragments is largely a result of the fact that the representative fragments only allow for general era of production and popularity dating due to lack of maker’s marks and other trademark information. However, the known date for the midden may allow for a certain amount of refinement of those general popularity and production ranges.
The shell-edge, or scalloped, rim fragment, one of the cheapest decorated ceramic-types in the nineteenth-century, was popular and available from about 1780-1860; however, its popularity began to decline after 1830 or so (Majewski and O'Brien 1987:152). This style appeared on white-ware (as opposed to the earlier pearlware) and was characterized by a molded rim of vertically incised straight to slightly wavy lines that were painted over in colors. The example at the Shepard site is probably a whiteware, was painted dark to royal blue, and the lines were low relief and vertically straight (as opposed to wavy). Royal blue came into popularity by about 1820 (Majewski and O'Brien 1987:150). But, according to Miller (1997) even scalloped, pressed, straight lines were produced and popular from 1809-1831. Taking both of those date ranges into account, this suggests that the vessel (a plate or shallow bowl) from which the fragment derived was produced, purchased, and used between 1820 and 1860. However, as the straight incised lines may indicate, it was quite possibly purchased between 1820 and 1840 (again allowing liberally for frontier conditions that may have prevented immediate transport and sale of products and also extended the periods of demand for production longer for frontier communities vis-a-vis east-coast areas).

The remainder of the decorated styles represented in the midden assemblage has proved to be hard to date. The mulberry flow (dark purplish-brown) fragments have a probable production date that is earlier than Medici as it was an early color but generally contemporaneous with the dark cobalt-blue (Majewski and O'Brien
The functional category of this fragment could not be identified with any certainty.

The hand-painted fragment was likely produced between 1840 and 1860, indicated by the royal blue shade (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:158-159). Also, it may well be a fragment of the hand-painted and sponge-printed ceramic bowls excavated in 1996 near the side of the house (approximately 3 meters west of N109 E40) that bore a floral motif in the center and royal-blue rims (see Sayers, Nassaney, and McMillan 1998). These were dated between 1830 and 1850 (Lynn and Latuszek 1997). The functional type of this vessel could not be identified either.

The annular fragments recovered exhibit narrow dark brown banding “with slight relief” (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:163) and white horizontal stripes on the exterior sides. Underneath those colors, on one fragment, is what appears to be a much wider stripe of light blue that is slightly “swirled” with white; whether this was the color/motif of the remainder of the vessel body or just a wider stripe that was proceeded by a white body is uncertain. Regardless, this general style was produced between 1790 and the early twentieth century (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:163; Moore 1996). This particular color combination and set of characteristics suggest that it was produced later than 1790, likely no earlier than the 1830s (Moore 1996:12). Given the chronological parameters set by the midden feature this then suggests that its use and deposition occurred sometime between 1830 and 1875. Kullen and Wallitschek (1991:128) observed annular ware in the assemblage from a mid-nineteenth-century farmstead in Illinois; these fragments had a midrange date of
1845, which suggests that this style was available to Mid-West residents at that earlier date. Thus, it can be said that this style fits into the general age range expected for this feature. It is worth noting that annular ware ceramics were some of the cheapest decorated ceramics available in the mid-nineteenth-century (Majewski and O'Brien 1987; Miller 1980). The fragments located in the deepest level (N=2; 35-40cm bd) were identified as being fragments of a cup whereas those fragments found in another stratum (N=3; 25-30 cm bd) were not identifiable.

One small fragment of a caramel-colored (brown and yellow) slipped fragment was recovered; this piece has been identified as Rockingham ware (Sayers 1998b) on the basis of McConall’s (1990:12) description and similarity to definite examples found in laboratory collections. The body is of yellow earthenware and it appears to have derived from a serving vessel of some sort given its interior/exterior glazing and its roughly 0.5 centimeter thickness. The production and popularity dates ranged from 1760-1900; however Rockingham appeared on yellow-ware from 1830-1900 (Moore 1996:9; Remer 1992:160). Thus, again the dates of occupation at the site and the date of the feature allows us to suggest that it was used and discarded between 1834 and 1880 on the Shepard farm. It is likely a hand-painted style and may fall into Miller’s (1980:3-4) general value index at the second to lowest level; although Rockingham is not mentioned specifically by Miller, this group includes most hand-painted and semi-unskilled artistic designs like sponge and splatter decorated, mocha, and featheredge. Rockingham likely would be included within it. The functional type represented by the fragment could not be discerned.
Table 5 shows where each type of ceramic described above appeared (in 5 cm levels). When excluding the constant Medici and indiscernible white-glazed wares, some interesting variation does occur. Mulberry flow and flow blue, which were suggested to be of probable earlier production appear in levels A and B and A through C respectively. The transfer-prints, unknown light blue fragments and the Cobalt Staffordshire fragments appear in B and C and B through D respectively. Annular type fragments appear, curiously, in levels B and D but not C. The feather-edge, hand-painted, and Rockingham appear only in level C.

So, including Medici and unknown undecorated wares, level A yielded 4 out of ten 10 types in the sub-assemblage, B yielded 7 out of 10, C yielded 8 out of 10, and D yielded 4 out of 10. If it is given that the earliest dumping activities occurred after the construction period (1853-1854) and the latest between 1875-1885 then it follows that level D represents the oldest depositional activities, whereas A represents the most recent within the range in question.

