
Article:
Nally, D. and Brooks, C. orcid.org/0000-0003-1580-045X (2018) From the Teen to the Green Revolution: American philanthropy and youth club work in Northern Europe. Journal of Historical Geography, 61. pp. 27-43. ISSN 0305-7488

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2018.03.002

Abbreviated title

From the Teen to the Green Revolution

Abstract

Established in 1923, the International Education Board (IEB) was a philanthropic organisation that aimed to sponsor and steer educational projects on a global scale. Extending the work of the General Education Board (GEB), which had organised development activities in the southern states of the USA, the IEB focused on improving the social and economic roots of society by supporting, on the one hand, scientific research (mainly through institution building and fellowships) while, on the other hand, funding and promoting rural modernisation through farm demonstration work. While the IEB's 'macro' programmes of institution building and fellowship creation have been capably studied, its role in developing rural capacities through 'micro' schemes of community development is much less well known. This paper therefore concentrates on farming education programmes trialled in the three Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Finland and Sweden. We argue that these village-level programmes of rural pedagogy, aimed at children and adolescents, were intended to inculcate new farming habits, dispositions and techniques to better synchronise young adults with the routines of scientific and industrial farming. Promoting youth club work, via farm demonstrations and home economics, the IEB aimed to reshape the social by directly engaging with the next generation of farmers in rural Europe. The precise targeting of teens, we finally argue, is indicative of a broader shift that saw agrarian reformers look beyond technics to the 'culture' within agri-culture, and in particular to the tactics that heighten youth receptivity and responsiveness. This deep interest in the 'how' of striving — by this we mean the actions, forces and intensities that spark human endeavour — was later refined and developed during the Green Revolution as villages and peasants across the globe were made the targets of philanthropic reforms. By inciting new embodied attachments and affective relations between youth and land philanthropists hoped to quell social upheaval and inject 'modern' entrepreneurial values into the countryside.

Key words

agriculture; affect; embodiment; green revolution; philanthropy; youth

> [W]hoever could make two ears of corn, or two blades of grass, to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country, than the whole race of politicians put together.
> — Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, 1726

> When a growing child studies a growing plant and strives to make something out of it, the results, both direct and indirect, are sure to be good.
> — O.B. Martin, The Demonstration Work, 1921

The International Education Board (IEB) was created in 1923 as a philanthropic organisation seeking 'to promote education on an international scale'.[1] The IEB followed in the footsteps of the General Education Board (GEB), another Rockefeller-funded philanthropy, created in 1903 to promote the economic development of the American South. The American South was marginalised from the economic centres of the east coast through deliberate policies that had maintained poverty across the region since the end of the American Civil War.[2] A heavy reliance on primary industries in the South, in particular agriculture, meant that the region lagged significantly behind the rest of the country. Concerned and perplexed by these perceived deficiencies, northern philanthropists and state officials turned to education and agricultural reform as a means to 'cure' these social maladies.[3]

The GEB sought to materially improve education, lobbying for compulsory schooling and promoting farm demonstration. The ultimate aim of these endeavours was to inspire greater levels of economic participation among the rural poor and consequently larger revenues through taxation as farmers became more economically productive.[4] According to Eric Anderson and Alfred Moss, reformers from the northern states felt the GEB was 'more flexible than governmental bureaus, less restricted in their choice of agents and advisers, more continuous in policy' and therefore an ideal organisation for advancing the long-term development of the South.[5] However, the GEB's charter prohibited any work being conducted outside the borders of the United

States. This restriction in charter, allied with a new desire to broaden the geographical scope of reform, forced a programme rethink that ultimately led to the internationalisation of philanthropic work first trialled in the domestic sphere.

Whilst the GEB has been the focus for several scholars exploring the links between philanthropy, education and social reform, this paper concentrates specifically on the work of the IEB in enabling and facilitating rural pedagogy through the deployment of farm demonstrations.[6] Improving agricultural productivity through farm demonstration provided an organising focus for the IEB, just as it had for the GEB. Demonstration operated through instructors who travelled to small towns and villages to physically show the application of new farming techniques and communicate the perceived advantages of embracing methods already adopted in other areas of the United States. The IEB decided to test this method in an international context, basing their work firstly in Denmark, before expanding and consolidating work with youth clubs and demonstration programmes in Sweden and Finland.

The core principle of demonstration, epitomised in the phrase 'learning by doing', reflected the pedagogical philosophy of the IEB's president Wickliffe Rose (1862-1931). Rose assumed the role of president of the GEB alongside his position at the IEB in 1923. Rose was a committed internationalist and only accepted John D. Rockefeller Jr's (1874-1960) invitation to head the GEB on condition that Rockefeller would also establish and fund an international board dedicated to global educational ambitions.[7] Underpinning Rose's philanthropic career was a particular philosophy of giving, which emphasised education as a process of personal and societal transformation. At the local scale, activities in villages and households focused on remaking social and agricultural norms to modernise the behaviour of individuals, whilst at the international scale philanthropic investment in university campuses, scientific fellowships, and financial support for laboratory and library building would foster international cooperation and the mutual exchange of cutting-edge scientific knowledge.

Philanthropy, through its support of education, formed a concerted effort to intervene in and reformulate how society functioned. The creation of new transnational organisations and international educational initiatives fuelled a mission to save society from the self-destruction wrought through conflict. Investment in public pedagogy

through youth clubs and farm demonstration, alongside broader educational exchanges, was thought to provide the first step toward social harmony and greater international understanding.[8] While geographers have shown how social institutions play important roles in forging the attitudes and competencies of children and youth, less examined are the micro-spaces of pedagogic practice — in our case, fields, gardens and kitchens — where new attachments (to seeds, machinery, inventories, accounting practices and cooking technologies for example) can be worked on, shaped and cemented.[9] One important aim of this paper, then, is to consider how philanthropists exploited the milieu of the farm to mould youth into productive citizens.

Seen in this way, the IEB's efforts to enrol youth in the modernisation of rural spaces is homologous with other cultural projects — from industrial schools to orphanages and scouting clubs to the girl guides — that variously sought to activate youthful potential, encourage 'moral' behaviour, and refashion political allegiances.[10] For instance, recent work by Sara Mills and Catherine Waite on the 'scalar politics' of making youth-citizens speaks to our concern with everyday spatial forms of interpellation that bound youth to new ontological positions.[11] It is clear too that the IEB framed youth as 'becomings, rather than beings', to adopt Mills and Waite's formulation, and that this framing underpins two developments that are central to the arguments presented in this paper. First, the elaboration of new pedagogical transactions — particularly a 'learning by doing' model of farm training — that consciously mobilised embodied and affective strategies to incite new behaviours and learned capacities. Second, the formation of spatial relationships that enlisted fields, kitchens and gardens in a politics of youth conversion.[12] The regulation of atmospheres, bodies and habitats, we contend, was a signal feature of efforts, led by Progressive-era reformers, to expand the logic of the market by turning disinterested youth into committed, industrious farm-workers. American philanthropists were some of the first to see the modernisation of rural habits as a necessary first step in the commercialisation of rural behaviour. Reformers sought models that would build self-confidence, heighten aspiration, facilitate innovation and increase farmers' practical know-how. They felt sure that the release of dormant potential would kick-start a cavalcade of benefits that would ultimately transform the material culture of society. Children and adolescent youth were deemed more pliant and impressionable and consequently rural instruction was designed to draw youthful bodies into circuits of coordinated, remunerative

activity. Finally, we argue that rural demonstrations did not just teach farmers how to transition to industrial farming; it also taught adventurous philanthropists that through targeted interventions it was possible to change the outlook and behaviour of particular communities. For this reason, we argue that the internationalisation of rural demonstration is an important, if overlooked, antecedent the Green Revolution, particularly the theories of social change and agricultural development that accompanied its 'technological package'. While Michael Latham is right to insist that the 'theory of modernization [popularised with the Green Revolution] first required a useful theory of society itself', we want to argue, somewhat against the grain, that early philanthropic efforts were a key moment in defining the parameters of future philanthropic engagement, including the very possibility of influencing the 'stages of growth' in rural settings.[13] The nomenclature of 'laggards' and 'innovators', so common to diffusionist theorists of the 1960s, was in many ways an updating of an older rhetoric of 'ambition' and 'capacity' that littered the writings of philanthropists working in the American South and later in the northern regions of Europe.[14] Before turning to the specifics of these early twentieth-century programmes, we first want to elaborate the historical context for philanthropic involvement in international education and rural reform.

