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<td>56</td>
<td>Fifth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Milltown Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sixth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Glendale Colony, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sixth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Clearwater Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Seventh-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Sommerfeld Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>First-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Brightstone Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>First-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Mayfair Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Second-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Oaklane Colony, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>First-Generation Bi-Level House Type, Bon Homme Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Second-Generation Bi-Level House Type, Beaver Creek Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Second-Generation Bi-Level House Type, Sundale Colony, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>&quot;Tri-Level&quot; Residential Structure, Milltown Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Single-Family Dwelling, Rock Lake Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Former Barracks Structure, Fairholme Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Residential Structures, Fairview Colony, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Center Square, Mayfair Colony, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

In Hutterite society, tradition has dictated "what ought to be." This view of reality emphasizes simple living and avoidance of the world and is reflected in ascetic colony housing. However, as more areas of Hutterite life change in response to attempts to increase economic production, it is difficult to maintain avoidance as an ideal. As the gap between "idea and reality" increases, tradition is undermined, and on many colonies, normative validity claims are no longer unquestionable. Consequently, colony leaders are now confronted with demands for participation and collective consumption, especially for modern and more-private housing.

This study explains how Hutterite housing has changed and why recent changes have been so dramatic. Housing data, collected in historical and field work research on eighty-eight colonies, are incorporated into rules based on methodology developed by Henry Glassie. These rules illustrate genetic relationships among Hutterite house types and identify the transition from "folk" to modern housing.

Concepts from symbolic interactionism and three interpretations of Marxist theory—technical determinist, broad mode of production, and critical theory—are used to explain why colony housing has changed. This theoretical synthesis indicates that the introduction of modern and more-private housing mirrors fundamental change in Hutterite society, change that is brought about by developments that have increased the tension in the contradiction between "being-on-the-colony" and "being-in-
the-world." This increase in tension and attempts at reconciliation are considered the driving mechanism of change on Hutterite colonies.

Although change in colony housing mirrors change in Hutterite society, the introduction of modern housing allows colony members to move "offstage" where they can improvise on group norms. This explains, in part, how individual Hutterites have become more autonomous, a development that was largely unforeseen and which is significant for two reasons. Firstly, the desire for more autonomy indicates that colony members are attempting to satisfy their own expectations of themselves, not just social expectations. Secondly, although housing has been defined by the colony, the unforeseen consequences of the changes made possible by more-private housing have acted back on the original definition and reshaped it.
INTRODUCTION

A modern two-ton truck had just pulled up to the curb. It was a blue-green vehicle and on its sides was written in square-headed lettering:

"And all that believed were together, and all had [sic] things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. Acts 2:44-45."

In the truck's rack sat a collection of the most oddly dressed people Elof had ever seen in his life. They reminded him instantly of a picture he had seen of fifteenth-century peasants of Middle Europe. The men were all dressed in black: black felt hat, black shirt, black pants, black shoes, black socks. Some even wore beards, and since most were black, even their faces seemed funerally garbed. The women wore grays and blacks: long skirts, long sleeves, and full and tight babushkas cowlng the head. Only the hands and full-moon visages were free to the stranger eye.

"Those prisoners?"

Fats coughed. "Depends. We might think so. But then they think we are."

"Who are they?"

"Hutterites. They're just like the Mennonites, except they practice their religion communistic. Live down along the Jim River bottoms. Out a sight. Come to town like this once in a great moon."

[Manfred 1975:200-201]

The Hutterites described in The Chokecherry Tree are a pietistic utopian group of Germanic origin who came to the North-American steppes in the 1870s after having fled first from Central Europe and then Russia. Settling in what is now the State of South Dakota, the Hutterians were determined to re-establish their God-inspired communities and to withdraw
from the wicked earth and await the hereafter in an other-worldly heaven. When the climate in the United States turned hostile, they decided that survival meant emigration, with the result that almost all of the Brethren moved to Canada. Here, too, the Hutterites located their colonies away from towns and major highways, "almost symbolically as if to turn their back on the world" (Peters 1965:78).

Unlike the Brethren described by Manfred, present-day Hutterites on the nearly four hundred colonies scattered across the Great Plains are participating extensively in the market economy, and for this reason, they can no longer maintain their separation from the world as an ideal. Indeed, in many areas, the Hutterites are the major agricultural producers and literally cannot afford to remain aloof. This trend is definitely assimilative and represents a trade-off of "a certain amount of freedom, or isolation, for greater security and greater acceptance by the non-Hutterite community" (Bennett 1975:130).

With this trade-off, there has been a redefinition of what it is to be a Hutterite in the 1980s. Not only are the Brethren identifying themselves in a way that is more congruent with the demands of a highly-specialized agricultural economy, but individual Hutterites are placing greater emphasis on interpersonal response and on the need for self-expression. In no area is this new social reality mirrored more clearly than in the contrast between the modern and more-private housing being constructed on contemporary colonies and the traditional, extremely ascetic communal dwellings that remain from the earlier period.

The study of changes in Hutterite housing is guided by the following
questions:

1. does Hutterite shelter represent folk housing, that is, traditional dwellings that developed from European folk building customs?
2. what is the present distribution of identifiable building traditions or types?
3. how is the distribution of house types explained? and
4. how are changes in house types related to changes in Hutterite family and community organization and general belief?

Hutterite housing offers an excellent opportunity to test many of the principles of house-type geography, a field pioneered by Fred Kniffen at Louisiana State University. Almost all of the Hutterite colonies are located in the Great Plains farming region of the United States and Canada, an area that probably comes closer to a "featureless plain" than any other section of North America. For this reason, many variables—cultural and physical—are distributed fairly evenly throughout the study area, thus enabling selected factors to be analyzed under relatively uniform conditions.

The analysis of the source of inspiration for the Hutterite building tradition in America includes a review of the architectural record on the Bruderhofs (from Bruderhose, literally "brother-forms") in Czechoslovakia and Central Russia and a discussion of the transition from South Russia to Dakota Territory. In the examination of the housing constructed in the founding period in North America, emphasis is on the comparison between the Mennonite building tradition and the central-hallway house
type that the Brethren constructed in the pre-1918 period. This analysis also includes a discussion of the construction techniques employed by the Hutterites in the Dakotas, particularly in terms of their origin. From a theoretical standpoint, the analysis of the origin of the Hutterite building tradition in North America is concerned with the conditions under which different house types and construction techniques have been accepted or adopted. This includes an examination of the alternative processes of diffusion and the relationship between the building tradition established in an area by the pioneer and post-pioneer settlers and the building practices adopted by subsequent in-coming groups.

The identification of Hutterite house types and their distribution is based on the assumption that there is a genetic relationship between different forms and that the architectural record changes as a result of the evolution or "advance" of one house type to another. It is also assumed that changes in house types and forms reflect the diversity of the pool of ideas available for building in a particular period. Since most ideas for housing flow from the larger society to the Hutterite colonies, interaction with the outside world is a potential source of innovation in colony housing. This suggests that diversity of house types and forms is correlated with considerable involvement in the affairs of the larger world.

The housing built in the period from 1874 to 1917 is examined in the first phase of the analysis of the architectural record in North America. This inventory provides the basis for the subsequent development of a system of rules to account for all of the identifiable house types and
their derivatives. This system of rules utilizes the methodology developed by Henry Glassie (1975) and is based on an analogy between language and the ability to design artifacts, on the underlying structural principles that relate simple, abstract shapes into a "geometric repertoire" (ibid.). The last section of the analysis of identifiable house types traces the architectural record developed by different branches of the Hutterite church after they had moved to Alberta and to Manitoba in 1918. The system of rules is employed in this analysis of colony housing to identify when Hutterite architecture shifts from folk housing to shelter built according to modern industrial design techniques and standards. The shift from folk to modern occurs when the system of rules is no longer sufficient to account for new house types.