Miller’s (1980:3-4) economic scaling system posits that four general levels of ceramics existed in the nineteenth century. In this system, level 4 ceramics were the most expensive (includes transfer-printed wares and porcelain), level 3 semi-expensive (includes hand-painted wares indicating skilled work), level 2 were the cheapest decorated wares available (includes shell-edged, spongeware, and annular ware) whereas level 1 ceramics were the cheapest (includes undecorated wares). Thus, Miller’s levels 1 and 2 together compose the cheaper half of the ceramic spectrum whereas levels 3 and 4 compose the more and most expensive.
In terms of Miller’s socioeconomic ranking of ceramic types, an interesting pattern emerges. In the most recent deposition level (A), only the highest ranking, level 4, and most expensive ceramic types were recovered (excluding the possible whiteware fragments): the Medici, Flow blue and Mulberry flow. In level B, besides the level 4 ceramics evident and the possible but unverified level 1 fragments of undecorated white slipped, the only relatively inexpensive level 2 ceramics recovered were annular fragments. However, in level B the variety of the more expensive level 4 types expanded to include light blue transfer and cobalt Staffordshire. In level C the most variety of any of the four levels occurred (8/10), four of which were more expensive transfer-types (level 4) and three of which were the less expensive, minimally decorated wares (level 2). It is also very interesting that the only appearances in the feature of feather-edge, hand-painted and Rockingham occur in this level. Finally in level D Medici, Cobalt Staffordshire, and annular styles were recovered.

The variation in general speaks to the fact that the dumping occurred in a routine manner over time. Although this would be expected according to the known patterns of dumping at domestic sites that were discussed above, the non-random occurrence of varieties at certain depths and not others as well as the consistent presence of Medici speak to the fact that this feature is a result of different disposal moments. For example, if this feature were the result of a single episode of mass dumping in the nineteenth-century, like when bringing in fill from elsewhere, we might expect a more even distribution throughout the unit of the types. The various lenses of soil in
profiles of the unit also suggest separate dumping activities (Western Michigan University field notes 1998).

If this midden was the result of periodic dumping throughout the middle, and perhaps last third, of the nineteenth-century, then it suggests that the Shepards were using a variety of ceramics contemporaneously with the Medici transfer set. The variation per stratigraphic level further suggests that the non-Medici ceramics saw shorter spans of use and non-use. For example, the Mulberry flow appears in the upper two levels whereas the feather-edge style appears only in the third level. This strongly suggests that the Mulberry was used and discarded at a later date relative to the feather-edge.

The presence of cheaper ceramics in conjunction with higher priced types and the constant presence of Medici print fragments is perhaps the significant aspect of the sub-assemblage for my purposes. This general variation may offer further understanding of the social and political economic relations as they were during the period encompassed by the depositional period that created the midden. The artifacts may also afford some clues regarding the period prior to the construction of the house and the subsequent dumping activities. I will now bring the discussion back to some of the issues discussed previously in this chapter and others. To do this, I will divide the sub-assemblage into two groups; Group 1, which will include all of Miller’s level 3 and 4 ceramics, and Group 2, which will include all of Miller’s, level 2 ceramics (Miller’s level 1 ceramics include only undecorated wares which aren’t verifiably contained in the assemblage).
Group 1

The presence of the Medici and cobalt blue Staffordshire fragments in the lowest level (D) suggests that they were among the earliest discards after the building of the house. This deposition indicates that they may have been purchased by the Shepards a few years prior to, or right around time of the building of the house (Lynn and Latuszek 1997). Given the dates suggested for the dark-blue cobalt Staffordshire (1820-1850), it is certainly possible that the Shepards had acquired those objects earlier than the Medici set and either used them alongside that set or that they were "phased out" as the Medici took over for daily dinner use. Another possibility is that they represent specialty items (or one such item), that were (was) used along with the Medici. The same type of fragments located in 1996 excavations indicates that at least one of these vessels was a vegetable drainer or meat strainer (Lynn and Latuszek 1997). The presence of the type in levels B-D indicates that they remained in use for some time but fell into disuse towards the end of the depositional episode.

All of the other level 4 ceramics come into the record in level C and B. Given the projected date ranges for the mulberry flow and flow blue, this later deposition is surprising. Ideally we might expect these projected older ceramics to appear in level D and phase out of the record by level A. However, in the case of flow blue, the high quantity of fragments relative to the rest may indicate that there were multiple dishes with this motif (it seems unlikely that one dish broke and was discarded; the presence of these fragments in multiple levels suggests otherwise).
If Medici was a consistently used set and is represented by the most fragments and by far the greatest total weight, then the flow blue might indicate a set or multiple vessels that were not used as much as the Medici but used contemporaneously. In other words, they may have been the ceramic vessels used at special gatherings and on Sundays. Although it would be tempting to argue that these vessels were used until the time of house construction and then began to have negative meanings for the Shepards as the Medici “took over,” the presence of so few fragments does not allow that conclusion. Had they discarded these at an accelerated rate at some time after we would expect, it seems, an abundance of these fragments that would rival or exceed the Medici and perhaps larger sherds or even semi-complete or complete vessels.