WICKLIFFE ROSE'S BIRD OF PASSAGE: THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY

Today, organised philanthropy is a dynamic force shaping global lives, but it is important to recall that this role is relatively new. Andrew Carnegie's famous essay on Wealth (first published in 1889 and later known as The Gospel of Wealth) is often judged to be a watershed moment since it set out a programmatic vision of how entrepreneurs and social elites could and should reconfigure society through (discriminate) giving. This approach to philanthropic giving was predicated on diagnosing social problems and pioneering solutions that attended to 'root causes'. For the new breed of gilded entrepreneurs, including Rockefeller, Carnegie and Henry Ford, the problems of ill health, poor diet and ignorance could be addressed through the diligent and calculated benevolence of individuals who had a moral duty to maintain social order in the face of rapid urbanisation, industrial growth and the forging of a new international world order. Philanthropists — many of whom were responsible for

unleashing the social forces that they now sought to tame — thus cultivated an 'ameliorative disposition' that encouraged social intervention in the name of moral and material enlightenment.[15]

Specifically, philanthropists turned to education — understood in its broadest sense as incorporating both institutional and public forms of pedagogy — as a progressive agent in determining social change. This perspective is well encapsulated in Rockefeller's claim that 'ignorance is the source of a large part of the poverty and a vast amount of the crime in the world — hence the need of education. If we assist the highest forms of education — in whatever field — we secure the widest influence in enlarging the boundaries of human knowledge; for all the new facts discovered or set in motion become the universal heritage'.[16] Determined to help to 'develop the best', as Rockefeller official Raymond Fosdick (1883-1972) recognized, American philanthropists also 'had a firm hand in defining and strengthening what the best might be.'[17]

If education was the 'vehicle' for promoting change, then youth was often the 'target' of these strategic reforms. As Carnegie philanthropist and educationalist Nicholas Murray Butler (1862-1947) noted, adolescence was a 'period of plasticity', a labile stage for cultivating — literally as well figuratively — good habits in communities.[18] In particular, Butler saw the act of educating youth as a means of social renewal that would ward off generational decay and the gradual ruin of civil life (ideas that would remain a feature of future philanthropic thinking).[19] The sense that youth were the future incarnate is very evident in the work of Seaman Knapp (1833-1911), a farmer, writer and preacher, whose successes with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) brought him to the attention of staff at the GEB and Wickliffe Rose in particular.[20]

Knapp brought an astonishing simplicity to the issue of 'southern development'. In his view, intergenerational poverty was the determining cause of rural misery, and to address this problem, farm yield and farmer productivity must be raised. Since most farmers were bound to familiar but inefficient methods of cultivation, the crucial task was to guide them away from traditional methods toward modern, scientific practices. Where Knapp excelled was in developing techniques of persuasion. It was no use, he

reasoned, to preach science to poor illiterate farmers; the superiority of scientific practices must be demonstrated to farmers on the farm and within the farm homestead where the benefits could be readily observed and imitated. With support from the USDA and funds from the GEB, Knapp began developing a 'toolkit' for modernising farms.[21]

At the heart of everything Knapp accomplished lay his philosophy of 'teaching by doing'. Girls' and boys' clubs were a particularly striking innovation. Through these clubs, youth were taught corn growing, poultry rearing, bread making, canning, the cultivation of vegetable gardens and 'home economics'. Competitions were encouraged and prizes were awarded for best practice. Rose was very aware of Knapp's teaching methods and immediately grasped the power of demonstration as a method for disseminating science in society. In a letter to Dr. Charles Wardell Stiles, a zoologist and expert on hookworm, Rose outlined his own experience of 'teaching by doing' in the arena of public health:

> The whole work is essentially educational: it is teaching people by demonstration. The field directors [all medical practitioners] carry out work among the people. They tell the story of the disease in varied graphic forms and in terms so simple that the common man, though he be illiterate, may see and understand. They use cases as object-lesson; they point out the gross clinical symptoms in these cases; they show specimens of the patients' stools and exhibit eggs of the parasite under the microscope; they show the parasites that have been expelled by the treatment administered; and by means of the microscope they exhibit the living, squirming embryos that live by teeming thousands in the soil that has been befouled by the infected persons. The teams gave lectures illustrated by lantern slides and other demonstrations, but the microscope was more eloquent than any of them.[22]

Crucially, demonstration is thought of here as an 'eloquent' assemblage — bringing together stools, eggs, parasites and soils — to generate new meanings and appreciations of infection, but also, of course, inciting new prophylactic measures and practices.[23] In much the same way that microscopes were made an 'object-lesson' in public health,

Rose felt that farm machinery, seeds and animals could be mobilised in pedagogical experiments to move the 'common man' toward enlightened self-understanding and improved everyday praxis. In technology Rose discovered 'a type of rhetoric, an argument in the form of an object'.[24]

American youth proved receptive to these experiments and it was noted that their involvement and successes kick-started wider reforms as siblings and parents observed first-hand the practical application of new habits. These observations fired reformers to develop 'model farms' and 'mobile schools' demonstrating the importance of new growing practices (the application of fertiliser, regular irrigation, crop spacing and so on). Targeted campaigns to sanitise homes ('clean-up week'), promote nutrition ('drink more milk' campaigns), and plant new seeds (varietal competitions) were used to instil a spirit of change in the countryside. Media technologies, including radio, print and theatrical film, were used to arouse enthusiasm for the movement. Observing Knapp's progress, Rose saw that small nudges in attitude and outlook could inspire large social transformations. The important point was to have a model or system whose advantages could be easily demonstrated and transferred.[25]

Transposing these educational activities to the international stage was central to Rose's vision of creating a global citizenry committed to the ordered, rational planning of society. In line with other Rockefeller philanthropies, Rose outlined a 'pump-priming' role for the IEB in that it would 'contribute to nothing that could be provided for by local funds', nor would it commit to furnish funds — even for the most worthy causes — in perpetuity.[26] Rose sketched his philosophy of educational philanthropy in a short memo entitled, Education on an International Scale, Rose outlined his philosophy of educational philanthropy. [27] This document provides the most comprehensive reference point for the work undertaken by the IEB during its most active years from 1923 to 1928. Rose's identified five areas that he deemed essential for a successful educational movement. First, he argued that education should be supported primarily through institutions and structured programmes. Second, he argued that social development ought to have a scientific basis in research. Third, Rose argued for a non-hierarchical model. As much as possible education should be participatory at all levels of society and contribute to the development of citizenship. Fourth, Rose emphasised the catalytic role of American philanthropy: 'non-governmental

institutions serve an important purpose; they have greater freedom for initiative and experiment; they thus serve to stimulate and guide governmental effort'. This last point dovetailed with his fifth principle: that the best philanthropy functions as a 'bird of passage'. The philanthropist should not provide grants in perpetuity — since this would only reinforce dependent poverty — but should instead aim to steer enlightened reform.

Rose's 'bird of passage' metaphor depicts the philanthropists as a broker of scientific collaboration and international accord. Yet within his memo is the suggestion that science is central to the articulation and extension of state power:

> 1. This is an age of science. All-important fields of activity, from the breeding of bees to the administration of an empire, call for an understanding of the spirit and technique of modern science. 2. The nations that do not cultivate the sciences cannot hope to hold their own; must take an increasingly subordinate place; must become more and more a drag to general progress; and must in the end be dominated by the more progressive states even though these states do not seek to dominate. 3. The nations now cultivating the sciences are but a small minority of the peoples of the world. 4. It should be feasible to extend the field for the cultivation and the service of science almost indefinitely. 5. Promotion of the development of science in a country is germinal; it affects the entire system of education and carries with it the remaking of civilization.[28]

There is also more than hint of social Darwinism in this passage as modern science is linked to cultural evolution through a host of organic metaphors (breeding, cultivating and germinating). In Rose's mind people, like crops, could be nurtured to produce desired properties and traits. 'The soil', he wrote pointedly, 'is the ultimate source of national wealth and upon its wise and efficient utilization national well-being largely depends'.[29] Together, philanthropy, science and education could, as it were, grow the future. Indeed, all that was needed was the right person to plant Rose's ideas on virgin soils.