The distribution of Hutterite house types and forms is explained by reference to several factors, such as membership in different branches of the Hutterite church and by colony wealth. Other variables that are analyzed include length of settlement, social distance (that is, the degree of relationship with reference to the system of mother-daughter colonies and by membership in "kindreds," or groups of colonies that tend to inter-marry), political jurisdiction, and environmental differences (e.g., climate, soil zones, groundwater regimes, etc.).

The first three questions posed in this research are concerned with how Hutterite house types have evolved. The last question focuses on why these changes are occurring, especially with regard to the recent introduction of housing that is considered modern by any standard. This process of change is visualized in terms of the reconciliation, to a
degree, of the contradiction between "being-on-the-colony" and "being-in-the-world."

These terms capture the essence of the contradiction inherent in the two realities that compose Hutterite society. "Being-on-the-colony" is characterized by the principles of avoidance, simple living, and by the subjugation of the individual to the commonweal; whereas "being-in-the-world" focuses on participation in the market economy where individual Hutterite managers have a great deal of autonomy within their agricultural specialty. These two realities have a distinctive mode of being. On the colony, surveillance is pervasive, and behavior is characterized by self-conscious awareness of the need to live up to certain standards. Participation in a pernicious agricultural economy, on the other hand, is marked by behavior that is opportunistic and matter-of-fact and guided by the drive to maximize profits.

The nature of the two realities in Hutterite society is defined by a "dialectical tension" (Richardson 1982:433) that enhances the distinctiveness of these two modes and "counterposes them...one against the other" (ibid.). These realities are also defined by the physical setting that "anchors" their being. On the colony, a rigid, extremely ascetic colony architecture and strict adherence to rectilinearity in the layout of colony buildings pervade; this is a setting where God's order is respected and the authority pattern of the colony is visible in all of its "supernatural rightness" (Hostetler 1974:169). Juxtaposed against this built environment is the material setting of the larger society which is viewed as individualistic and "worldly."
Because these two realities serve to maintain the Hutterite system, they are a unity; that is, participation in these two worlds is essential for the survival of Hutterite society. But because these two realities are also in conflict with each other, there is inherent in the Hutterite system a tendency towards change and development. Although any system may adopt strategies to negate propensities to transitoriness, at some point, however, it may not be possible to bring about their reconciliation. It is in this sense that the Hutterite system is changing. It is changing because feelings of personal worth are threatened as the gap between the "ideal" and the "real" becomes more and more apparent—when the world in which one "belongs" is no longer providing a source of identity that is adequate to meet the exigencies of living in the 1980s.

As this gap becomes more and more apparent, tradition has been undermined and no longer provides the sole basis for claims of "what ought to be." This "rupture of tradition" has had major consequences for Hutterite society and provides the investigatory thrust for the examination of the dramatic change in Hutterite society in general and in colony housing in particular.

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. In Chapter One, the history of the Hutterites in Europe and North America is reviewed. Various contemporary colony patterns—instrumental, economic, spatial, and colony growth and division—are also discussed. Chapter Two presents the theoretical concepts and the research methods employed in the study. The section on methods outlines the procedures followed in the sample
selection, data collection, and data analysis phases of the study and identifies problems encountered during the research.

The third and fourth chapters are concerned with the architectural record. In Chapter Three, Hutterite housing and building practices in Europe are compared with the communal dwellings and the construction practices utilized on the founding colonies in North America. Sources of inspiration for building are also investigated. Chapter Four examines the form changes that have occurred in Hutterite housing during the hundred and ten years that the Brethren have lived in North America.

Why colony housing has changed so dramatically during the last decade is the subject of Chapter Five. The first section in this chapter examines the nature of the contradictions inherent in Hutterite society. This is followed by an analysis of the factors that are heightening the tension between the inherent contradictions and which are forcing attempts at reconciliation. The last section in Chapter Five is concerned with the way individually-held meanings of housing are reconciled through public discourse.

The final chapter summarizes the study and highlights the major conclusions from the earlier analyses. These conclusions serve to relate or extend the findings of the study to the broader theoretical concepts outlined in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER ONE
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTEMPORARY COLONY PATTERNS

Historical Development

The Hutterites in Europe. Religious reform and the new economic order established in Europe during the early part of the sixteenth century proved to be a particular hardship for the poor and led to what Williams calls the "radical reformation" (in Diener 1974:610). Initially, this movement was violent, and in 1524, the peasantry of the South Germanic region rose up in arms. This revolt, called the Peasants' War, was crushed in the following year, however, and as a result, leadership of the radical reformers passed to those who considered violent resistance as useless and immoral.

Although the peasant rebellion failed, "Luther's endorsement of the old social order and his condemnation of the rebels disillusioned and alienated many of his supporters" (Peters 1965:10), resulting in the return of great numbers to the Catholic Church. Some of the disillusioned joined the small groups known as Anabaptists.

From its foundation in Zurich, the Anabaptist movement spread rapidly throughout Europe, and by 1527, articles of faith, known as the Schleitheim Confession, were defined and adopted. These articles
proclaimed adult baptism and withdrawal from the larger society. The articles also condemned attendance at parish churches, the use of force for any purpose, lodging complaints before the courts, becoming a magistrate or holding political office, and the swearing of oaths of allegiance (Diener 1974:611). Although Anabaptism spread rapidly, the movement had been prohibited since its inception, and as a result of the combined opposition of both Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, the civil governments in Europe carried out a fierce and bloody persecution against the Anabaptists. This persecution, which began in 1527 and continued for more than one hundred years, ended Anabaptism as a mass movement in Europe.

1. Formative Period.

The Hutterian Brotherhood was established by Swiss Anabaptists who had fled to Moravia (in modern Czechoslovakia, Figure 1) from various parts of South Germany and the Austrian Tyrol. In contrast to the centralizing, bureaucratic government that was developing in the German territories, Moravia was a borderland country where the nobles continued to enjoy considerable independence and were willing to accept Anabaptist refugees (Peters 1965:12). Since the Anabaptists were unsuccessful in their attempts to either oppose or passively withdraw from the developing capitalistic states, their strategy was to flee "to marginal areas where feudal norms remained at least partially intact" (Diener 1974:612).

At Nikolsburg, which had become the major Anabaptist center in Moravia, a division developed on the matters of pacifism and collection of war taxes, and between 200 and 300 members of the group opposed to the
use of force broke away under the leadership of Jakob Widemann and established themselves at Austerlitz in 1528. The move from Nikolsburg to Austerlitz is singularly important in Hutterite history, since it was during this journey that a cloak was spread on the ground, "and every one laid down on it his earthly possessions unconstrained and with a willing hand according to the teachings of the prophets and apostles" (Horsch 1974:7). This was the beginning of total communal ownership of property, a feature that has become the chief doctrinal position of the Hutterite Brotherhood.

Toward the end of the formative period, the Confession of Faith was written in prison by Peter Rideman, who was head pastor of the Church from 1542 to 1556. The Confession of Faith is the most important
statement of Hutterite ideology, and even today, it is considered authoritative by many of the Brethren. Since the Anabaptists and the Protestants both used the Luther translation of the Bible, the religious ideology in the Confession of Faith agrees with the position taken by most present-day fundamental churches on a number of important tenets: belief in a single, personal God who is omnipotent and omnipresent and who created the universe and placed everything in a divine order and proper hierarchy; that original sin is the cause of physical death for man; and that the individual can attain life after death only by repenting and by continual submission of the self to the will of God.

The Hutterites are set apart from the evangelical churches, however, by their beliefs in communal ownership of property, believers' baptism, non-resistance, and avoidance of worldly affairs. The latter, which is based largely on the ministry of Paul, receives considerable emphasis in the Confession of Faith. For example, in regard to personal possessions, Paul admonished his followers to, "Set your affections on things above, and not on things on earth" (Rideman 1950:52). Similarly, in terms of withdrawal from the larger society, Paul's message was to, "Go out from among them, and be ye separate" (ibid.:164). Even today, the doctrine of avoidance is considered by many Hutterites to be the principle on which their way of life is based.