Rather, the limited amount and weight suggest contemporaneous use with Medici and very limited breakage which, given their status as level 4 expensive ceramics, may indicate a certain degree of special and infrequent use. The small size of fragments may also indicate that objects were not thrown out even when slight damage was done. Finally, as with the flow blue, the appearance of this type in the assemblage may indicate another specialty item that the Medici set would not have had. However, the functional type of these vessels (e.g., cup, plate, tureen, etc.) is indiscernible (Sayers 1998b) and no evidence from earlier excavations (i.e., 1996) suggests that these were specialty vessels.

The mulberry flow appears in level B and A; this fact may also suggest curation due to a special functional nature. However, the shape and width of the few fragments suggest that they represent at least one eating bowl of some sort (Sayers
1998b) and thus would have had a functionally parallel vessel in the Medici. Furthermore, given the popularity ranges which were contemporaneous with the early phase of flow blue popularity, it seems that the late appearance of this vessel is also a bit anomalous; in this case we might also have expected to locate mulberry fragments in levels that correspond to earlier dates (i.e., level D and perhaps level C). Thus, the mulberry flow may have appeared later in the occupation even though they had Medici and other ceramics and even though its style and motif were somewhat out of vogue even by the 1840s. Another possibility is that the vessel(s) were purchased by the Shepards much earlier during their popularity and production ranges (i.e., 1820-1850) and were used even after the Medici set came into the house.

The light blue floral transfer was represented by 3 fragments weighing a total of 4.3 grams. Unfortunately the small size of the fragments do not allow for any functional assignment beyond that of a container(s). Given that light blue became popular after 1845-1850 it seems likely that this was also acquired around the time of the construction of the house. This is also supported by the fact that it did not appear stratigraphically until level C. The fact that it was located in levels B and C only, combined with the limited amount of fragments, may indicate that this was a single piece chipped and damaged over time or that it was only represented by a few vessels in the Shepard kitchen.
Group 2

This group consists of those types that were inexpensive (i.e., annularware, feather-edge, and Rockingham) and in toto should be considered examples of Miller’s Level 2 ceramics. What is interesting from my point of view is that they are present at all in this particular context. Obviously, when they were used it was done contemporaneously with the Medici set as well as some of the other four types of Level 4 ceramics.

It would seem, all things being equal, that the Shepards would not have used them after they had purchased the Medici and other Level 4 ceramics because the Medici and the other Level 4 ceramics fell in with the rise of economic wealth and progressive idealism. The question must be addressed of whether or not they actually functioned on this farm as eating service items or if rather they had found some other ad hoc function after they were replaced in the 1845-1855 span by Medici and other Level 4 ceramics.

I argue that they were used in the house and kitchen. If they were used and broken on the farm in locales other than the kitchen and/or house like, for example, in barns or other outbuildings, it seems rather unlikely that anyone would have bothered to sweep them up and carry them over to the house to discard them. Had we recovered conjoinable fragments, or large fragments and partial vessels, that formed semi-complete to complete vessels (like the conjoinable fragments that were found for Medici vessels in 1996) perhaps this case could be made. For example, were a vessel dropped and broken beyond use in an outbuilding in which people worked...
walked, then someone may have bothered to pick the debris up and dispose of it in the general dumping area. However, the small sizes of the fragments of these level 2 types, in general, suggest that the fragments would have been left where they fell and broke, or, at best, would have been disposed of near those outbuildings (i.e., thrown out the door or put in a production area dumping spot). It seems likely, then, that they were indeed broken in the kitchen or house where any debris would have been periodically swept up and disposed of. This leads to the question of why they were present and discarded from the kitchen when the Medici and other ceramics more befitting of a rising middle-class farm family were already present?

Ceramics, Class, Gender, and the Landscape

I have discussed in this chapter the rise of the progressive farmscape and its accompanying political-economic conditions and some of the contradictions that arose with its internal system. I argued that the nucleated landscape, which was at least partially a result of economic decisions to produce surpluses for market, and included products used as remuneration of farm laborers for their seasonal and year-round work, allowed and forced the Shepards to engage in semi-reciprocal or non-capitalist relations with those non-familial workers to ameliorate contradictions that arose on the landscape. These political-economic contradictions came about as the spaces comprising the landscape that were available for living and non-field work became extremely restricted and forced women and men of the middle- to upper-class family to live in the same restricted spaces as public, lower-class, males.
However, even with the efforts to engage in non-capitalist, non-alienating, and non-exploitative relations with non-familial males, the Shepards still used material culture on the landscape, intentionally, to exude and make seemingly positive statements about their rise in status to themselves and the true public. These same messages would have been understood by the public yet private, lower class, male workers who worked and lived on the farm. The symbolism was thus multivalent and would have reinforced the distance between the Shepards, as owners of the means of production, and the workers who worked within forces and relations of production that were increasingly capitalist in their orientation. Therefore, these messages and statements via material culture would have helped to perpetuate the class-antagonisms, however subtle and mundane they theoretically could have been, that the semi-reciprocal relations would have been trying to assuage or prevent. The dialectic then, in this case, was between the social relations of production (the various forms of labor relations) and the use and meanings of the products of capital themselves: commodities in the form of material culture of the landscape.