RURAL PEDAGOGY AS A TOOL OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

On Tuesday 13th of February 1923, Soren Sorensen, the agricultural attaché of the Danish legation in Washington, joined Rose and Wallace Buttrick (1853-1926), secretary to the GEB, for an evening dinner at the prestigious Cosmos Club. Founded in 1878 to advance 'science, literature, the arts and public service', the private social club was an inspired location for a meeting to discuss the terms for future collaboration between American philanthropists and the Danish government.[30] A prior conference with Sorensen in December, plus ad hoc meetings with officials, convinced Rose that Denmark offered the 'most favorable conditions for first demonstration abroad'.[31] Since receiving a green light to pursue his agenda on international philanthropy, Rose had been busy contemplating where best to begin implementing his vision of agrarian development. Scandinavia emerged as likely site because of existing connections via the USDA, but equally important was the belief that Denmark was committed to democracy, individualism, enlighten education and industrialization, values that Rose felt were 'germinal' for social progress. It was the assumption of common values and aspirations that convinced the board that they had unearthed a new frontier 'primed' for change. Denmark, the board noted, was the 'most highly developed in general intelligence, in agriculture, in cooperative activities, in democratic government'.[32] Rose, who personally visited Denmark as part of a wider European tour in 1923, wrote: 'I came away with a very warm place in my heart for … these countries are physically attractive and their people are a fine stock; fine unspoiled animals'.[33] A properly conducted programme based in Scandinavia could serve as a symbol of accomplishment as well as 'a training center from which to extend the service to other non-Slavic European countries'.[34]

The pledge of Rockefeller support must have been music to Sorensen's ears. Commissioned to study US efforts to promote rural development, Sorensen had only recently returned from several months touring rural America where he observed first-hand the popularity of youth club work. One output from those travels was a lengthy report for the Danish government in which he lavished praise on programmes of instruction devised to teach children 'independence and economic responsibility' and to make agricultural life 'more attractive' for the next generation of farmers.[35] Sorensen was keenly aware of Knapp's pioneering work as well as the crucial backing provided by the GEB. Knapp's genius, Sorensen readily grasped, was to wage a quiet revolution against tradition and parental authority. Whereas adults tended to resist the forces of

modernisation, adolescents and youth — when properly instructed — would support and adopt new farming practices. Moreover, their exuberance and enthusiasm, not to mention their considerable successes in applying the principles of scientific farming, meant that adults soon saw the advantages of modern techniques over traditional methods. The spectacle of 'Champion Boys' and 'Champion Girls' embracing the tenets of self-improvement and the 'spirit of competition' filled Sorensen with hope. He posted Rose a copy of his report and made clear his view that the idea behind the 'intellectual awakening' Americans was eminently portable. The time was 'ripe', Sorensen added, for planting club work in Denmark.[36]

As we have seen, these conversations took place at a time when Rose was already in discussion with his colleagues about widening philanthropic activity to include overseas operations. He was not alone in this vision. Frederick T. Gates, confidant and advisor to John D. Rockefeller, also framed the philanthropist's mission in avowedly global terms.[37] However, the shock and material disruption caused by the First World War — halting international trade, disrupting production and impeding the flow of scientific exchange — made geopolitical arguments central to debates about the merits of operating internationally.[38] Notwithstanding some differences of opinion, most reformers saw governing the global borderlands, especially the rural fringe, as a first step in a larger campaign to ensure order and lasting peace.

Soon after their deliberations at the Cosmos Club, Sorensen appealed to the Danish government to formally request the assistance of the IEB in establishing local programmes dedicated to farm demonstration work.[39] Meanwhile, Rose sought to secure the service of Frantz P. Lund, a Danish émigré and employee of the USDA, whom he and Buttrick had spoken with regarding the prospects of running a GEB-style programme in Europe. Lund was exactly the kind of dedicated and conscientious administrator that Rose sought: schooled in languages and the natural sciences, and an admirer of Bishop Nikolaj Grundtvig, a Lutheran minister who helped found 'folk schools' to prepare schoolchildren for active participation in national life. Lund mixed Christian ideals with a remarkable faith in the curative powers of science and technology. '[T]he greatest thing any one [sic] could do in the world,' declared Lund, 'was to serve humanity and to help the great masses to secure better homes, better education, better understanding of life, and to help them get nearer to their Creator.'[40]

Crucially Lund had also encountered Knapp's teaching methods. Shortly after moving to the United States in the mid 1890s, Lund was approached by the Danish Peoples' Society of America to help found a colony, later known as 'Danevang', in southern Texas. Accepting the challenge, Lund remained with the colony for eight years, serving as a preacher, teacher and agricultural advisor. After his eye-opening stint at Danevang, he moved briefly to the Virgin Islands to take up the post of principal at an all-boys high school, before finally settling again in Texas, where he was hired to superintend an experimental farm. During his sojourns in Texas and the Virgin Islands, Lund experimented with preserving fruits, meat and fish, later teaching locals these new methods. It was this work as a quasi-itinerant farm instructor that eventually brought Lund into contact with Knapp. 'While he impressed me strongly', Lund confessed to Rose, 'I did not see the value of his educational system until I was at the Virgin Islands. My contact with the colored population there (in my school I had pupils of all shades from pure white to darkest black) caused me to realize the practical value of his ideas, although I had unconsciously applied many of them, while working to improve conditions for the new settlers at Danevang, Texas'.[41] Knapp tirelessly preached that the real value of demonstration was its ability to both reach and teach recalcitrant subjects: those deemed less able, rather than less willing, to embrace progressive change. Having travelled and personally mentored peoples of 'all shades', Lund had observed first-hand the challenge of instructing people thought to have radically different competencies and capacities.[42] Knowledge of such differences — which, significantly, Lund racialized — fed the conviction that reformers ought to adopt a gradated approach to rural development.[43] Evidently bodies were not equally sensate or able to absorb 'impressions', and therefore reformatory action needed to engage in subtle but significant acts of human sorting and classification.[44] Thus, judgements over 'the capacity for capacity' were a means of inscribing bodies with racial and gendered identities as well as sanctioning new forms of social, moral and economic stewardship.[45]

Sorensen agreed that Lund was the right person to direct the programme, and after another luncheon at the Cosmos Club in May, a memorandum of understanding was drawn up and the IEB applied to the US Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, to secure his release for one year (without pay) to begin work in Denmark. In typical

fashion Rose empowered Lund to determine the precise arrangements for the programme.[46] Earlier conferences and correspondence made clear that Rose hoped to extend the work to other European countries, but when and how this should be done was still to be decided. Lund was made aware that the IEB always worked in partnership with governments and local authorities, and since funding and support from the board was finite, the expectation was that after a determined period — in which the programmes had convincingly demonstrated their success — control of operations would cede to local public authorities. Thus, the goal of philanthropy was to act as 'mother and nurse' to new pedagogies, projects and practices. In theory, funding would end with the realization of a permanent public infrastructure dedicated to promoting development in rural areas. Indeed, as Rose saw it, the task of philanthropy was to be a 'partner not a patron', and to aid states in 'organizing and bringing into activity their own forces'.[47] While 'self-help' was considered both the means and ends of successful planning, the policy always assumed that poor and peripheral peoples were ill-equipped to supervise their own development.[48]

BEGINNINGS: DENMARK

Lund arrived in Copenhagen on the 18th of September, 1923 and lost no time in becoming acquainted with leaders on Danish agricultural matters.[49] After a convivial meeting with Thomas Madsen-Mygdal, the minster for agriculture, Lund visited the Danish Agricultural Council — where he met with local businesses, newspaper editors and academics from various agricultural colleges — before undertaking an extensive speaking tour on the benefits of club work.[50]

Lund formed impressions quickly. Although keen to stress the importance of indigenous efforts to engage the youth in agriculture, he hastened to add that existing programmes lacked central coordination and an overarching vision.[51] Privately, he complained to Rose that farm boys were typically hired out and put to work without ever being told how to work or why one way of working was better than another. This inevitably led to the acquisition of 'poor habits'. The agricultural schools and colleges he visited were no better: dusty, 'theoretical knowledge' designed for the benefit of 'scholars' bore no relationship to the practicalities and daily requirements of family

farms.[52] Notwithstanding giant technological strides, Lund found that nothing had been done to 'lighten and simplify womens' [sic] work', and consequently, rural girls 'carried on traditional work similar to what was done 50 years ago'.[53] There was, he concluded, 'no definite idea about how to carry into practical life the teaching of home economics to the people at large. Social conditions, class distinction and education, old traditions, the difficulty in approaching the home itself, financial conditions, all conspire to make the work exceedingly hard.'[54] In short, work had been undertaken, but it lacked professionalism and a programmatic vision.