2. The Favorable and Ideal Times for the Church.

Beginning in 1553, there began in Moravia what is referred to as "the favorable time for the Church." This was followed by the "ideal period," 1563 to 1592, when there was little open persecution of the
Brethren (Horsch 1974:19). During these times of relative peace, the Moravian noblemen were strong and jealous of their local autonomy and were able to assert their right to administer their own domains and to ignore the edicts of the central government to persecute the Hutterians. Between 1529 and 1621, 102 colonies developed in Moravia with an estimated population of twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants (Hostetler 1974:29); there may have been as many as sixty-five colonies at any one time (Peters 1965:16). Bennett (1967:27) suggests that some of the Bruderhofs had as many as 1,000 residents. Each colony was a "rational establishment of great efficiency" (Hostetler 1974:35), "in and by itself in every way almost entirely self-sufficient" (Peters 1965:19).

There was hard work, frugality, little waste, and no motive for private gain. This approach to large-scale enterprise, developed by the Hutterites in the sixteenth century, was practically unknown before the Industrial Revolution. The Hutterites of today continue to demonstrate this rational efficiency in their farm enterprises in North America. [Hostetler 1974:35]

Although the Hutterites prospered during the "Ideal Period," they never lost sight of the basic opposition between their system and that of the larger society. In an effort to reverse the course of economic development during this period, the Hutterites carried out what Hostetler (1974:57) considers the most aggressive missionary activity in sixteenth-century Europe.

3. Decline and Destruction of the Brotherhood in Central Europe.

The decline of the Brotherhood in Central Europe started in 1593 when war broke out between Turkey and Austria. During the period that followed, the Brethren were subjected to a number of tribulations,
including the quartering of soldiers in the colonies, high taxes, confiscation of property, and expulsion from certain lands. In 1605, sixteen colonies were destroyed by the Turkish armies and their allies, and a large number of the Brethren were killed or carried off into slavery (ibid.:63). These tribulations continued during the Thirty Years' War, which started in 1618 when Bohemia revolted against Emperor Ferdinand II. Because Moravia aligned with Bohemia and expelled the Jesuits, the emperor invaded Moravia in 1619 to punish the country for its succession. As a result, sixteen of the forty remaining Hutterite colonies were destroyed. Seventeen other colonies were plundered and a large number of the Brethren either killed or wounded, a pattern that was to continue for two years.

Because of the ensuing persecution in Moravia, many of the Hutterites fled to more remote colonies. Later, many escaped over the Hungarian border to Sabatish, where more than 3,000 of the Brethren had taken refuge. In 1621, many crossed over the Carpathian Mountains and settled in localities among nobles who accepted them favorably. That same year, a number of the Brethren in Hungary were seized forcibly and transported to Transylvania, where in 1622, they received permission from the authorities to build a colony at Alwintz (Figure 2).

As a result of the foregoing wars, central control over the German territories became more effective, and in 1622, the governor of Moravia obtained full power and authority from Emperor Ferdinand to expel the Hutterian Brethren from Moravia. Those who would convert to Catholicism would be allowed to remain and would be given assistance (Horsch
As a consequence, many of the Brethren despaired and abandoned their faith; others moved to Hungary and to more distant frontiers.

In Hungary, the Brotherhood suffered not only privation and persecution, but also spiritual decline. The period between 1619 and 1631 was one of particular hardship, and by the end of this period, the total population of the Brotherhood was reduced to less than 1,000 (ibid.:65). Although the two decades that followed were relatively peaceful, a spiritual decline set in for which several causes are noted: famine conditions, years of pillage by marauding armies, and "self-seeking and a lack of brotherly love" (ibid.:74). After years of
pillage by the armies, "the surrounding population began raiding the colonies for supplies, and finally the nobles, too, joined in" (Hostetler 1974:68).

Notwithstanding the Brethren's vulnerability, the waning of spiritual fervor and the loss of moral earnestness are considered the major contributing factors by Horsch (1974:73).

The author of the so-called Smaller Church Chronicle, Johannes Waldner, says that in the books written in this period complaint is found "that a majority of the Brotherhood departed from the simplicity of Christ and the filial obedience which they owed to God and the Church, and followed only their own inclinations. They did not abide by any regulations and were no longer satisfied with the cut of clothing which until that time was in use in the Church. Especially those who were in the services of the lords began to dress in worldly fashion, indulged in covetousness and self-interest, secretly kept some of the money they had earned, became accustomed to the use of wine," etc.

While the right of doing extra work for self-interest was denied by the Brotherhood and the leaders, an increasing minority desired just such a departure from the old order. Also there was a steady increase in the number of the indolent who apparently had united with the Church from a desire to live off the fruit of the hard work of others, rather than from religious conviction.

In 1663 and 1664, many of the buildings and crops were destroyed by the Turks, and 122 of the Brethren were carried off into slavery. The Bruderhof at Alwintz was burned in 1661, and although it was rebuilt, the congregation never recovered (Hostetler 1974:74). Under these circumstances, together with what Horsch considers "the inner, religious decline of the Brotherhood," the community of goods became more and more of a burden. In 1686, the Brotherhood at Levar decided to abandon community of goods; similar action was taken by the other colonies.

"Compelled by the greatest poverty, it was ordered that every one should pay for himself" (Horsch 1974:75).
Permission to attack the Brotherhood in Hungary and to compel it to convert to Catholicism was granted by Empress Maria Theresa upon petition of the clergy in 1759. Since initial attempts to force the Brethren to attend Roman Catholic worship did not succeed, it was not until 1761 that the persecution began in earnest. At Sabatisch and Levar, the ministers and most of the older members were imprisoned; those not imprisoned took to the forests in flight, where they were hunted down and sometimes beaten before being confined. Since imprisonment did not bring about a change in the attitude of the Brethren, they were then severely beaten by Jesuit mercenaries until they converted to Catholicism. By these means, all of the Brethren in Hungary fell away from the faith.

4. Renewal of the Brotherhood and Flight to Wallachia.

A renewal of the Brotherhood occurred in Transylvania as a result of a spiritual awakening elsewhere in Europe. In 1752, in the Archduchy of Corinthia (in modern Austria), some of the population had abandoned the Roman Catholic Church and had become Lutherans. About 270 of these converts were deported to Transylvania in 1755. At Alwintz, the Corinthian refugees became acquainted with the Brethren and met daily to study the old writings of the Hutterite Brotherhood. Despite efforts by the authorities to discourage this practice, a congregation was established at Cruentz in 1766 "according to the old order and discipline of the Hutterite Brotherhood" (Horsch 1974:101).

Extermination of the Hutterites in Central Europe was continuing unabated, however. In 1762, before the old order had been re-established, the Jesuit Delpini received permission to convert the
Brethren at Alwintz in Transylvania. As a result of the ensuing persecution, a number of the congregation turned Catholic, another faction held steadfast, and in the face of continuing harassment, a number escaped to Creuntz on several occasions, only to be returned. Because Creuntz was a hindrance to the ultimate conversion of the Brethren, the empress issued an imperial order granting the Jesuits full authority and power to exterminate all of the Anabaptists in Transylvania. Since this order was tantamount to extinction, the only alternative was flight into territory under rule by the Turkish emperor. And on October 3, 1767, sixty-seven persons, including sixteen from the congregation at Alwintz, left Creuntz and fled to Wallachia (in modern Romania).

In Wallachia, the Brotherhood settled at Tschoregirle (German Krahbach) on the outskirts of Bucharest. In the spring of 1769, the congregation moved several miles to a more suitable site at Paretschin. War had started between Russia and Turkey in 1768, however, and at Paretschin, the Brethren were raided by plundering bands. When they appealed to Russian authorities for assistance, they were advised to emigrate to Russia. On April 10, 1777, a group of about sixty persons set out.