The ceramics discussed above may have had a role in these same sorts of contradictions. As was suggested, the majority (in terms of style-types and numerical presence of fragments of those types) of the sub-assemblage that was examined followed, more or less, what would be expected of a progressive farmstead; after the construction of the house when the particular locus of disposal began being used, the family utilized one set of expensive ceramics (the Medici) and the set may have been accompanied, at various times, by specialty items. Furthermore, the Shepards may
have used a different set of ceramics for special events or meals (represented by the flow blue fragments) which would have been a corollary to their rise in status within the community and the social and political groups within which they were involved.

However, the presence of a variety of cheaper level 2 ceramics, many of which had functions (e.g., cups and plates) that were already “covered” by the Medici set, demands an expansion of the explanation for the sub-assemblage. One would not expect a progressive, middle- to upper-class farm family to use and possess these sorts of table wares when they had more expensive sets and types as counterparts in their cupboard. However, as was discussed above, laborers also ate at the farm during and after work hours and, as lower-class, non-familial residents and workers, they may have been the ones using many of the cheaper ceramics.

It can be assumed that prior to the building of the house the Shepards did indeed own ceramic tablewares. Furthermore, it is also likely that in the early years, up to when the building of the railroad in Battle Creek (in 1845), they would not have had access to complete sets of ceramics; they probably acquired ceramics piecemeal. Hypothetically and theoretically, these ceramics would have also, in general, reflected the lower socio-economic status of the Shepards in the 1830s through early 1840s. It might, therefore, be expected that a hypothetical assemblage from the pre-progressive (and also non-capitalist or transitional) Shepard farm would consist of precisely what was found in Group 2 with perhaps some accompanying Group 1 or expensive items (these would also have been acquired piecemeal). The only difference is that we
might expect to find quantitatively greater amounts of Group 2 ceramics in any hypothetical assemblage of the earlier years.

However, as they began to rise in class and wealth, and began to replace their older and cheaper ceramics, as well as the out-of-vogue level 4 objects, with higher priced sets, they may have retained their old ones. When we recall that workers began working consistently on the farm in 1848, that the house was built in 1853-1854, and that the Medici set was purchased sometime during this span things become clearer. The Shepards may very well have retained the old ceramics for use, perhaps only in the day, by the laborers although Shepard himself may have used them during the day as well.

This argument would explain why so few fragments of the Group 2 variety were found and also the small sizes of those fragments. Regarding the general paucity of cheaper ceramics, by the middle 1850s when objects began to be discarded in that particular location, many of the Shepards’ older ceramics may have already been discarded elsewhere on the old farm landscape (it should be remembered that the old farmhouse was located somewhere else on the land and the dumping areas in association with that structure would be elsewhere as well). If laborers were assigned the cheaper and older ceramics, this may have led the Shepards to retain vessels even after chips and small breaks occurred. The usual quality and appearance issues and standards that would have followed the upper-class Medici vessels would probably not have applied to the worker-assigned ceramics; serving them on damaged vessels would have been tolerated and an economic means of feeding them (as opposed to
obtaining new dishes for them). These suggestions do account for the variation in the portion of the archaeological record that has been examined.

Another possibility is that the majority of the cheaper vessels were obtained after the house was built. This is supported by the fact that, with the exception of annular fragments in levels B and D, the cheaper fragments were all located in level C. If use of these objects maintained throughout the landscape transition era and were brought into the house from the old residence, as was suggested above, we might expect to have recovered fragments in the earliest level (D). Only the fragments of annular ware were recovered in level D. Thus, the archaeological florescence of these cheaper wares in level C is somewhat interesting.

This distribution may suggest that even after the house was built, the Shepards still applied more egalitarian ideals in their mundane and daily food serving practices; they may have fed workers from the set they used themselves. Eventually, and not too long after the house was built, they began augmenting their generally expensive wares with cheaper ones for serving the non-familial workers. Perhaps the non-capitalist relations were doing their job too well and the Shepards saw fit to distance themselves from workers a few years after the house was constructed even through such low-key material culture. However, at this point it is difficult to argue either case.

A final possibility is that both options are true; perhaps some of the fragments represent vessels that were holdovers from the old farmstead and others were obtained opportunistically and piecemeal after the house was built in order to replace
broken and discarded vessels or to increase the amounts of vessels available to serve the workers.

Discussion

There can be little doubt that the building of the extant Greek Revival structure marked a distinctive outcome of a series of political-economic changes stemming from a set of interrelated economic, social, and ideological transitions that took place from the time the Shepards worked their land for agricultural purposes (ca. 1838). The major impetus for the building was to make a material statement regarding the Shepards’ acceptance of ideologies of progressivism that included general market-orientated agricultural production, efficient management of labor, which was manifested in the gendered division of labor, and use of non-familial farm labor. The house in itself, with its more intensive use of space, also reflected and fostered this acceptance of progressive capitalism. So, although many elements of this political-economic and ideological transition may have been present on the old farmscape, the 1853-1854 Greek Revival was in many ways a culmination of these changes, although the political economy was probably not truly stagnant thereafter.