A fresh approach was needed and this is precisely what Lund proposed in the budget and plan of work he presented to the board for approval. The strategy was to train field agents in the art of demonstration and to set them to work in 'favorable communities' where the programmes stood the best chance of success and were therefore more likely to serve as a model for neighbourly emulation.[55] Adopting the American demonstration model, activities would be sharply differentiated by gender: the girls would undertake gardening and other work that 'can be expected to fall under the housemother's sphere', while boys were taught to grow commercial crops and engage in profit-making activities on the farm. Lund also suggested a chronological order for the introduction of new tasks and activities. For girls, the work would begin with demonstrations in home economics. Later, after harvest time, the young women would receive instruction on how to preserve and store produce from the farm. For boys, club work typically started with garden and field crops, but would eventually expand to include more complex tasks such as animal breeding and husbandry. In the winter, the work would concentrate on livestock and dairy farming (sectors that had witnessed a marked intensification since the mid nineteenth century), whereas in the summer months arable farming and horticulture were prioritised.[56]

In letters and reports to Rose, Lund outlined his hopes and expectations for the work as well as his anxieties about future conflict. These letters offer striking insights into the theory of change he was developing. At what rate, Lund wondered, do local populations process and absorb alien ideas, practices and habits? Moreover, are such absorption rates open to control and discrete manipulation? Clearly partnerships were necessary to ensure the work could begin quickly and remain in place when the IEB withdrew, but Lund worried that local groups outside his control might become

flashpoints for resistance, a home for 'fractious' elements to organise and disrupt or slow the work.[57] While the Danish minster of agriculture had promised his personal help in preventing 'premature criticism', Lund was especially anxious to make a swift and successful start.[58] After careful deliberation Jutland was chosen as the optimal site to launch club work. '[A] large part of Jutland has recently been brought under culture after having laid for centuries as heath', Lund explained. Indeed, 'the conditions resembled more new settlements in America; there was little or no social distinction between children and servants; and there was more willingness to attempt anything that might make it possible for the young people to increase their earning capacity'.[59] Embodying the spirit of the 'New' rather the 'Old World', Jutland seemed to Lund to be free of the crust of custom, not to mention the sparks of protest that might unsettle a new agricultural programme. Here was a place, he felt, where philanthropists could shape social structures with greater license — and crucially, less resistance. This granular approach, particularly the use of controlled micro-settings or 'enclaves', was distinctive feature of IEB's designs.[60] Working at the local scale — in village communities and even within homes — strengthened the philanthropists' conviction that they were stitching their ideas in the very fabric of society.

Lund spent the next few months on the 'constant go'.[61] He delivered lectures, made introductions, authored pamphlets and stepped up his inspection of local agricultural and horticulture societies. Beginning in January 1924 he also set up short courses for training demonstrators in home economics and pressed local associations to supply additional personnel to assist with the programme.[62] In addition, Lund also rolled up his sleeves and engaged in propaganda work. At a regional fair in Haderslev, for example, he built and demonstrated a kitchen 'display' showcasing the latest labour-saving devices used in American homesteads. Lund's bespoke kitchen included a cabinet, teacart, fireless cooker, iceless refrigerator, sponge box, cupboard (to house preserved fruits and vegetables) and ironing cabinet **[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]**. 'Nothing expensive or elaborate was shown', he informed the board. In his view, most of the appliances could be made by 'any village carpenter or by any intelligent boy who had had elementary training using saw, plane and hammer'.[63]Mimicking field-based demonstrations, these expositions were conceptualised as moments of ambient production and socialisation. On the face of it, Lund and his team were demonstrating the uses of practical devices, such as steam pressure canners and food preservation

tools. However, the real aim was to bring notions of efficiency, planning and standardisation to rural homes by fostering attachments to new home appliances.[64] Much of the power of the club method, as Gabriel Rosenberg has noted, was the ability to present modern, technocratic solutions in non-threatening theatrical forms.[65]

Thirteen sites were initially chosen for club work and more than twenty agents were dispatched to teach the new farm programme.[66] To participate in club work rural youth had to be at least ten and typically no more than twenty-two years old. Club workers were expected to secure their own land, usually between one hundred and five hundred square metres for garden work and at least one hundred square metres for field plants. Ideally, these experimental plots were located on the home farm or nearby ('this way the work becomes more personal'), but in cases where plots could not be procured, leased ground was supplied.[67] On garden plots, club workers were shown how to grow celery, peas, beans, root crops, cabbage, cucumbers, pumpkins and strawberries; in the fields, the youth learned how to plant and tend various root crops (potatoes, rutabagas, sugar beets and carrots) as well as chicory, oats, barley and mangold. Record keeping was mandatory and assiduously monitored: each member received a booklet with the 'main rules' for cultivation as well as log pages for club workers to record crop yields, product sales, expenditures, fertiliser usage, observations on disease and pest management and rotation cycles.[68] These logs and records acted as a stimulant to self-study by encouraging the youth to continuously quantify and evaluate their activity and performance. Learning methods were self-consciously styled in opposition to the 'stilted pedagogy' thought to characterise the lecture hall and classroom.[69] By demonstrating the everyday, 'practical utility' of quantification Lund and his army of field agents were slowly and methodically immersing the youth in what Rosenberg terms the 'epistemology of the industrial agriculture'.[70]

By July 1924 Lund's small cadre of demonstrators had enrolled more than 500 boys and girls in club work; by 1926 there were 2,089 members, of which 1,366 were boys and 723 were girls [INSERT **FIGURE 2 HERE]** [71] Lund wrote in confident terms to the IEB and separately compiled a report for the Danish government extolling the unique brand of cultural pedagogy being rolled out in the Danish countryside. The 'underlying principle' of the work was to train rather than teach, to instil good habits through 'competent instruction', rather than hectoring and cajoling the youth.[72]

Targeting adolescents was a deliberate strategy designed to shape the social orientation of the next generation.[73] In a revealing and quite typical passage, Lund likened these 'future citizens' to crops that could be raised and improved through careful husbandry:

> The age of adolescence is more suited to physical work than to studying, and the peculiar psychological instincts or inclinations present during this time are rightly led to and utilized in the development of the young person himself both as an individual and as a future citizen. It has again and again been experienced that the young people who take part in club work grow and develop mentally just as fast or faster than the crops they cultivate.[74]

In much the same way that plant scientists manipulate environments to control and enhance biotic life, rural reformers thought they could 'cultivate' the agrarian citizens of tomorrow. The much-fêted 'plasticity' of youth, so central to IEB's international programme, was made an instrumentality in a wider project of orientating what Stephanie Olsen's terms an 'incipient citizenry'.[75] The objectives of socialization were clear from the beginning: to overcome the enervating forces of custom; to re-make the domestic economy of families; to inspire confidence in agricultural technologies; to impart the principles of scientific cultivation; and to shift from subsistence living to commodity production. The field reports presented to the IEB were peppered with glowing testimony from agents 'amazed' to witness new habits and attitudes filter through the countryside. Observers were encouraged to see that the youth were learning to handle money and that they now seemed to appreciate what one agent termed the 'remunerativeness' of the farming enterprise.[76] 'Their sense of economy has received an often needed shove in the right direction', commented Viggo Kristensen, a demonstration agent working near Brønderslev, a small north Jutland town.[77] Other agents remarked positively on the new interest in farm activity, noting the pull of independent earnings meant the youth were now less disposed to spend time in 'idle' leisure.

A central plank of the work was to enable the youth to undertake tasks for themselves. From planting seed to disbursing fertilizer, club workers were expected to develop — through engagement and participation — their capacity for intelligent self-direction.[78] Moreover club work, as embodied practice, was specifically designed to

activate and nurture feelings of pride, ambition and self-fulfilment.[79] Discovering independence through economic responsibility, and reward through endeavour, taught young people to see farming as a freedom-enhancing enterprise as well as a source of personal growth and satisfaction. Through feats of extrapolation, adolescents learnt that to experiment on the farm was to experiment on the self. Youth were encouraged to see personhood as a continuous, therapeutic project — the first step toward what Lund termed 'progressive economical development'.[80]

Of course, the bigger picture was social rather than personal transformation. At the centre of the project stood the adolescent as an 'instrument' or 'catalyst' — to use the preferred idiom of philanthropists — in the reorientation of rural relations. This theory of change can be traced to Knapp:

> It is realized that the great force which readjusts the world originates in the home. Home conditions will ultimately mold the man's life. The home eventually controls the viewpoint of man; and you do all that you are a mind to do in the schools, but unless you reach in and get hold of that home and change its conditions you are nullifying the uplift of the school. We are reaching for the home. The matter of paramount importance in the world is the readjustment of the home. It is the greatest problem with which we have to deal, because it is the most delicate and most difficult of all problems.[81]

Here the home is configured as an elusive social object — a 'delicate problem' that requires careful and discerning mediation. Knapp's answer to the difficulties of access was to reverse the flow of custom by having teens train adults.[82] Thus the girls' work was performed in the home where adults could follow the new methods, while boys' work was carried out in fields — on or adjacent to the family farm — where parents could easily observe progress. Initially many parents viewed their children's 'work' with wearied indulgence and, in some cases, outright scorn, but as allotments matured and homes were refashioned into functional, efficient spaces, the adults, who resented being unfavourably compared with children, soon admitted (at least in Lund's version of events) the usefulness and superiority of modern techniques.[83] Indeed, in much the same way that the agents consciously used 'pride' to stimulate youthful cooperation, they now mobilised 'shame' to coax adults to emulate their children's habits. This

potent cocktail of pride and shame — what Lisa Malkki describes as 'intimate affect management' — was the animating force driving club work.[84] Thus, Lund's reports are peppered with Damascene conversions: idle adolescents metamorphose into entrepreneurial youths and doubting parents reappear as 'enthusiastic believers' in modern science.[85] In one district, for example, Lund reported the near-complete destruction of the potato harvest by blight — the exception being the crop raised by local boys who followed the agent's advice to immunise their fields by spraying (Lund hastened to add that these diligent club members later sold their harvest 'at a fancy price' as temporary scarcity gripped local markets).[86] As ever, he tended to present such anecdotes as convincing evidence that American agricultural science could be transplanted to Danish soil. 'Such results', he wrote, arouse 'considerable comment and are the best means of securing increased interest in club work'.[87]