5. The Brotherhood in Russia.

During this period, the Russian government was anxious to induce foreign settlers to colonize the steppes.

Russia, under its young empress, Catherine the Great, had just organized the area north of the Black Sea into the New Russian Territory. The next task of the imperial government was to attract settlers to these new domains, as well as to the Volga region, which
had been devastated by the Pugachev uprising. Already, in response to Catherine's Manifesto of 1763, 23,000 Germans from the Palatinate and a small group of Moravian Herrnhuter had settled in the Volga area. The Manifesto offered foreign settlers virgin lands, tax concessions, and privileges, including complete religious freedom, but excluding the right to proselytize among members of the Orthodox faith.

The Russians expected the foreign settlers to fill two roles. They were to colonize the steppes, and to serve as models for the native population in farming techniques. [Peters 1965:31]

When they reached Russia, the Brotherhood entered into a contract with Russian Field Marshall Count Rumiantsev to settle on his lands at Vishenky on the Desna River, a tributary of the Dnieper (Figure 3). Freedom of religion was guaranteed, and a loan for the establishment of a colony was promised. In 1770, the Brotherhood reached Vishenky, and, "In the year 1771, on July 20, we were again gathered together under one roof and at one table" (Horsch 1974:107).

After having spent thirty-two years at Vishenky, 202 persons moved eight miles to Radichev. Here, the colony suffered both spiritual and temporal decline, and in 1819, community of goods was abandoned. According to Peters (1965:34), there was not enough land for the growing community, and since there was no land nearby, there was a reluctance to establish a daughter colony well removed from Radichev. "When, however, the general impoverishment of Radichev and the decline of the enterprises reached the stage of bankruptcy, it was too late to branch out to form a second colony" (ibid.).

In 1834, after considerable internal friction, the group at Radichev appealed to the Russian government for assistance and was directed to Johann Cornies, an agricultural leader in the Mennonite colonies. In
1842, with Cornies' help, 384 persons moved from Radichev to Hutteral, 450 miles to the south, near the Molotschora Mennonite settlement in the vicinity of Melitopol (Hostetler 1974:105). At Hutteral, the Hutterites were required to establish their community on the Mennonite village pattern, and it was here, through the placement of young men and women on Mennonite farms, that the Brethren were brought into contact with modern economic and agricultural practices. Among the Mennonites, the Brotherhood again attained some measure of prosperity, and in 1852, a second village, Johannesrah, was founded. Three additional villages were established within a short time of the founding of Johannesrah: Hutterdorf in 1856; New-Hutteral in 1857; and Scheromet in 1868 (ibid.:107).

Figure 3: Hutterite Villages in Russia, 1770-1879 (Hostetler 1974:109)
Beginning in 1845, several unsuccessful attempts were made to introduce community of goods. Although initial efforts proved futile, communal living was finally established by two separate groups in 1859 and 1860.

This renewal took place at one end of the village of Hutterdorf in 1859. In the following year, preacher Darius Walter established communal living at the other end of Hutterdorf. In the center of the village were those who remained uncommitted to communal living. Michael Waldner was called "Schmied-Michael" because he was a blacksmith and his group, therefore, acquired the name of Schmiedeleut. In 1868, his group sold their property in Hutterdorf and moved to Scheromet, about eight and one-half miles away, where they were joined by others from Johannesruh. The Schmiedeleut practiced communal living for fifteen years before they came to South Dakota in 1874, having lived nine years in Hutterdorf and six years in Scheromet.

The Schmiedeleut were a congregation distinct from the Darius Walter group, which soon took on the Dariusleut after the given name of their leader. The Dariusleut lived communally in Hutterdorf for fifteen years before they immigrated to the United States. The third branch of the Hutterite movement, the Lehrerleut, was formed after the arrival of its members in South Dakota. [ibid.:111]

About the time that the Hutterites were re-establishing the old order, Russia was becoming increasingly nationalistic, and in 1864, the Primary Schools Bill was passed, making Russian the language of instruction in the schools. Within a short time, it was also announced that universal and compulsory military service would be introduced. This caused great concern among foreign settlers, and when the Hutterites and the Mennonites failed to get their grant of freedom from military service confirmed, both groups decided that survival depended upon emigration (Peters 1965:35). Between 1874 and 1879, at least 1,265 Hutterites, including those not practicing communal living, departed for the United States.
The Hutterites in North America. About a third of the Hutterites who emigrated from Russia settled in three colonies in Dakota Territory, in what is now the State of South Dakota. The majority of all of the other Hutterites who chose not to live communally settled on individual homesteads in the same region. These independent, non-colony Hutterites were called "Prairieleut" and affiliated eventually with Mennonite church groups.

Several reasons may be found why the Hutterites settled in what is now the south-east corner of the State of South Dakota: (1) the Brethren were preceded by a large number of their ethnic kin (i.e., other "German-Russian groups); (2) the land on which they settled was similar to the agricultural region they occupied in Russia; and (3) homesteads were still available in Dakota Territory. Although the colony Hutterites did not take advantage of the Homestead Act, the availability of homestead lands would have been of critical import to the Prairieleut who established independent farms. By 1875, homesteads were no longer available on Federal lands in adjacent states such as Nebraska (Menno: The First 100 Years 1979:2).

1. Initial Settlement in South Dakota.

In 1875, the Schmiedeleut purchased 2,500 acres on the Missouri River west of Yankton in Bon Homme County, where they founded Bon Homme Colony. A year later, the Dariusleut bought 5,400 acres on the James River forty miles north of Bon Homme, which became known as Wolf Creek Colony. In 1877, the Lehrerleut bought 5,440 acres north of Wolf Creek for their founding colony, which became known as Old Elmspring. From the
original location in Bon Homme County, the Hutterite colonies spread northward along the James River. By 1917, twenty-one Hutterite colonies had been established in the United States: nineteen in South Dakota and two in Montana. The population of the Brotherhood in 1917 was nearly 2,000 (Hostetler 1974:126).

Between 1874 and the entry of the United States into World War I in 1917, there was no serious conflict between the Hutterites and their neighbors (ibid.:125). When the United States entered the war, however, Congress passed the Selective Service Act. Since there were no provisions for conscientious objectors except for non-combatants within the service, this created the first important confrontation between the Brethren and the United States government. With all claims for exemption denied, the young Hutterite men who appeared before the military boards of enquiry were "often simply classified...as stubborn and obstinate peasant-farmers, and sent...to military training camps" (Peters 1965:43). At these camps, the young Hutterite men were harassed, provided with limited rations, and sometimes tortured. Two Hutterite men, Joseph and Michael Hofer, died following four months of confinement at military prisons. The death of these two men "was without question the experience that motivated the migration to Canada" (Hostetler 1974:130).

Initially, the Brethren decided that a few colonies would be established in Canada where all men of draft age could be transferred. However, increased hostility of "excessively patriotic neighbors" forced the Brethren to undertake total emigration (Peters 1965:45).

The climax was reached in 1919 when suit was brought by the State of South Dakota in the Circuit Court of Beadle County against the
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Hutterians, asking for their dissolution as a corporation. The charges were that the incorporation was false because the Hutterians transacted business, that the leaders had a bad influence on their members, that the colony regulations and practices were contrary to the laws of the state, and that the Hutterians refused to support the nation in time of war. Judge A.E. Taylor ruled that the Hutterian "corporation should dispose of all its property exceeding fifty thousand dollars; amend its by-laws so as to exclude therefrom all provisions with reference to the transaction of secular business and submit such amended by-laws to the court for approval; and should no longer engage in farming, stock raising and other secular pursuits and businesses not authorized by the charter." The overt object of this decision was to "absolutely exterminate" the Hutterians in South Dakota. [ibid.]