However, the very same motivations that produced the progressive landscape created a social and political economic agrarian space that was very limited and nucleated in its extent. This economically efficient use of space was not particularly socially efficient in maintaining adequate spaces for the variety of people who lived on the farm. The nucleation of the living spaces created divisions on the farmscape
that, at once, overlapped and contradicted one another. There were functional divisions of space, divisions of space based on public and private dichotomies, and masculine and feminine spaces that all had to be dealt with and negotiated daily even though their contemporaneity often would have resulted in tension and contradiction. When we further add the extra-familial, male, lower class, and theoretically public elements of the consistent presence of agricultural laborers, the situation at the farm becomes even more dynamic and contradictory. If without the laborers the situation was difficult, adding them would have further blurred all those meanings (i.e., public, private, feminine, and masculine) given their interdependency and would have threatened the sanctity and efficiency of the familial system of this American petty bourgeois farm.

It was thus that the Shepards and the workers opted to maintain semi-reciprocal exchange relations instead of engaging in the more impersonal and alienating relations that would have stemmed from cash-paid contracts. In so doing, a certain quasi-familial or communal type of relationship and feeling would have permeated most transactions that the Shepards and laborers were involved in together. This would have ameliorated, if only through a process of mystification, some of the tensions that both the family and workers felt as the meanings and uses of space were being negotiated.

However, the Shepards still made their particular middle- to upper-class status in the new capitalist and market oriented society known. The progressive landscape was definitely one way they went about this. Thus, although they sought to create a
sense of semi-egalitarianism in their social and economic relations with the workers who came to work for them, the landscape itself would have contradicted and muted this dialogue to a marked extent. No matter what the Shepards did to foster a less exploitative working and living situation for workers than, say, those experienced by workers in industrial towns (e.g., McGuire 1991; Mrozowski, et al. 1996), the latter certainly would have been bombarded on a daily basis by the material culture and spatial statements that told them that were not equals by any means, that the Shepards did indeed have some power over them, and that simply the Shepards were more successful compared to them.

The ceramics discussed above likely served a similar function and had a similar result or effect. Regardless of specific chronological issues, such as when the cheaper ceramics assumed a role in the Shepard kitchen or when the more expensive ones went in or out-of-vogue, the presence of the contradictory Level 2 and Level 4 ceramics point to, and reflect, some of the same contradictions in class that the landscape itself helped to promote. The fact that the Shepards went to such expense to reconfigure their landscape in the middle of the nineteenth-century suggests that this same effort would have been reflected in more mundane, mobile, and disposable material culture. Ceramics are just one example. In this case it appears as though the Shepards purchased a set of expensive ceramics that had a motif that was in line with ideologies of progressivism. It seems unlikely that they would have turned around and served laborers on these vessels; this would have not only shortened the life-span
of the set but it also would have been contrary to a main reason for purchasing them in the first place.

However, gendered notions of work may have also played a role in this differential use of ceramics. During the day, when laborers and Shepard would have been coming in from masculine-oriented work (i.e., field and outbuilding work) perhaps the cheaper vessels were used (it is hard to imagine, but not impossible, that Warren Shepard came in and ate from different ceramics then the other workers). The noon-lunch for male workers then only warranted use of cheaper ceramics.

However, at night when the family was together and the internal domicile space was suddenly filled and the day's (male) labors were over, perhaps then the Medici set was used for dinner serving. This usage would have taken place in the serving room or kitchen, would have involved the whole family as a general rule. Thus, the serving vessels would have had symbolic significance and power in the maintenance of the feminine domain of family and domestic unity. It is difficult to say whether the Shepards would have included renters and laborers at their table during dinner; if they did then they likely used the Medici set as well. If they were served meals from the kitchen but ate elsewhere (i.e., segregated eating), then it is more conceivable that they were served on cheaper, non-Medici ceramics as they would have eaten away from the Shepards (perhaps in their rooms or the kitchen if the Shepard's had a separate dining room) and the obvious contradictions would not have literally sat at the same table with them.
Thus, the variation observed in the ceramics may have significance in understanding not only the increasing gendered divisions of space, labor and meaning of work but also at the same time have significance in understanding class differences at this mid-nineteenth-century farm. As the transition to a more capital-dominated farmscape, mode of life, and social-unit occurred, the more material culture was used as a “final word” regarding the differences between the Shepards and those who worked, lived on, and visited their progressive landscape and space. The more expensive Level 4 ceramics may have further had efficacy in maintaining the heightened and aggravated division of labor and space based on gender through associating finer ceramics with feminine private, familial eating, and serving whereas the cheaper ceramics were used for serving male workers as they came in for noon-meals after working in the fields and processing spaces of the farmstead. The general association of fieldwork and masculine labor with dirtiness, unwholesomeness, and non-familial meaning in the progressive era would seem to support this interpretation (see McMurry 1997). The use of cheaper ceramics, as disposable, replaceable, and non-set objects would have made almost intuitive sense in that hurried context of noon-lunch.