EXPANSION: SWEDEN

The following season Lund added three objectives to the IEB's programme: first, to expand the ambition and reach of the Danish work; second, to ensure the responsibility for the programme would be assumed locally (and as soon as possible); and finally, to use the Danish work as a catalyst for a pan-Nordic campaign of farm education. Expanding the Danish programme seemed to be a relatively straightforward task. By the end of 1925, club membership had tripled to 1,618 participants (1,120 boys and 498 girls), and Lund was now regularly submitting reports to the Danish ministry, Rose and the IEB.[88] Mindful that the IEB considered itself a 'partner, not a patron', Lund constantly emphasized the respect shown to existing customs and mores, even as the clubs expressly targeted both for reform. 'In the adaptation of the young people's work to Danish conditions', Lund wrote, 'it has been the object to have the work appear not as something foreign which in ready-made form was introduced and forced upon the country young people, but to apply the underlying principles in such a way that the whole work with the young people would grow and develop slowly and in a natural way, as if it had its origin in the very soil and national character of the Danish people'.[89] Appearances mattered, and Lund was keen to ensure that the IEB's mission could not be construed as an enterprise in appropriation and control.

The opportunity to expand the board's work came in the summer of 1924 when the Jordbrukare-Ungdomens Förbund (JUF), a newly-minted youth agricultural federation, approached Lund about beginning club work in Sweden. Privately Lund described the JUF as a poor 'imitation' of the board's youth club programme.[90] It failed, he said, to 'go down to the very fundamentals', and he was concerned by the 'aristocratic feeling of superiority among men of the more educated classes towards the farm population'.[91] However, in the countryside among the farmers themselves 'I met greater understanding as to the value of the work … than I had dared hope for, and this gives faith as to the future'.[92] Rose urged cautious collaboration, reminding Lund that 'work in one or two places well accomplished is a more effective demonstration than forced progress over a large area'.[93] He shared Lund's worries about the gulf between the 'educated classes' and the 'farm population', but viewed the 'proper training of native persons to direct this work' as the obvious antidote.[94] To ensure the programme's long-term viability the trainers needed to use the methods of 'personal help, instruction and guidance that [are] so important and essential in our work in the United States'.[95] The JUG seemed keen to support Lund's pedagogic mission. Because 'farming [in Sweden] is not [held] in high esteem, is often fighting against economical difficulties, and the young people seek in large numbers to go from this to other things', they wrote, it was important 'to create in the members love for their home community knowledge … received through person[al] studies of the community and environment'.[96]

It was agreed that work in Sweden, as in Denmark, would commence on the principle that the agricultural societies in each county (län) would fund, in whole or in part, the salary of club agents. On this point, Rose was emphatic: from the very beginning the work had to be undertaken on the clear understanding that the IEB would be a 'bird of passage'. Initially the work was modest and confined to Skaraborg län where club agents guided 114 youth, spread across ten clubs, in horticulture and arable farming. As in Denmark all boys and girls over the age of ten could participate in the clubs, provided they could secure the requisite farmland [INSERT **FIGURE 3 HERE]**. Again, the field crops included mangels, rutabagas, turnips and carrots; on the garden plots, potatoes, strawberries and field peas were trialled. Lund complained that it was often difficult to secure the parents' consent to let the boys follow the agent's instructions, particularly regarding the application of fertilizer.[97] In addition, the support structures for commercial agricultural were in an infant state and basic farming

equipment proved difficult to acquire. Still, Lund hoped that his agents' pedagogic labours would overcome these deeper infrastructural problems.

The following year Lund undertook a lecturing tour to raise consciousness. He also authorized the commencement of club work in Hallands län, arranged for Swedish agents to travel to Denmark to observe and learn from the work there, and prepared and published a pamphlet 'written to meet a demand for an explanation of club work, its underlying principles, its introduction into Europe, and its adaptation to Swedish conditions'.[98] The impetus for club work, the pamphlet professed, did not come from theory, but from practical problems and from the youth themselves: 'Club work seeks not only to develop the material side of life, but to awaken a feeling within the young people in regard to the place they are to occupy in the future in whatever community they may chance to belong'.[99] And it was clear from the remainder of the pamphlet that it was in the countryside that the youth primarily belonged: 'To a nation where agriculture is a main resource, the problem of how best to awaken and hold the interest of its boys and girls in this particular means of livelihood, must ever be a problem outstanding in significance'.[100] Above all the pamphlet promoted the idea that club work stirred and channelled desire, placing it firmly in the service of rural reform and national development. Ultimately it was 'eagerness and initiative' that made one plot of soil more productive than another. Similarly, nurturing 'higher level[s] of growth and accomplishment' would yield better citizens. It is clear, then, that pleasure — the small gratifications discovered in setting and realizing goals — was a crucial, if somewhat intangible, ingredient in shaping felicitous outcomes.[101]

Lund's campaigns grew as more counties established youth clubs [INSERT **FIGURE 4 HERE]**. By 1926 the membership numbered 294 youths (87 girls and 207 boys) attached to 26 clubs. The membership more than tripled in the third year to 1,036 youth participants; the following year, 1928, it doubled again to a final tally 2,074 youths [**INSERT TABLE 1 HERE].** Activities also increased. Films produced in the United States were screened to the youth and proved enormously popular.[102] Animal husbandry — bee keeping as well as raising calves, sheep, colts, chickens, geese, ducks and rabbits — was added, and agents trained in home economics began instructing girls in 'the rudiments of baking, the preparation of palatable, cheap and nourishing meals from home-grown products, the value of vegetables in the daily diet, and the

preservation of food by canning, salting and drying'.[103] These efforts at home-making were doubly significant in the board's eyes. By introducing economic values into homes, agents saw themselves as replacing subsistence principles with the ideals of industry and commerce. In this way, non-capitalist social formations were remade into sites of remunerative enterprise. But more than this, the home was also conceived of as a site of social reproduction, a space critical to the gendered reconstitution of society.[104] In the field 'men' as well as crops were grown; in the home agents entertained the belief that they were nursing the future into existence.[105] If plants could be 'domesticated', then so could the occupants of homes. In other words, society, configured as 'unmoulded clay', to borrow a phrase from Arathi Sriprakash, could be shaped and sculpted by the board's army of agents and rural instructors.[106]

Gratified by the progress made during the first year of its operations, Rose was nevertheless anxious to transfer the expense and administration of club work to local authorities. The youth had been 'roused' in field and home, but the challenge was to ensure that local elites were alert to their responsibilities as stewards of the future. 'The transfer of technical responsibility is a comparatively simple thing', Rose commented, but 'the transfer of the substantial responsibility for carrying out the principles and details of the demonstrated program is not so easy'.[107] The desire to cede executive powers to local agents was the kernel of meaning in Rose's gnomic phrase 'bird of passage', but the timing of his interjection was significant, for the board had recently approved Lund's request to expand club work to the neighbouring 'frontier' state of Finland.[108] On the one hand, expansion was read as a sign of success; on the other, it raised the spectre of overreach — a predicament that Rockefeller staff nicknamed 'scatteration' — and the concomitant concern that the IEB might have to bankroll the long-term development of the Nordic states. Keen to prevent either outcome, Rose reiterated his conviction that the principal objective of philanthropy was to 'prime the pump' rather than act as a permanent reservoir: 'I am particularly interested to see that the work in Finland is being started under the general supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture. This ties the government to the work at once and guarantees their understanding interest from the beginning. This is fundamentally important'.[109] These stipulations made clear that philanthropy could be a goad to, but never a surrogate for, independent statecraft.