Acting before the court had made its decision, the Hutterites founded sixteen colonies in Canada, six by the Dariusleut and Schmiedeleut and four by the Lehrerleut.

The possibility of moving to Canada had not escaped the attention of the Hutterites during their pre-1918 period in South Dakota. Initially, this interest was prompted by fears that Hutterite men would be conscripted during the Spanish-American War. And in 1893, the Dariusleut established a colony near Dominion City, Manitoba, only a short distance north of the U.S.-Canada border. The Spanish-American War ended very quickly, however, and none of the other colonies in the United States moved to Canada. In 1905, the colony members abandoned the Dominion City site and returned to South Dakota. The original Dominion City site has never been repossessed by the Hutterites.


While there was some fear initially that public opinion in Canada would move in the same direction as it had in the United States, conditions in the Canadian West during the First World War were quite
different from those in South Dakota, particularly with regard to the availability of manpower.

The war had drained off Canadian manhood and the government was already considering sending boys from Ontario and Quebec, dressed in khaki uniform and described by the press as "soldiers of the soil," to help western farmers. Western agriculture was one of the most important elements of the Canadian war effort, and weakness here could seriously cripple Canada's contribution to the Allied cause. To the government and the immigration authorities, the incoming Hutterites with their excellent reputation as farmers were the most valuable immigrants at a time of the nation's need. [ibid.:46]

The move to Canada split into two streams, with the Dariusleut and Lehrerleut moving to Alberta and the Schmiedeleut to Manitoba. In Alberta, the ten colonies established in 1918 are located in two parts of the province: all of the Lehrerleut and four of the Dariusleut colonies are situated in the southern part of the province not far from the United States border; while the other two Dariusleut colonies are located in the Rockyford area in South-Central Alberta. The six colonies established in Manitoba in 1918 are all located in the rural municipality of Cartier, near the town of Elie. The municipality of Cartier had a large French-Canadian element, and according to Peters (1965:49), this was responsible, in large part, for the community's initial ready acceptance of the Hutterite settlers.

Although the depression caused particularly difficult conditions on the Canadian prairies, the Hutterite colonies "were sufficiently solvent to buy more land, to patronize business, and to pay their taxes" (ibid.:52). The result was that municipalities with Hutterites considered them valuable assets, and many of the municipalities made efforts to attract additional colonies. During the depression, there was
also a move by the State of South Dakota to address the local problems created by farm foreclosures and diminishing tax revenues through the passage of a communals act in 1935, which granted community-owned farms the same tax privileges as cooperatives. With enactment of this legislation, the Hutterites started to return to South Dakota. This interlude of good will was to end abruptly, however.

Because of their position on pacifism and their claim for exemption from active military service, the Hutterites aroused bitter feelings during the Second World War. Feelings towards the Brethren were particularly hostile in Alberta, where pressure from various protest groups resulted in the enactment of the Land Sales Prohibition Act in 1942.

The Act prohibited the sale of land to Hutterites and enemy aliens, and in 1943 it was amended to prevent the leasing of land to such persons. However, in the same year, the Act was declared ultra vires by the courts because of references to "aliens". Another Land Sales Prohibition Act was passed in 1944, making specific reference only to Hutterites and Doukhobors, and it remained in effect until 1947, when the Act was due to expire. [Alberta 1972:6]

Upon the expiration of the Land Sales Prohibition Act, the Alberta government passed the Communal Property Act, which was in effect until it was repealed in 1973. Initially, this statute limited the amount of land that a colony could own to 6,400 acres, or to the original acreage if a greater amount was owned before March, 1944. In 1951, the Communal Property Act was amended by dividing the province into zones based on agricultural capability. Under the new provisions of the Act, larger colonies were permitted in zones with poorer quality soils.

By 1953, the acquisition of adequate amounts of land became so
difficult that the Hutterites began to circumvent the Communal Property Act by various means. Such methods resulted in protests by the opponents of Hutterite expansion, however, and in response, the Province of Alberta established the Hutterite Investigation Committee in 1958. As a result of the Investigation Committee's report, the Communal Property Board was established in 1960 by an amendment to the Act. Although acquisition of land for a new colony could be approved only by the Provincial Cabinet, the Board had the authority to determine if the acquisition was within the terms of the legislation.

In Manitoba, Hutterite colonies were incorporated through the passage of private bills. However, in 1946, in response to opposition to the "encroachment of the Hutterite colonies," bills to incorporate new colonies were rejected by the Private Bills Committee (Peters 1965:56-57). Although subsequent attempts to enact restrictive legislation in Manitoba failed, in 1957, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities was successful in demanding an informal agreement with the Hutterites whereby the Brethren would locate no more than two colonies in large municipalities and only one in smaller jurisdictions; would limit the acreage of new colonies to 5,120 acres; and would maintain at least ten miles between colonies.

In 1971, the Province of Manitoba sold the land and buildings of a former airbase to the Hutterites over the objections of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and indicated that the agreement between the Union and the Hutterites was discriminatory. As a result of the Province's actions, the Schmiedeleut announced that it considered the
informal arrangement with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities to be null and void (Hostetler 1974:135).

As a result of Canadian land restrictions, Hutterite colonies have dispersed into wider geographic areas. In Manitoba, the threat of restrictive legislation and the inducement offered by the State of South Dakota with the passage of a communals act were effective in persuading a number of the Schmiedeleut to return to South Dakota. Although most of the original colonies in South Dakota were owned by the Dariusleut and the Lehrerleut, these two leuts sold most of their holdings to the Schmiedeleut. Today, all of the Hutterites in South Dakota and Manitoba belong to the Schmiedeleut.

Response to the restrictive legislation enacted in Alberta was dispersal into either adjacent provinces or states or into the province's northern agricultural frontier. The reaction of the Lehrerleut to the restrictive legislation in Alberta was most dramatic. Between 1937 and 1950, this leut did not start any colonies in Alberta, branching instead into Montana, where eight colonies were established during this period. In 1952, Hutterite colonies from Alberta began to branch into Saskatchewan, where they were met with immediate opposition. This resistance culminated ultimately in a "Memorandum of Understanding" between the Lehrer and the Darius groups and the Saskatchewan Government. The Memorandum outlined several "guidelines" for colony establishment, including a separation allowance between colonies of at least thirty-five miles and a maximum size of 10,000 acres unless located on poorer soil. Unlike Alberta, Hutterite expansion was not governed by statute and was
therefore not legally binding on the colonies. Nevertheless, the Hutterites respected the agreement, and it thus "appears to have the same effect as legislation" (Alberta 1972:11).

In an overall assessment of Hutterite settlement history, Diener (1974:615) suggests that the Great Plains is an "evolutionary niche" that the Brethren have occupied for over 400 years. This ability to seek out the "rural frontier regions of expanding capitalism" explains why the Brethren have been able to withdraw from the world and maintain a simple life. However, since the dry-land farming region of North-Central United States and the prairie provinces of Western Canada is being subject to progressively greater development, the Brethren's ultimate survival may depend on their ability to find yet another niche that is "underpopulated, undercapitalized, underdeveloped, and incompletely integrated within the larger economic structure" (ibid.:613-614).

Contemporary Colony Patterns

Instrumental Organization. Formal colony organization is illustrated in Figure 4 and includes the following: (1) two levels of authority, with the chief executives and elders occupying the first level, the "Governing Roles," and the heads of the various farm enterprises responsible for the second level, the "Agricultural Management Roles;" (2) the absence of a separate church structure; and (3) except for the head cook, the exclusion of women.