In sum, the material culture that composed the landscape as well as more disposable objects, like the ceramics, were integral aspects of the agrarian political-economy. The rise of the embellished, expensive, and intensive landscape and architecture around the middle of the nineteenth-century may very well have been in some ways important set of statements regarding the Shepards and the community’s having
gone through an envelopment by the expanding CMP; there may have been multiple transitions, or perhaps a partial, yet multi-faceted, transition to capitalism, in many of the economic and socio-political facies of the nineteenth-century farms' history. But, again, the lack of cash-dominated wage work within the family, and between the family and workers, indicates that the political-economy of the Shepard farm was not fully capitalist by the eve of the Civil War. At the Shepard farm, the material culture further acted as sources of contradiction along class and gender lines, rooted in the progressive nucleation of the domestic and social spaces of the farmstead proper.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis, I have attempted to bring together multiple sources of information regarding one site, and to a lesser extent the community and region within which that site was (is) located, in order to address a variety of issues pertaining to agrarian political-economic transitions. The final conclusion regarding whether or not the Shepard site went through a political-economic transition from the community to true capitalism is that it probably did not. However, this is not because it was always capitalist but rather because that at least through 1860 wage-labor never came to dominate any particular labor-relation sphere. There is no reason to believe that it did after that date, at least until Almeda Shepard’s death in 1868, when many of the contradictions may have weakened. However, there was definitely political-economic transformation prior to Almeda’s death and perhaps facets of the understood historical agrarian transition in other economic and ideological elements, such as the rise of surplus production, market orientation, and progressivism. Also, only one part of the transitional type 3 seems to have occurred; the land became commercialized but the labor didn’t really become proletarianized. Thus, it is a somewhat confusing situation, but the lack of wage-labor dominance indicates that a fundamental aspect of the CMP never defined this farm’s labor relations.
After Warren Shepard died in 1875, the farmstead may have become dominated by wage labor as a new owner, John Shepard, took over production. However, that cannot be presently discerned. By 1897 farming for surplus likely ceased on the land as the Shepard daughters took over; in fact it is possible they may have begun to engage in some subsistence production again until they sold the house in 1919. The property was never used for any intensive agricultural production again, as far as is known. I will now briefly summarize what has been argued and then I will discuss some of the contributions this study has made to historical scholarship. Lastly, I will point to some possible future directions for research.

In Chapter II, I wove together various Marxian and political-economic theoretical ideas regarding the nature of the CMP. These included the agrarian question, the ways that petty commodity production articulates with and contradicts the CMP, and the role of various transitional types, derived from Wallerstein, that have promoted political-economic change at multiple scales. I then linked these issues to gender relations and divisions of labor in the pc and discussed the historical understanding in current scholarship. This brought into the discussion the debate about whether an agrarian transition to capitalism even occurred. It was argued that it is likely that both elements of capitalism as well as non-capitalist political-economy had been widely present to various degrees throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, the lack of dominance of wage-labor in agrarian labor relations would preclude calling a community or individual farm capitalist. Finally, progressive farming was also discussed which allowed for the addition of ideologies and
spatial-use into the framework of North American agrarian political economy. This framework allowed for an analysis of the agrarian political economy of nineteenth-century Michigan, Battle Creek, and most elaborately, the Shepard site in Battle Creek.

In Chapter III, I discussed the ways that historical archaeology from a political-economic and landscape perspective is an excellent way in which to analyze the many issues of the transition to agrarian capitalism. The approach taken for research at the Shepard site was discussed and was shown to center on three general sources of information: documents, landscape and architectural information, and material culture. A somewhat detailed discussion of the Warren Shepard’s account ledger system was given as this has been a critical document for the research of the period.

In Chapter IV, I discussed the general history of Michigan and emphasized the role of the state and the broad role of farming. I also discussed Battle Creek history and showed that the rural/urban distinction was borne of pioneer agrarian settlement, capitalist investors’ control of water-power and riverine acreage, the state capitalist investment, and state-sponsored laws and regulations. I also discussed how the town became increasingly connected to external markets, producers, and capitalists so that by 1860 residents were literally in a very different world than they were in the 1830s-1850s. Whereas earlier the community was characterized by reciprocal and community-oriented labor pools and “bees,” later it became increasingly a place of manufacturing, mercantilism, and general market-exchange. Farmers increasingly became
oriented toward this nexus of consumption and exchange as they themselves strove for more and more surplus production.

A history of the Shepard site was given in some detail along three general lines. One was Warren Shepard’s history, as he was the legal owner of the operable means of production. Second, I examined the distaff and domestic domain which emphasized Almeda Shepard’s role in the political economy but also included the two surviving daughters. Finally, the third focus was on the extra-familial laborer relations; these included over thirty workers throughout 1848-1858. I argued that there were a few periods of change in labor relations at the farm, most diversely after the building of the house in 1853-1854.

In general, I argued that each domain had its own unique but interdependent history at the site, that wage-labor never came to dominate any one domain, and that market-production, and progressivism at the farm did not create an entirely capitalist farmstead. Rather, pcp seems to have dominated the distaff domain, non-capitalist labor relations were prevalent in the extra-familial domain, and Warren Shepard as owner and direct producer never was a wage-worker. Thus, the farm produced surpluses for and helped perpetuate the “external” CMP that was coming to dominate the erstwhile frontier area of Battle Creek, but the farm itself, in terms of its own political economy resisted capitalist penetration. Of course this begged the question of how and why this seeming contradiction occurred.