CONSOLIDATION: FINLAND

The seeds for IEB involvement in Finland were planted in 1925 when, not long after work had begun in Denmark, Lund received a request from the Mannerheim League for Child Welfare to visit Finland and lecture on the theme of boys' and girls' club work and its 'adaptation to European conditions'.[110] The American club model of promoting scientific farming had already attracted positive press in Finland. In addition to the circulation of American pamphlets, Arthus Rindell, professor of agriculture and the chancellor of Åbo University, published a special study of club work and publicly called for its local introduction 'under experienced guidance'. Lund arranged a conference with Mannerheim and the Finnish minister for agriculture at which it was agreed to seek IEB approval to initiate a club program in Finland. The board considered and approved the request in the autumn of 1925, and it was agreed that work would commence the following spring.[111]

Lund began the work with customary zest. In the first year, he fixed on just three districts where his agents introduced local youths to scientific methods for growing garden and field crops. After a season of instruction, the youths were trained in the techniques of animal husbandry (pigs, calves and chickens), while the more experienced youth were encouraged to experiment with rotation patterns, new fertilizer regimes and novel crops. In Vörå, for example, several of the older club members, 'as a side line', ran experimental fields of alfalfa, barley, beets and improved pasture grass.[112] Apart from onions and potatoes, Lund observed, vegetables were 'practically unknown' in local diets. 'Suddenly this year by the magic of club work there appeared 111 beautiful garden plots with an abundance of fine vegetables, many of which the inhabitants had never dreamed of being able to successfully grow'. [113] The home economics work mirrored this pattern of persistent, incremental improvement. In groups of five to ten, the girls learned methods of food preservation and storage, 'simple lessons in nutrition' as well as basic accounting (monitoring farm income and expenditure). As the remit of tasks expanded so too did youth membership, the number of districts involved, and the sum of agricultural agents employed (INSERT TABLE 2 HERE).

In his annual reports to the IEB Lund continued to provide testimony from parents and agricultural agents on the progress of the rural youth. One Finnish mother told how her daughters matured and developed through the pull of emulation:

> Our daughters have through club work learned how to grow many vegetables that we never before have been able to grow, and they have also learned how to use them on the daily diet, and how to can them for winter use. They often speak of Maja, the club girl that we saw in the film from America, and they have decided that they are going to work very hard and learn all the things that she knows how to do, in order to become just as competent a club girl as she is.[114]

Another farmer described how home and character were transformed together: 'I find this club work very useful because it imbues the children with the spirit of agriculture. Our daughter has through her club work also beautified the home surroundings, and is so happy in her club work that she no longer finds any pleasure in merely running around the countryside in her spare time'.[115] A further witness described the economization of habits that commenced with club activity: 'Our son pays almost all his school expenses with his club money. This summer I often found him sitting beside his tomatoes, figuring out how much money he would be able to make on them'.[116] If the birth of a cadre of committed and enterprising youth was celebrated, no less gratifying was the knowledge that the work was inspiring independent, auxiliary activities: banks and private individuals provided funds for excursions and prizes; health workers, impressed by the focus on diet and nutrition, lent their support to the work; a nationwide home economics group, known as the Martha Association, began using club work to promote 'home improvements', 'home gardening' and 'home industry'; and, in the districts along the Russian border where several industries were located, factory owners became interested in the IEB's 'educational movement' and sought Lund's help to establish 'factory villages' to interest youth in agriculture and 'thus divert surplus labor into this important industry'.[117] But most pleasing to Rose's ear was the news in November 1928 that the Finnish authorities approved the founding of a central authority to administer club work [INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE]. In that year, the Finnish parliament granted 300,000 Finnish marks ($7,615) for the continued

'support and maintenance' of club work. As a 'bird of passage' the IEB had proven its worth.[118]

CONCLUSIONS: PHILANTHROPY UNBOUND

In his officially commissioned retrospective on the IEB, historian George Gray stated that Rose's lasting achievement was to think strategy always in 'planetary terms': 'His effort was constantly to break the boundaries of parochialism and lay the plans in accordance with world patterns'.[119] According to Raymond Fosdick, sometime president of the Rockefeller Foundation, Rose 'had the mind of a general, and he wanted a broad area in which to maneuver, because anything less than that would be ineffective. He thought of the world as a field of strategy'.[120] The 'strategic' and 'planetary' were certainly hallmarks of Rose's philosophy of giving. Rose believed that agriculture was one of the building blocks of civilization and it was the duty of science, supported by the largesse of wealthy donors, to assist the material and moral advancement of less developed societies. This model of development, based on education and agricultural growth, was honed in the American South by the founders of the GEB, but the tragedy of the First World War — coupled with the success of the Rockefeller-supported International Health Board — emboldened Rose and his colleagues to consider the world as their laboratory.[121] If donors organised strategically, philanthropy could become a means to 'heal the dissension of nations' as well as an instrumentality in the shaping of future public life.[122]

In total, the IEB contributed some $295,500 (more than $4 million today) to club and demonstration work in the three Scandinavian states. While club and demonstration work was just a small part of a larger programme sponsoring scientific research, fellowship exchange and the building of educational institutions, it was nevertheless central to Rose's grand strategy. The stated aim of this work was not to replace government, but rather to incite it to act in novel ways. As the IEB's representative on the ground, it was Lund's job to prove the social value of American-style farm demonstration work. This he accomplished through propaganda, but also through the assemblage of facts and statistics which lionized the clubs' achievements. As we have shown, Lund meticulously recorded membership in each club, the number of clubs in each county, the total acreage planted, the yield of new crops, the market

value of the harvest, and the number of agents successfully trained. He even mapped the geographical diffusion of club work. This recourse to cartographic and statistical forms of 'picturing' worked to dramatize the feelings of ambition and independence that Lund saw emerge in the countryside, and it helped convert youth effort into metrics that state officials could readily grasp and appreciate.[123]

On the ground, the IEB focused on youth enrolment and structured club activities to incrementally modernise rural values. The intention was to inject economic productivity and efficiency into rural social relations — in short, to synchronise home farms with industrial values — a change that was thought more likely to happen if the innate conservativism of adult farmers could be bypassed. In fields, rural instructors encouraged boys to experiment with the latest technologies and in rural homes girls were taught home economics, domestic sanitation and petty commodity production. Special club projects, such as pageants, competitions, fairs and film screenings, became unique hortatory occasions — what Richard Stites terms 'festivals of mustering' — that reinforced club values by combining them with feelings of pleasure, communal belonging and civic attachment.[124] As a case study, then, Scandinavian club work is deeply significant as one of the earliest efforts to implant overseas the scientific and cultural forces that were radically transforming farming life in America.[125]

Wickliffe Rose retired from the IEB in 1928, the same year the Rockefeller Foundation undertook a fundamental reorganisation of its programmes. Although the IEB continued for ten more years, its funds were all but exhausted and its activity had virtually ceased. Precisely twenty years after beginning its farm demonstration work in Denmark, the Rockefeller Foundation established the Mexican Agricultural Program (MAP) to increase food production and industrialise agriculture in Mexico.[126] This work was hailed as a phenomenal success and soon the Rockefeller foundation was sponsoring an international programme to promote a 'Green Revolution' in poor countries around the world.[127] The context for these international efforts bears striking resemblance to Rose's programme in Scandinavia. The catastrophic damage and loss of life caused by the Second World War encouraged philanthropists once more to fund and support international programmes to secure greater cooperation among nations. As Nick Cullather's research ably shows, the spectre of communism and fears about the mass mobilisation of hungry peasants also gave agricultural programmes greater weight

and significance in philanthropic circles.[128] As donors such as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations doubled down on their commitment to 'conquer hunger', they turned once more to thinking about how best to transmit their ideas to rural communities who were weakly disposed, and often openly antagonistic, to the ideas and practices that many philanthropists sought to promote.[129] While the technological features of the Green Revolution are relatively well studied, the cultural war to rouse peasants and win 'hearts and minds' is less well known.[130] The GEB in the United States and later the IEB in Northern Europe were some of the first attempts to socialise farming communities to modern farming methods — a practice that Nicole Sackley names the 'scientization' of rural reform.[131] Both programmes were organised around farm demonstration work and they hinged on the promise of generational change kick-started through the training of youth citizens.

Canning clubs and growing competitions might sound like 'child's play', but in fact this demonstrates much of the persuasive power of youth club work.[132] Under the sign of 'recreation' youth could be enrolled, assessed and guided to profitable enterprise and cultural change. The philanthropists active in the GEB and IEB were therefore some of the first reformers to take seriously the role of culture in the transformation of what they called 'traditional agriculture'. At the end of the Second World War, 'technical assistance' and the polices of 'high modernism' would dominate overseas aid — including programmes associated with the Green Revolution — but a small influential group of 'low modernists' continued to tout the idea that when it comes to 'modernisation' social and psychological barriers were just as important as technical limitations.[133] Although a smaller coterie, low modernists successfully championed grass-roots initiatives and 'community development' — extension work, villagisation schemes, and rural reconstruction — as a more effective strategy for grasping and changing the lived materiality of rural existence. By appreciating the subtle difference between teaching and learning — as well as pioneering the use of embodied and affective practices embracing fields, gardens and homes — American philanthropists demonstrated new instrumentalities for the remaking of rural life. Several decades earlier Seaman Knapp believed that youth 'demonstration work has proven that it is possible to reform, by simple means, the farm method, the economic life and practically the personality of the farmer on the farm'.[134] Wickliffe Rose saw in Knapp's vision a recipe for global development, a method for implanting science and industrial values

in hearts and homes. In no small way, then, one might say that this earlier 'teen revolution' was a pivotal moment in the making of the Green Revolution.[135]

NOTES

[1] Statement of General Purposes of IEB, Education Board History 1923-1928, International Education Board Archives [hereafter IEB], Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown NY, Series 1 Subseries 1 Box 6 Folder 107.