The colony's executive function is served by a Council which always
includes the positions of first minister, secretary (or colony boss), and field manager (or farm boss). When the first minister reaches an age when he needs an assistant or when the colony begins preparations for a division, a second minister is elected by lot and becomes a member of the Council. In addition to the first minister, second minister, secretary, and field manager—who are always on the Council—two or three other men are elected for life to serve on the colony's executive. The German teacher is usually one of the persons who is elected, although the positions may be filled by "anyone from the poultryman to the assistant mechanic" (Peters 1965:86). The Council is responsible for "practical day-to-day decisions," for discipline, and for performance of a judicial function in minor disagreements (Hostetler 1974:162-164).

The responsibilities of the colony's chief executives may be functionally specific, diffuse, or both. The first minister, for example, is not only the spiritual head of the colony, but also functions as court of last resort, guardian of tradition, and arbitrator of intra-colony disputes. He is also entrusted with the responsibility of disseminating information among the colony members on issues awaiting discussion or vote. [Bennett 1967:146]

Compared to the responsibilities of the first minister, the roles of the other colony executives are much more functionally specific, including the position of secretary, who is responsible for the common purse, and field manager, who is in charge of the field crops and the allocation of labor. Although slight, there is a gradation of authority from first minister to secretary to field manager (to German teacher, provided the latter is on the Council).
(All adult baptized males take part in the Assembly—the colony's group-decision body. Women do not participate or vote.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNING ROLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Church Elder or First Minister (Spiritual leader; communications officer) (Most colonies have a second minister)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Authority principles: 1, 2, 3, 4, but with slight gradation as represented by 1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL, OR VORSTEHEN DER GEMEINDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Made up of Elders, Aufsehers, or Chief Executives, in both elective and honorary positions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: 6 Chief Executives; Councillors; plus 2 or 3 Farm Enterprise Managers, as below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT ROLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARM ENTERPRISE MANAGERS (elective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any number; varies with enterprise.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL: Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATTLE (bull)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Authority: Only one person per enterprise; no gradation; no group organization.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABOR FORCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Laborers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All men 15 years or older not in executive or managerial positions; When baptized, in voting group.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All Men in Executive-Managerial Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(When available, or on call.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Especially younger, unmarried.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE HIERARCHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD GARDENER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Only executive position for women—not elective.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDEN WIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISE WIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Workers, usually spinsters, not in jobs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN DO NOT VOTE OR PARTICIPATE IN ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Formal Colony Organization (Bennett 1967:144)**

The management level is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the colony's economy and includes those in charge of a number of agricultural functions—cattleman, pigman, poultryman, etc.—as well as the heads of various other enterprises, such as shoemaker, bookbinder, and others. While the heads of larger enterprises may have one or more assistants, several of the smaller endeavors may be consolidated under one individual. Neither is it uncommon for an individual to be represented on both the executive and the management levels. For example, the German teacher may also be in charge of the colony garden.
and if elected to the Council, serves the dual role of executive and manager.

The "Church" includes all of the baptized men and women on the Colony. The church, however, does not have a separate administrative structure, for as Peters (1965:76) notes, "The community is the congregation." It is also noted that the church's only functional roles—those of the ministers—are already represented on the colony's executive. To illustrate further what Bennett (1967:145) calls the "synthesis of the practical and the spiritual in Hutterite society," it is the church, through the voting power of the male baptized members, which directs the actions of the Council on important matters. The baptized males also vote to determine who will fill leadership positions.

What is particularly germane to the discussion of colony authority patterns is how incentives can be maintained without these rewards becoming divisive. In the perspectives outlined by both Bennett (1967) and Peter (1975), the tension between individual aspirations and needs, on the one hand, and group goals, on the other, is controlled largely by a "system of automatic promotions based entirely on age" (ibid.:114). In the case of seniority, there are no written rules; instead, there is the expectation that a man will move up through the ranks of the agricultural and executive positions as he grows older and acquires experience. However, in this, as in other management contexts, the Brethren are flexible, with age having greater influence in matters of personal conduct and religious tradition. In technical areas, on the other hand, the ministers, for example, are not necessarily influential. Instead,
there is a consensus that technical matters "should be in the hands of
the most capable, regardless of age" (Bennett 1967:150). Generally, the
principle of seniority supports the broader notion that, within the
appropriate sex group, age is the most important factor determining the
position of an individual in the colony's hierarchy.

There is a fundamental difference, however, between Bennett and
Peter on the extent to which individuals actually aspire for prestige and
status. According to Bennett (1967:157-158), differences in prestige are
"more a matter of form than of personal preference or gratification."
Except for young men who are allowed to prepare themselves for the
colony's intellectual jobs, "Hutterite men never consciously aspire...for
managerial or executive positions" (ibid.:158, emphasis in the original).
Thus, while the colony system is characterized as functionally
differentiated, it is considered only marginally differentiated in terms
of prestige and lacking in overt competition. Although the individual
Hutterite does not seem to have the need to achieve on an individual
basis, he does have "strong incentive to do well for the good of the
group" (ibid.:160).

In a much different perspective provided by Peter (1975:114), the
individual Hutterite male is taught "to entertain high hopes for
advancement and social privileges."

The importance of the hierarchical order in Hutterite communities,
and the emphasis on even very small status differentiations and the
significance of the behavioral validation of status attainment in
all aspects of the daily life of the communities demonstrate the
existence and the extent of this motivational reward system. The
second reward system consists of a limited, but legitimized, access
to material resources and other privileges stratified according to
the status positions obtained in a community. (ibid.)
In this scenario, advancement is made possible through very rapid colony growth and development of identical communities which make these promotions possible. In order to finance this growth, it is necessary to expropriate surpluses and to restrict domestic consumption. Such restrictions are facilitated by expectations for advancement through the colony's promotional network.

**Economic Patterns.** Although the Hutterites practiced a variety of crafts in Central Europe, the move to Russia emphasized agriculture. This shift resulted from two factors: one, a lack of markets and resources for craft production; and two, the availability of good land. Because the land in the Dakotas was similar to that in Russia, emphasis on agricultural production was continued in the U.S., even though each colony still made most of its own tools and household articles. Growing commercialization and specialization of North American agriculture, however, soon required a shift to a more capital-oriented enterprise, with even less time being devoted to home crafts. As Bennett (1967:166-167) notes in his study of six colonies in Southern Saskatchewan,

The third stage, reached by the colonies in the late 1950's and early 1960's, involved the purchase of highly specialized labor-saving devices like hydraulic post-pounders, automatic milkers, automatic bale-stackers, and forage harvesters, and thus furthered the shift to a capital-oriented agriculture. For all six colonies in our study, the move to Saskatchewan meant an inevitable rise to this third stage, since it became clear to everyone involved that establishment in this high-risk environment could be attained most effectively by investing in such equipment and thereby permitting the labor force to work more productively on machine maintenance and high-income products like eggs and swine. In the early stages of colony development, capital requirements are
high and there is little, if any, accumulation of wealth. Among older and wealthier colonies, on the other hand, the potential is great for the accumulation of funds. On these colonies—ones which could afford to spend more on possessions—low consumption is still maintained on an individual basis. Among wealthier colonies, savings are used to assist colonies with meagre resources. On all colonies, capital investment is limited after a certain level is reached, with savings accumulated to finance expansion and to support the retirement of the aged (Bennett 1967:174). Since the branching process requires the withholding of substantial cash reserves, it is through this process that the ideal of consumption austerity is "functionally reinforced" (ibid.:194). In turn, the fission process is made necessary by rapid population growth and by the Brethren's definition of optimum colony size.

