In his analysis of how the dominant ideology was formed Taylor includes a number of quotes describing the role ascribed to farm women. These will provide valuable ammunition for feminist scholars: Taylor argues “the farm woman’s social identity was based upon her homemaking role and was expressed through male language and institutional models” (p. 79). He then discusses how this conditioned the public and community roles played by women, centering them on homemaking, motherhood, and citizenship.

The chapter on the language of agrarianism looks at radical, conservative, and female agrarianism and argues that while the dominant conservative ideology was established by the 1920s there was a residual of radical agrarianism throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century. This radicalism was too weak, however, to influence the political agenda of Manitoba farmers or to provide support for farm women faced with an appropriation of their goals by middle-class women.

Overall Fashioning Farmers is a valuable resource for adult educators who wish to better understand the educational, social, and economic forces which underpin the foundations of Canadian adult education. It would be even more useful if it had an index.

Bruce Spencer
Athabasca University

THE THIRD CONTRACT: THEORY AND PRACTICE IN TRADE UNION TRAINING.


At first glance, Michael Newman’s book would appear to be only of interest to those engaged in labour or workers’ education. While his central audience is labour educators, his arguments are important for others involved in nonformal adult education and provide illumination for all adult educators. His work as a “union trainer” in Australia provides a backdrop for a wide-ranging discussion of adult education/training methods and philosophies. In the core of the book he works systematically through four traditions which he sees as the basis for adult education and training in Australia: the liberal tradition, drawing essentially on United Kingdom (UK) experience; the mechanistic, which includes Malcolm Knowles and Cyril Houle; psychotherapy, including Carl Rogers and Jack Mezirow; and community development and social action, which review contributions by Myles Horton, Paulo Freire, and Jane Thompson among others. He is sympathetic to all contributions and explores how these writers can be useful to adult educators (in his case union trainers).

The thrust of his argument is that there is a “third contract” in union training which goes beyond the contract between the formal union structure and the trainer (the first contract, which may be linked with mechanistic training for union roles) or that between the course participants and the trainer (the second contract, a
more humanistic relationship linked to personal development). The third contract is “between the participants in the course and the union they belong to.” In Newman’s view, the saying “the members are the union” (p. 38) is clearly linked to notions of collectivity and democratic participation, and, consequently, should draw on community education and social action frameworks.

I am not convinced the author has captured the special nature of labour or union education in his notion of the third contract. Yet I am sympathetic to his recognition of a union course as a group with a common identity and purpose not easily reproduced in a different adult education milieu. It is also important to understand that union work contracts are collective contracts between the union membership and the employer, in which individualism plays no part. This special notion of “collectivism” is rare in modern day society and may not exist in any other adult education classroom, at least in this extreme form. He is also correct in identifying the special relationship which can exist between a committed union trainer and a class of labour unionists which enjoy shared experience and values. His writing validates much of my twenty-plus years in labour education.

The Australian Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA) is a state-supported yet union-controlled body quite different from anything existing elsewhere. It has been the fountain of union training in Australia. Although individual unions have also provided courses, TUTA has dominated the scene and set the standards (at present TUTA’s role is under review). It has also provided the language within which labour education is discussed: union training rather than union education or labour education; union trainers not labour educators or industrial tutors. This language is important, as Newman would recognize—see his discussion of Freire (p. 218-243) and, combined with the limited experience of TUTA training course (few of which exceed four days) provides a context for Newman’s work. It can be argued that he is combatting a limited de-politicized view of “union training” by invoking a richer tradition of workers’ and adult education.

He knows that if unions are to remain important bases for democratic struggle, then union education has to be more than “tool training” (for example, courses on representing members and how to bargain) delivered in a mechanistic manner. He discusses the shift to mega-unions (in Australia this could result in 20 or fewer unions by the turn of the century) and the changes associated with globalization and restructuring, and makes his call to fully recognize the potential of union training before it is too late:

The third contract is essential to the continued success of a union. If the interaction between a union as a sum of its members and a union as an organisation is vigorously and continually democratic, then that union will be able to resist domestication by employers, governments and its own peak bodies and, when necessary, will be able to engage in radical action. Defining, redefining, establishing and continually re-establishing this third contract must be the overriding purpose of all our training. (p. 272)

The book discusses union culture and depicts well the texture of union education. Newman’s examples are generally very insightful. However, one or two
appear naive: for example, when he is discussing how trainers were asked to “sell” the union/government accord or new management “participation” committees to members. In the UK there were always trade union tutors who would resist “incorporation” and “management sponsorship” and we did not need Mezirow to help us! The real struggle is not so much establishing an appropriate educational philosophy as developing a more independent perspective than that of the sponsoring union.

There are a number of other dubious claims made in the text, for example, arguing that union training is rooted in the liberal tradition because they sometimes discuss liberal issues (p. 77) is the same as the old “slipped in” argument in the UK; that is, we do not need to structure in sessions on economics, history or politics because they can be “slipped in by the tutor.” Yes, there can be some discussion, but it is limited, ill-prepared and usually does little to advance understanding; it needs to be contrasted with a structured course for unionists dealing specifically with these issues, as they are in the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) or Labour College of Canada courses. In fact, a few pages later (p. 83) he gives a good example of why spending a couple of hours on something is not good enough. While he uses this to discuss a failure of method by the visiting speaker, it also illustrates my point.

To nitpick through the text would misrepresent its many good arguments and description. At times it is more of a “how to” book with good discussion on group work and how the whole variety of adult educational methods can be a rich resource for union educators (UK tutors who have accepted the Trade Union Council [TUC] “one-way” approach should take note!), than an analysis of the politics of workers’ education. He explains clearly that simply being a facilitator is not good enough in many situations: trainers have to teach. He also debates the many authorities he quotes and progresses logically towards the community education and social action model as a key element in union training. He argues that one of the central purposes of union training is to advance democracy, particularly economic democracy. But he does not discuss this extensively. What kind of social action is needed, what it is we should be promoting, remains a central question for labour educators.

The book draws globally from the writings of adult educators. Unfortunately, Newman is unaware of the variety of union education experienced outside Australia. The two- and three-year courses offered by Leeds University or the similar length labour studies program at Manitoba are not mentioned, nor is the eight-week residential course of the Labour College of Canada or anything similar. As a result he does not draw distinctions between “tool courses,” “issue courses,” and “labour studies” which may have helped him apply different approaches to different situations and relate those to the different authorities he discusses. He does not discuss the tensions that can exist between university- or college-based educators and unions. Nor is he aware of the power and control the TUC exercised over tutors involved in their scheme; thus, he misses out on some implications for his third contract from these sources. The fierce debates in the UK about methods
on union courses that masked issues of control could have enlivened and enriched his discussion of adult education methods and philosophies as they applied to union training in Australia. However, these are quibbles about the universality of Newman’s analysis.

Nonetheless, I would argue that new forms of union education, such as that developed by the CAW in their Paid Educational Leave program or the distance learning courses being developed in UK unions which examine the broader sociopolitical and economic contexts, are central to achieving Newman’s goal. A four-day training course cannot cut it; a more sustained program with a “labour studies” focus is needed. I think “union training” undertaken by “union trainers” is too limited a title for his vision. At the very least it has to be seen, and named, “education.”

Bruce Spencer
Athabasca University