[2] See R.B. Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board, a Foundation established by John D. Rockefeller*, New York, 1962.

[3] J. Ettling, *The Germ of Laziness: Rockefeller Philanthropy and Public Health in the New South*, Cambridge MA, 1981.

[4] J. Sealander, *Private Wealth and Public Life: Foundation Philanthropy and the Reshaping of American Social Policy from the Progressive Era to the New Deal*, Baltimore MD, 1997.

[5] E. Anderson and A.A. Moss, *Dangerous Donations: Northern Philanthropy and Southern Black Education, 1902-1930,* Columbia MO, 1999, 9.

[6] J.H. Madison, John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board and the rural school problem in the Midwest, 1900-1930, *History of Education Quarterly* Summer 24 (1984) 181–199; S.C. Thueson, *The General Education Board and the Racial Leadership of Black Education in the South, 1920-1960*, Tarrytown NY, 2001.

[7] R.E. Kohler, *Partners in Science: Foundations and Natural Scientists, 1900-1945*, Chicago, 1991, 135.

[8] C. Brooks, The ignorance of the uneducated: Ford Foundation philanthropy, the IIE, and the geographies of educational exchange, *Journal of Historical* Geography 48 (2015) 36–46; T. Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1880-1939*, Manchester, 2013.

[9] S.L. Holloway, P. Hubbard, H. Jöns and H. Pimlott-Wilson, Geographies of education and the significance of children, youth and families, *Progress in Human Geography* 34 (2010) 583–600. On affective attachments see L. Berlant, *Cruel Optimism*, Durham, 2011.

[10] On the (geo)politicisation of childhood identities and citizenship see S. Mills, 'An instruction in good citizenship': scouting and the historical geographies of citizenship education, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38 (2013) 120–134 and M.C. Benwell and P. Hopkins, *Children, Young People and Critical Geopolitics*, London, 2017.

[11] S. Mills and C. Waite, Brands of youth citizenship and the politics of scale: National Citizen Service in the United Kingdom, *Political Geography* 56 (2017) 66–76; E.A. Gagen, An example to us all: child development and identity construction in early twentieth century playgrounds, *Environment and Planning A* 32 (2000) 599–616.

[12] This thinking is informed by L.A. Staeheli, D.J. Marshall, and N. Maynard, Circulations and the entanglements of citizenship formation, *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 106 (2016) 377–384.

[13] M. Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*, Ithaca NY, 2008, 44

[14] Y. Hayami and V.W. Ruttan, *Agricultural Development: An International Perspective*, Baltimore, 1985 [1971], 255-298.

[15] R. Skinner and A. Lester, Humanitarianism and empire: new research agendas, *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40 (2012) 729–747.

[16] J.D. Rockefeller, *Random Reminiscences of Men and Events,* New York, 1909, 55.

[17] R. Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, New Brunswick, 1989 [1952], 104.

[18] N.M. Butler, *The Meaning of Education: Contributions to a Philosophy of Education*, New York, 1915. See Mills, 'An instruction in good citizenship'.

[19] See J.W. Gardner, Renewal in Societies and Men, 1962 Folder 1 Series I.F. Box 4 Archives of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Butler Library, New York, NY.

[20] R. Acheson, *Wickliffe Rose of the Rockefeller Foundation: 1862-1914 the Formative Years*, Cambridge, 1992.

[21] N.J. Ring, *The Problem South: Region, Empire, and the New Liberal State, 1880-1930*, Athens, 2012.

[22] Cited in, R.M. Acheson, *Wickliffe Rose of the Rockefeller Foundation,* 70.

[23] T.M. Li, What is land? assembling a resource for global investment, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39 (2014) 589–602.

[24] N. Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia*, Cambridge MA, 2010, 159.

[25] D. Nally and S. Taylor, The politics of self-help: The Rockefeller Foundation, philanthropy and the 'long' Green Revolution, *Political Geography* 49 (2015) 51–63.

[26] W. Rose, Log of Journey, Wickliffe Rose Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Series 12.2 Subseries 2 Folder 24.

[27] W. Rose, Outline for a Scheme for the Promotion of Education on an International Scale, 1922-1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 1 Box 5 Folder 72.

[28] Rose, Outline for a Scheme, IEB Series 1 Subseries 1 Box 5 Folder 72.

[29] J. Farley, To *Cast Out Disease: A History of the International Health Division of Rockefeller Foundation 1913-1951*, Oxford 2003, 9.

[30] W. Rose to S. Sorensen, 9 February 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[31] W. Rose to S. Sorensen, 31 May 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[32] Minutes of the Meeting, 8 February 1923, IEB Series 3 Box 35 Folder 6.

[33] Letter from W. Rose to W. Buttrick, 20th March 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 1 Box 2, Folder 36. Denmark made elementary education compulsory since 1814 (30 years before England) and the constitution of 1849 made primary schools free for parents of limited means. See I. Henriksen, The transformation of Danish agriculture, 1870-1914, in: K. G. Persson (Ed.), *The Economic Development of Denmark and Norway since 1870*, Aldershot, 1993, 162.

[34] Minutes of the Meeting, 8 February 1923, IEB Series 3 Box 35 Folder 6.

[35] Agricultural Education Among Young People in the United States: Boys' and Girls' Clubs, 17 May 1921, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[36] Agricultural Education Among Young People in the United States, 17 May 1921, IEB. See also S. Sorensen, Extension Work in Denmark, 9 May 1922, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[37] F.T. Gates, The Memoirs of Frederick T. Gates, *American Heritage* 6 (1955) 65-86.

[38] *Annual Report 1925-1926*, IEB Series 3 Box 35 Folder 3. See also B. Cabanes, *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918-1924*, Cambridge, 2014.

[39] S. Sorensen to W. Rose, 16 February 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[40] F. Lund to W. Rose, 4 May 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402. On Bishop Grundtvig see E. Jensen, *Danish Agriculture: Its Economic Development*, Copenhagen, 1937, 100–104.

[41] Lund to Rose, 4 May1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402.

[42] In April 1917, Lund took up employment with the USDA as an Extension Agent in food preservation. In 1919, and again in 1920, he was released from his obligations at the USDA to teach home demonstration work in France. During his second secondment, Lund also made brief visits to lecture in Luxemburg, Belgium, Holland, England and Denmark. Lund to Rose, 4 May 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402; F. Lund to W. Buttrick, 1 January 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[43] M. Domosh, Practising development at home: race, gender, and the 'development' of the American South, *Antipode* 47 (2015) 915–941; K. Mitchell, Education, race and empire: a genealogy of humanitarian governance in the United States, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* in press (2017) DOI: 10.1111/tran.12180.

[44] K. Schuller, *The Biopolitics of Feeling: Race, Sex, and Science in the Nineteenth Century*, Durham, 2018.

[45] K. Schuller, *The Biopolitics of Feeling;* A. Eddens, White science and indigenous maize: the racial logics of the Green Revolution, *The Journal of Peasant Studies* (2017) 10.1080/03066150.2017.1395857

[46] F. Lund and S. Sorensen, 10 May 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402.

[47] Cited in, Fosdick *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, 34.

[48] D. Immerwahr, *Thinking Small: The United States and the Lure of Community Development*, Cambridge MA, 2015; Nally and Taylor, The politics of self-help.

[49] F. Lund to W. Rose, 4 May 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402.

[50] F. Lund to W. Rose, 6 October 1923, IEB Series, 1 Subseries 2 Box: 28 Folder: 402.

[51] F. Lund to W. Rose, 19 October 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[52] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[53] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB, Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[54] Lund to Rose, 19 October 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[55] Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Denmark: Working Plan and budget for a Demonstration in Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Denmark is Presented herewith for the Board's Consideration, 2 January 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[56] Henriksen, The transformation of Danish agriculture, 158-160.

[57] F. Lund to W. Rose, 27 February 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[58] Lund to Rose, 27 February 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[59] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to December 31 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[60] On enclaves see M. Sparke, *Introducing Globalization: Ties, Tensions, and Uneven Integration*, Oxford, 2013, 313.

[61] F. Lund to IEB, 25 March 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402.

[62] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[63] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to December 31 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[64] M. Llewellyn, Designed by women and designing women: gender, planning and the geographies of the kitchen in Britain 1917–1946, *Cultural Geographies* 1 (2004) 42–60.