Although all of the Hutterite colonies in North America practice mixed farming, there are regional differences. In 1971, seventy-three colonies in Alberta received a combined income of $23,837,712; all except $833,124 was from the sale of farm produce (Alberta 1972:21). Compared to the provincial farm average, the Hutterites derive a substantially greater proportion of their income from the sale of livestock and livestock products: 67.6 versus 57.3 percent. On the other hand, the amount of cash the Hutterites receive for grains (26.1 percent of cash income) is considerably lower than the provincial average (41.0 percent). A substantial portion of the expenses incurred by the seventy-three colonies is for purchases of feed ($2.7 million) and livestock ($5.5 million), products produced by other Alberta farmers.
When profits and expenses are calculated on an acreage basis, Hutterite colonies do not differ substantially from farms participating in the Alberta Farm Business Analysis (FBA) program. Measured by income, the FBA farms are in the upper one-third of all farms in the province. While the provincial standard is $17 per acre, the colonies have an income of $30.87 per acre and the FBA farms $31.21. Expenses per acre for the Hutterites and the FBA farms are $21.52 and $24.79, respectively. The profits of the average Hutterite colony ($9.35 per acre) and FBA farms ($7.42 per acre) are also comparable (ibid.).

The Hutterites farm 721,559 acres of land in Alberta (Alberta 1974:11). There are 6,732 persons living on eighty-two colonies. Province-wide, 62,702 farms on 49,506,287 acres support 237,924 persons. Stated differently, 2.83 percent of the farm population live on Hutterite colonies and farm 1.45 percent of the province's agricultural land. The average size of farm holdings (including rented and leased land) is: Hutterite colonies, 8,799 acres; average provincial farm, 789 acres. The average colony has eighty-two persons and farms 107.2 acres per person. The average provincial farm has about four persons, or 208.1 acres per person (ibid.).

Hutterite colonies in Manitoba are much more highly specialized than their Alberta counterparts. Although the Hutterites in Manitoba own less than one (0.87) percent of the province's farmland, the Brethren account for: fifteen (15.3) percent of total hog sales; eighteen percent of all laying chickens; twenty-four percent of all turkey sales; ninety-five percent of the goose sales; and sixty-two percent of the total sales of...
ducks (Ryan 1977:246-247). Turkey production, in particular, is very highly specialized, with about a quarter of Manitoba's total production concentrated on only twelve colonies. The Hutterites in Manitoba also over-produce in several other areas relative to the amount of farmland owned: three percent of the province's oats, two percent of its barley, and one percent of total wheat production; 1.7 percent of the dairy cattle; and 5.6 percent of all honeybee colonies. Beef production, a significant enterprise on most Alberta colonies, is not a major source of revenue in Manitoba, accounting for only 0.2 percent of the province's total beef operation. Only 1.1 percent of all gross sales income on Manitoba Hutterite colonies comes from enterprises other than farming (ibid.:228-229).

**Spatial Patterns.** Much of the literature on Hutterite colonies reports that the layout of the colony reflects the Hutterite world view, a cosmology that stresses separation or withdrawal from the larger society and belief in an other-worldly heaven. This suggests that colonies are located so that they are deliberately removed from towns and major highways and that the Hutterites put their barns and sheds, the most functional and usually the least attractive part of the colony, nearest the road, "almost symbolically as if to turn their back on the world" (Peters 1965:78).

According to Hostetler (1974:154-156), the layout of a colony must maintain God's order. In "Dariushof," the center of the colony is a rectangle with multi-family dwellings, or "long houses," on both sides and with the kitchen and the kindergarten on opposite ends. On
Lehrerleut colonies, the kitchen is usually in the center of the square (Plate 1 and Figure 5). The long houses run due north and south and have been squared with the compass, for as one preacher remarked, "You don't walk crooked to the earth, you walk straight...and not askew" (ibid.:154). Many of the other buildings on the colony are laid out either parallel with, or at right angles to, the long houses.

Except for the minister, his assistant, and children under the age of six, all meals are taken in the communal kitchen, where men and women eat at separate tables. The minister and his assistant eat in the home of the former, children under the age of three have their meals in their dwellings, and those aged three to five years receive their meals at the kindergarten.

Plate 1. Center Square of a Hutterite Colony (Hostetler 1974:155)

Hostetler (1974:168) also contends that there "is no church
Since order is more important than place, church services—although usually held in the school building—can be held anywhere. "The only requirements are that the room be large, orderly, clean, and unornamented and that there be enough seats to assign everyone..."
his place." Sacred space is any area where God's order is respected and thus includes all of the colony.

The church service functions to integrate the community symbolically by making the authority pattern of the colony visible and by emphasizing its "supernatural rightness" (ibid.:169).

The service stresses the importance of right order both in the seating of the members and in the sequence of the service. The women's seating is arranged by age, separate from the men. (Families do not sit together.) In the congregation men sit according to age, but on the council bench at the front of the room they sit by rank. When the service is ended the oldest man in the rear of the assembly leaves first. The oldest woman follows the youngest boy, and finally the council files out behind the youngest girl. The first minister leaves last, shepherding his flock.

Hutterite identity symbols also include the use of colors on buildings to reflect their attitude toward a particular structure.

In one colony the kitchen, the long houses, and the kindergarten are all painted white with blue trim. The small buildings near the long houses that are primarily for colony use, such as the bee house, the shoe shop, and the small traditional goose houses, are also painted white with blue. In contrast, those buildings used primarily for economic activity that brings in money from the outside economy are painted, in this particular colony, a bright red. They include the machine shop, the pump house, the root cellar, the various barns. An exception is the public school house, which in Dariushof is stucco instead of wood, is painted yellow, is oriented to face the state road rather than the colony, and from which the sign giving its former name and school district has never been removed. Although physically within the colony, the members have emotionally placed it outside. [Hostetler and Huntington 1967:19]

Peters' and Hostetler's views were written over a decade ago and in some respects, are outdated. For example, many of the colonies established in recent years are no longer hidden from towns and major highways. A case in point is Spring Water, a recently-established Lehrerleut colony in Montana, which is only three miles from Harlowtown.
and in full view of travellers on Highway 191. Neither is there such strict segregation of colony buildings by color. At the Verdant Valley Colony in Alberta, for example, all of the colony buildings, including the residential buildings, the piggery, and whatever, are painted white with blue trim. All of this in full view of Highway 576.

Recently, a great many colonies have constructed church facilities. Although some of these new facilities are free-standing (e.g., Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota), most churches are included on the end of the communal kitchen. While the construction of church facilities must reflect assimilationist tendencies, colony churches are not a recent phenomenon. At the Huron (now Riverside) Colony in South Dakota, the colony church is a free-standing masonry structure that was built in 1916. Another pre-1918, free-standing church was reported at the Milltown Colony in South Dakota.

Adherence to strict rectilinearity in the layout of colony buildings is also showing signs of loosening. At the Rolland Colony in South Dakota, each residential building is offset appreciably so that the houses on one side of the square do not face directly towards the front of the structures on the other side. In what will be a complete departure from the norm, the new colony proposed by the James Valley Colony in Manitoba will have the residential units arranged in a circle around the communal kitchen (Rev. John Hofer, James Valley Colony, Manitoba, pers. comm.).

Population Growth and the Colony Fission Process. Hutterite family and reproductive patterns have resulted in an extremely high rate of
natural increase. In 1950, this rate of natural increase was calculated by Eaton and Mayer (in Boldt 1983:235) to be 4.32 percent per annum, or a doubling of the population every sixteen years. The age-sex distribution of the Hutterites, based on a high and constant birth rate, is classified by Eaton and Mayer as a "stable population model." That is, the population has an unchanging (or constant) rate of growth and age structure.

The mechanism that the Hutterites use to maintain small, manageable, face-to-face groups under conditions of very rapid population growth is referred to as "branching" or "branching out." As a social adaptation to a high rate of natural increase, branching is the key to the success of individual Hutterite colonies. This is so since there is always a growing surplus of available men relative to the number of positions of responsibility that are available. Whereas almost all of the adult men are in charge of an office or an enterprise on a new colony (e.g., cattleman, hogman, etc.), on an older and larger colony, the number of men assigned to general labor or as assistants increases substantially. Colony branching or division is the key to the success of individual colonies, since it is through the fission process that opportunities for personal advancement are provided within the Hutterite system.