In Chapter V, I argued that the demands of surplus and market production, scientific management and efficiency of the farm, and progressive ideologies in gen-
eral worked to create a context where the new brick home (1853-1854) was surrounded in a tight, nucleated, and axial fashion by limited activity spaces and outbuildings. These spaces were surrounded then by agricultural land (plow land). These and other architectural and landscape uses certainly then helped to perpetuate the very same progressive, scientific, and profitable agricultural practices that helped to establish them in the first place.

It was the nucleated farmstead and landscape that was a significant element in the social and political economy of the site. Through, and in, such a limited space, the daily existence of many people had to be negotiated; through many processes, the spaces of the farmstead were ascribed multiple meanings in terms of dichotomous and often contradictory social categories (e.g., public/private and male/female). I argued that there was a cultural tendency among progressive farmers to divide labor along family and gendered lines; women and children worked at certain tasks, typically domestic ones, and men worked outside in public and economically significant agrarian market production. When Shepard began bringing male farm-hands and laborers onto the farm both to work and live, the presence of a lower-class, male, public person(s) would have aggravated the already existent gendered tensions by limiting and disturbing family and feminine space. Thus, it was argued, Shepard and the workers continued to engage in labor relations that would have lessened the alienation and estrangement that comes with wage-labor. This and other aspects of their relations, in effect, would have massaged and perhaps often alleviated the class tensions
that would have been present because they would have nurtured a more familial or kin-like type of meaning to the nature of the work on the farmstead.

However, such measures probably didn't always work, or they may have even always had a consistent or constant element of failure. Surely the grandiose material culture and landscape and the presence of unequal power between the Warren Shepard, Almeda and daughters, and the extra-familial workers would not have been totally ignored nor unobservable. Thus, it was argued that not only did architecture and the landscape significantly effect class and gender relations, but, archaeologically recovered disposable material culture did as well.

Ceramics, in particular, also point to class antagonism and disparities because of the presence of contemporaneously used expensive and inexpensive ceramics. The latter were likely reserved for laborers and outside workers (including perhaps Warren Shepard) during the day and nicer expensive ceramics, namely the Medici transfer-printed set, solidified family and private ties at evening meals and concomitantly contradicted the kin-like labor relations between Shepard and the workers. It is not certain whether workers ate from the same expensive ceramics as the Shepards but it seems rather unlikely that they did.

Progressive concerns with establishing symbolic material statements of success and efficiency as well as the need for family time likely would have caused a certain segregated eating system to develop. In the case of the former, it would have defeated the purpose to serve laborers with the Medici ceramics (on a regular basis anyway) because they were purchased, at least in part, for their class symbolism. In
the case of the latter, inclusion of laborers at the family table would have disrupted
the mode of life and would have made tenuous the fabric of the meaning of family at
the farm.

However, if as I have argued, the laborers engaged in labor-relations that
would have promoted a certain closeness with the Shepard family, might they have
become so kin-like that were included in family activities such as eating with the
family? I would argue that the answer is probably, for the most part, “no.” The point
was made that the relations of laborers with the family were at once likely familial
and, contradictorily, class-oriented. The laborer was almost literally a walking con­
tradiction on the farm. The non-capitalist relations worked to allow the surplus-
producing labor to get done on the farm. However, the time spent working to pro­
duce surplus goods probably did not work too often to allow a given laborer to infil­
trate the truest and idealized family moments and activities. Some of the longest-term
and most trusted workers were allowed into more of the family relations and activities
than other workers but it seems doubtful that many became honorary or “achieved”
kin (vs. ascribed kin). Perhaps no workers enjoyed this status. Regardless, as general
rule, workers had a very blurred and confusing role in the domestic economy as well
as the mode of life, in part, because of the other gendered and public/private mean­nings and uses of space and the landscape. The non-capitalist relations helped make it
a tolerable environment but certainly did not create a utopian environment for any­one.
This study has, I hope, contributed to a few discussions in historical scholarship. Of course, first is the debate about the nature and ramifications of the transition to agrarian capitalism in the northern US and Mid-West. Where there appear to be two sides to the debate about whether a transition occurred in general (there was a transition vs. there was not a transition), I hope to have shown that there is room for a different perspective. In this case, the presence of elements of both CMP and non-capitalist social formations and relations may actually indicate that both sides have claim to some measure of truth. It was argued that in frontier conditions the local area and the Shepard farm were rooted in generally reciprocal systems of exchange. Eventually CMP exchange and production relations inundated the area but the Shepard farm, and perhaps other farms, never became fully capitalist even though its production for market exchange and profit inextricably linked it to the national and global economy. However, until the landscape data and information was brought to light there was no obvious explanation as to why such a contradiction was present even up to 1860. With the landscape perspective, a plausible cultural history was given that may also apply to many farms and communities given that the nucleated farmstead was so common in agrarian sectors. Rather than arguing that labor relations always were capitalist, or went from being reciprocal to capitalist, it is seen that perhaps they never became capitalist because of the acceptance and undertaking of surplus market production. These were rooted in external pressures of the CMP itself. Thus, the presence of and dominance of capitalism on a local scale prevented
capitalism on the site-specific scale. This is, it seems, a very interesting prospect and perhaps the debate on the transition is better informed for it.