[65] G.N. Rosenberg, *The 4-H Harvest: Sexuality and the State in Rural America*, Philadelphia, 2016, 6.

[66] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to December 31 1924, IEB, 5.

[67] Translated copy of Report of Frantz Lund to the Danish Ministry of Agriculture on Boys [sic] and Girls [sic] Club work, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[68] Translated copy of Report of Frantz Lund, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[69] Rosenberg, *The 4-H Harvest*, 83.

[70] Rosenberg, *The 4-H Harvest*, 81.

[71] F. Lund to W. Rose, 15 July 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 27 Folder 397.

[72] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[73] P. Gruffudd, The countryside as educator: schools, rurality and citizenship in Inter-war Wales, *Journal of Historical Geography* 22 (1996) 412–423.

[74] Translated copy of Report of Frantz Lund, IEB, Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[75] S. Olsen, *Juvenile Nation: Youth, Emotions and the Making of Modern British Citizen, 1880-1914*, London, 2014, 20; Mills, 'An instruction in good citizenship'.

[76] See Frede Mortensen, an agent in Kjellerup Enclosure 1 Extracts of letters from Agents regarding young people's work, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401

[77] See Viggo Kristensen, agent in Brønderslev Enclosure 1 Extracts of letters from Agents regarding young people's work, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[78] On participation as governmentality see K. Mitchell and C. Lizotte, The grassroots and the gift: moral authority, American philanthropy, and activism in education, *Foucault Studies* 18 (2015) 66–89; See also K. Ryan, Governing the future: citizenship as technology, empowerment as technique, *Critical Sociology* 37 (2010) 763-778.

[79] On the embodied see, A Gagen, Making America flesh: physicality and nationhood in early twentieth-century physical education reform, *Cultural Geographies* 11(2004) 417–442.

[80] Lund to Rose, 19 Oct 1923, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[81] Knapp cited in, G.E. Frysinger, *Home Demonstration Work, 1922: United States Department of Agriculture Circular 314,* Washington, DC, 1924, 1. General Education Board, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown NY, Series 1.4 Box 694 Folder 7152.

[82] Although of course *adult* agents guided the children in learning new farming and domestic work.

[83] Report Boys' and Girls' Club work in Denmark During the Calendar year 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[84] L. Malkki, *The Need to Help: The Domestic Arts of International Humanitarianism*, Durham, 10. On the relationship between structures of feeling and 'land epistemologies' see G. Marchesi, The other Green Revolution: land epistemologies and the Mexican Revolutionary State, *Antipode* 49 (2017) 1060–1078.

[85] Report Boys' and Girls' Club work in Denmark During the Calendar year 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[86] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[87] Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and Home Demonstration, September 1923 to 31 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[88] Report Boys' and Girls' Club work in Denmark During the Calendar year 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[89] My emphasis. Translated copy of Report of Frantz Lund to the Danish Ministry of Agriculture on Boys [sic] and Girls [sic] Club work, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 401.

[90] F. Lund to W. Rose, 30 December 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 58.

[91] F. Lund to W. Rose, 21 March 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[92] F. Lund to W. Rose, 25 May 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[93] F. Lund to W. Rose, 2 June 1926, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[94] Rose to Lund, 2 June 1926, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[95] Lund to Rose, Dec 30 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[96] Translated letter to the IEB Board from C. Svedelis and S. Sevensson on behalf of the Board of JUG, 1 May 1924, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[97] Report of Boys and Girls' Club Work in Sweden Calendar Year 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586; Report of Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Sweden During the Calendar Year, 1926, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[98] F. Lund to W. Rose, 5 February 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 585.

[99] 'Lantungdomens Yrkesutbildning Genom Praktisk Självverksamhet under Vägledning Av Konsulenter: Lantbruksklubbarbete För Ungdom Enligt Det Amerikanska "Boys' and Girls' Club Work"', IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[100] Lantungdomens Yrkesutbildning, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[101] Lantungdomens Yrkesutbildning, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[102] Report on Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Sweden Calendar Year 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[103] Report on Boys and Girls Club Work in Sweden, Calendar Year 1928, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[104] Domosh, Practising development at home.

[105] Report on Boys and Girls Club Work in Sweden, Calendar Year 1928, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 41 Folder 586.

[106] A. Sriprakash New learner subjects? Reforming the rural child for a modern India, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 34 (2013) 325-337.

[107] S. Rose to F. Lund, 14 July 1926, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 399. Indeed as early as 1925, but in relation to conditions in Denmark, Rose was urging Lund to 'undertake mediating the transfer to government responsibility.' W. Rose to F. Lund, 9 January 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 399.

[108] For a description of Finland's frontier status see W.R Mead, *Farming in Finland*, London, 1953

[109] W. Rose to F. Lund, 3 May 1926, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 28 Folder 402.

[110] F. Lund to W. Rose, 3 June 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 460.

[111] F. Lund to W. Rose, 3 June 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 460; Brierley to Minster of Ag, Finland, 10 December 1925, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 460.

[112] Report on Boys' and Girls' Work in Finland, Calendar Year ending 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[113] Report on Boys' and Girls' Work in Finland, Calendar Year ending 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[114] Report on Boys' and Girls' Work in Finland, Calendar Year ending 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[115] Report on Boys' and Girls' Work in Finland, Calendar Year ending 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[116] Report on Boys' and Girls' Work in Finland, Calendar Year ending 1927, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[117] Report Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Finland, Calendar Year 1928, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[118] Report Boys' and Girls' Club Work in Finland, Calendar Year 1928, IEB Series 1 Subseries 2 Box 33 Folder 461.

[119] Gray, *Education on an International Scale*, vii.

[120] Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, 279.

[121] For an argument linking 'domestic' to 'international' development see M. Domosh, International harvester, the U.S. South, and the makings of international development in the early 20th century, *Political Geography* 49 (2015) 17–29. See also Sealander, *Private Wealth and Public Life*.

[122] W. Rose cited in, A.C. Waterhouse, *Food and Prosperity: Balancing Technology and Community in Agriculture*, New York, 2013, 48.

[123] The term 'statistical picturing' is from D. Demeritt, Scientific forest conservation and the statistical picturing of nature's limits in the progressive-era United States, *Environment and Planning D* 19 (2001) 431–459. We are indebted to the elaboration on this theme in Li, What is land?

[124] Stites cited in J.C. Scott *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, 1998, 195. See also L. Prosterman, *Ordinary Life, Festival Days: Aesthetics in the Midwestern County Fair*, Washington DC, 1995; D. Fitzgerald, *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture,* New Haven, 2003

[125] See also S. Schmalzer, *Green Revolution, Red Revolution: Scientific Farming in Socialist China*, Chicago, 2016

[126] D. Fitzgerald, Exporting American agriculture: the Rockefeller Foundation in Mexico 1943-53, *Social Studies of Science*, 16 (1986) 457–483; T.C. Olsson, *Agrarian Crossings: Reformers and the Remaking of the US and the Mexican Countryside*, Princeton, 2017; J.H. Perkins, The Rockefeller Foundation and the Green Revolution, 1941-1956, *Agriculture and Human Values* 7 (1990) 6–18.

[127] Norman Borlaug, one of the chief plant breeders associated with the Mexican Programme, was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 1970.

[128] Cullather, *The Hungry World*; N. Cullather, 'Stretching the surface of the earth': the Foundations, neo-Malthusianism and the modernising agenda, *Global Society* 28 (2014) 104-112.

[129] See especially J.G. Harrar, *Strategy Toward the Conquest of Hunger,* New York, 1967.

[130] On the technical aspects see V. Smil, *Enriching the Earth: Fritz Haber, Karl Bosch and the Transformation of World Food Production*, Cambridge MA, 2001; D. Goodman, B. Sorj, and J. Wilkinson, *From Farming to Biotechnology: A Theory of Agro-Industrial Development*, Oxford, 1987. For an account of the cultural wars see especially N. Cullather, 'The target is the people': representations of the village in modernization and U.S. national security doctrine, *Cultural Politics* 2 (2006) 29–48; D Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*, Princeton, 2010; Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution*; Rosenberg, *The 4-H Harvest*.

[131] N. Sackley, The village as Cold War site: experts, development, and the history of rural reconstruction, *Journal of Global History* 6 (2011) 481-504. See also T. Mitchell and R. Lowe, To sow contentment: philanthropy, scientific agriculture and the making of the new South, 1906-1920, *Journal of Social History* 24(1990) 317-340.

[132] Rosenberg, *The 4-H Harvest*.

[133] See especially, Immerwahr, *Thinking Small*.

[134] S.A. Knapp, A work for the girls [report dated Oct 24, 1910] Series: 1.4 Box: 694 Folder: 7152, General Education Board, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown NY.

[135] R. Patel, The long Green Revolution, *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 40 (2013) 1–63; Nally and Taylor, The politics of self-help.