In terms of historical archaeology, I hope that this exposition has contributed an anthropological and critical interpretation of agrarian archaeology. Although farmsteads are excavated frequently (e.g., see Beedle and Gyrisco 1996) I do think that there is far too little theoretical and anthropological weight accorded to them. Perhaps this study has shown this lacking to be unjustifiable. Furthermore, I hope it is an analytical step in that direction. Farmsteads do have the potential to inform us about many classes of people and illuminate the transitional periods of agrarian America. When multiple sources of data and theory are combined, the possibilities of study at these types of sites are nearly inexhaustible.

Finally, on the local level, this analysis of the Shepard site may inspire local historians of Battle Creek to attempt similar or dissimilar critical analyses of the area and of many time periods. The city has a dynamic and important history, not only to the State of Michigan but also to national and international histories. The cereal industry, the Underground Railroad, and the Seventh Day Adventist religion all have strong associations with this city and many very interesting interpretations of these and other historical aspects of Battle Creek are possible if approached critically. Regardless, I think the work done at the Shepard site may have a place in the present local historian’s discussions and understanding of the past.

Many potentially interesting questions have arisen from this line of reasoning and argumentation. First, obviously, no particular topic or part of this exposition has
been exhausted; the intricate dynamics of gender roles, laborer roles, and public/private meanings could be further articulated and much more detailed in order to understand the innumerable historical nuances and changes that attended them. But, the seeming incomplete nature of this thesis is a result I feel of my goal which was to present a wide variety of information in order to have a coherent understanding of the general political-economic and social history of this site.

Second, the archaeological assemblage available for research is much larger than was used here. Not only are there two other units that exposed the domestic midden I discussed but also at least two other units that have definite early to mid-nineteenth-century objects outside of that feature (Lynn and Latuszek 1997). These artifacts could be explored in a similar or different manner and would surely yield much more information about the variety and depositional sequences observed in this discussion. A more inclusive analysis could refine our understanding of the nineteenth-century political economy and use of the landscape. The small sample of objects used in this analysis undoubtedly hampered the development of a more detailed and thorough understanding of that feature and its implications.

Other archaeological information that was not used above also includes those features mentioned as having been found directly below the domestic midden feature. These features should be analyzed at some point because they almost certainly were formed during the construction of the house; they consisted of a roughly linear row of unmortared and loose bricks (feature 20) and a circular depression or hole beneath it (feature 21). These were both associated with multiple burnt brick fragments, numer-
ous pipe stems, a few fragments of light blue semi-melted glass, and some nails. Other than the glass fragments, there were no domestic objects associated with the levels and features. This sub-assemblage, then, is markedly different than the midden which was stratigraphically and vertically above them. If the features were formed during the construction-era then it is also quite possible that they were discarded by the laborers who actually built the house. Therefore, they could be profitably incorporated into a class or laborer study.

I have argued elsewhere that there were definitely African-American and African-Canadian laborers present on the farmstead during the 1850s-1870s (Sayers and Lapham 1995, 1996). As the Underground Railroad consistently brought fugitives and therefore potential inexpensive and migrant labor into town it would it is not surprising to that they found their way to the Shepard farm. The sorts of labor they performed, how their presence affected the dichotomies and contradictions discussed in this thesis, and how race and ethnicity played a role in the political economy of the Shepard farm are of potential interest. Further study could bring to light many other possible contradictory relations, including some between race and gender and race and class.

I hope that this thesis has offered some new perspectives and approaches to the analysis of agrarian transitions and transformations. The debates tend not to utilize material culture and historically relevant landscapes. However, I have hoped to demonstrate that the architectural and landscape analysis as well as disposable material culture can be used to further enhance our understanding why particular non-
capitalist relations can coevally exist with elements of the CMP. I also hope that this exposition has made a contribution to historical archaeology, particularly farmstead archaeology. Some of the issues of the agrarian transition have been discussed occasionally (Orser 1991, 1994; Stewart-Abernathy 1986, 1992) but they have been largely ignored and certainly not examined in great detail.

I do think that these sorts of contradictions may have been played out to various degrees at many farmsteads. The processes identified quite possibly occurred elsewhere in the state and beyond. The contradictions of gender and the landscape were almost certainly present on progressive and non-progressive farms alike, although the relative class-standing of the family may have influenced the character and nature of those relations. On progressive farms, one was more likely to find extrafamilial help and thus similar analyses could theoretically be applicable to those farms. Progressive farms were typically nucleated and family-oriented and many developed in a historically frontier context.

It would be very interesting to see how other farmers, families, and laborers dealt with the limited spaces and the progressive gender-based divisions of labor and meaning. This sort of investigation could, of course, allow for broad and significant generalizations as well as regionally specific discussions regarding the issues of the agrarian question. These contributions to the literature of US agrarian history would enhance our knowledge and understanding of this significant period of political-economic transmutation and transformation. In sum, I think the methods of analysis used in this study, or possible variations thereof, are applicable not only to the area of
Battle Creek but also anywhere that the transition to agrarian capitalism is thought to have occurred.
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