A number of recent studies suggest that the population growth rate of all three leuts has slowed considerably. Peter (1980:100), for example, infers that the rate of population growth has fallen by 1.2 percent, from 4.12 to 2.91 percent, with the start of the decline occurring sometime between 1965 and 1968. At the heart of this decline
is the growing surplus of young, relatively unskilled colony workers, including women, relative to the number of colony positions providing meaningful work and "status and prestige" (ibid.:104). Under conditions where there is a limited supply of meaningful jobs open to them, Peter suggests that colony men and women are postponing marriage for several years in preference for a single life that includes some participation in the activities of the outside world, an opportunity that is not available to married Hutterite men and women. Boldt and Roberts (1980) argue, however, that postponement of marriage is nowhere near sufficient to account for the rather spectacular drop in the rate of natural increase of the Hutterite population. Instead, they suggest the possibility of birth control.

The basic issue is whether the Hutterites can adapt to slower growth conditions without eroding basic beliefs. Because there is no specific age by which Hutterite males and females must be married, postponement of marriage does not constitute a threat to basic beliefs. On the other hand, birth control, in any form, is officially taboo. In this light, any inclination to practice such controls has to be viewed as "individual-choice behavior that is sharply at odds with basic religious tenets" (ibid.:114). Such individually-motivated behavior is thus considered evidence of fundamental changes in the Hutterite system and not simply a reflection of the ability of the Brethren to adapt to changing circumstances without modifying core values. The use of birth control also signifies a definite weakening of the ability of Hutterite leadership to maintain tight controls over individually-initiated change,
a practice that is likely "a precedent inviting a further loosening of their social structure" (ibid.:115).

In a subsequent analysis of population data supplied by the accounting firm responsible for the preparation of income tax returns for all of the Manitoba Schmiedeleut colonies, Boldt (1983:736) indicates that the overall annual rate of population growth since 1970 was 2.25 percent. This amounts to a two-fold increase every twenty-one years. There was some fluctuation in the data, with a slightly higher annual rate of increase in the 1975-1981 period (2.33 percent) than in the 1970-1975 interval (2.16 percent). The rate of Hutterite population growth has probably stabilized at the 1975-1981 level. The results also indicate that the rate at which new colonies are being formed has slowed considerably (ibid.). In addition, there is an indication that the shift toward smaller colonies has been reversed. In Manitoba, the number of persons per colony in 1970, 1975, and 1981 was 97.2, 86.5, and 91.7 persons, respectively.

Although Boldt is reluctant to assign a long-term trend to the slower rate of colony formation, Evans (forthcoming) suggests that this is, indeed, the case. While the average interval between branching was fourteen years up until about a decade ago, the average interval between branching, based on a sample of eighty-eight daughter colonies, is now 19.6 years. The variation within this sample ranges from an average of 17.3 years in Alberta and 17.8 years in Manitoba to 20.3 years in Montana and 24.3 years in South Dakota (ibid.)
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL CONCEPTS AND RESEARCH METHODS

Concepts play a key role in scientific analysis. They are significant elements in the prior scheme that the scholar has of the empirical world; they are likely to be the terms in which his problem is cast; they are usually the categories for which data are grouped; they usually become the chief means for establishing relations between data; and they are usually the anchor points in interpretation of the findings. [Blumer 1969:26]

One source of concepts for this study is derived from the field of house-type geography. The other source, one that is relevant to social change, includes selected concepts from Marxist theory and from symbolic interactionism. These concepts provide the basis for the analyses in subsequent chapters.

Theoretical Concepts, House-Type Geography

Of the principles of house-type geography established by Kniffen, his colleagues, and students, the following areas are particularly relevant to the understanding of the Hutterite building tradition:

1. the conditions under which different building traditions are accepted or adopted;
2. the genetic relationship among different house types; and
3. explanation of the evolution of one house type to another.

**Origin of American Folk House Types and Building Practices.** Initial settlement of America's Eastern seaboard was concentrated in three large source areas that Kniffen (1965:557-558) designates New England, Middle Atlantic, and Lower Chesapeake. The first region has frame construction based on English framing techniques. This tradition includes an English barn that was carried westward into the Upper Midwest with few modifications, and several house types that begin with a simple one-room unit. The series of house types, too, is considered to have its origin, at least in its early stages, in England (ibid.:558). The Middle-Atlantic source region focuses on Southeastern Pennsylvania, and its building tradition is associated with early log construction techniques and several barn types. To the south, in the Lower Chesapeake, a source area that is centered on Tidewater Virginia and which contributed largely to the Upland South, the building tradition begins with a frame, one-room English cottage with an end chimney. According to Kniffen (1965:555), the structures "compounded" from this basic English unit include the "I" house (a structure that is nominally one-room deep, two full stories high, and two rooms wide), which emerged from the Delaware-Chesapeake section and joined the movement southward out of Pennsylvania. This stream subsequently extended the "I" house into Texas and then northward into the Upper Midwest.

Kniffen and Glassie (1966) suggest that the European log building
tradition in the Middle-Atlantic source region is largely "vestigial" and that it was rejuvenated and perpetuated in the timber-rich area of the Eastern U.S. This means that many of the house and barn types evolved in America from obscure European customs. Jordan (1980, 1983), however, theorizes that an active wood-building tradition was brought from Europe to the Middle-Atlantic source region and points to prototypes of American folk architectural forms that are extant in the European building record.

Although they acknowledge that the Swedes who settled on the Delaware were the first to utilize horizontal log building techniques in America, Kniffen and Glassie (1966:58) argue that their building tradition "did not spread beyond New Sweden; in fact, they soon abandoned it for stone and brick." Instead, the origin of American log work is reputed to be among German-speaking areas in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia (ibid.:59). From here, it was brought to America by the Pennsylvania Germans. The notable characteristics of the log building techniques attributed to these German-speaking emigrants include several notch types (V, full-dovetail, and saddle notch); the leaving of spaces, or chinks, between the logs; and the use of logs that are planked. Kniffen (1965:563) also suggests that the Middle-Atlantic source region had several barn types, and that all of these forms evolved from a "primitive German log barn." This primitive form and all other barns derived from German Pennsylvania consist of single or multiple rectangular units called "cribs." In America, a number of larger structures are derived from these simple ancestral forms, including the "great Pennsylvania forebay barn" (ibid.).
In "Alpine, Alemannic, and American Log Architecture," an article based on field work in Central Europe, Jordan (1980:179) identifies the European location of prototypes for the Pennsylvania forebay barn and for various "sub-types" of the American double-crib log barn, thereby refuting Kniffen's claim that a number of larger barns, including the Pennsylvania forebay barn, evolved in America from a much simpler form. In a subsequent article, "A Reappraisal of Fenno-Scandian Antecedents for Midland American Log Construction," Jordan (1983:93) suggests that, notwithstanding the prominence of Pennsylvania-German barn types, the antecedents of the log building tradition found in the Middle-Atlantic/Upland South region are largely Scandinavian and Finish in origin and include several types of corner notching (V, square, half, and undersided saddle notchings); the corncrib, the single-crib barn, and the cantilever-gable smokehouse; two-sided planking, board roofs, and the Anglo-western gable; the dogtrot house; and the post-and-rail fence.

To support the thesis that the antecedents of the log building tradition that originated in the Middle-Atlantic source region are Fenno-Scandian, Jordan (ibid.) argues that the imprint of the Fenno-Scandian log building tradition occurred most strongly "in the most primitive Midland-American forms that were associated with pioneering and the frontier." The importance ascribed to the pioneering nature of Fenno-Scandian settlement in the Lower Delaware Valley is consistent with Wilbur Zelinsky's theory of "first effective settlement," in which "the first group able to effect a viable self-perpetuating society...[is]...of crucial significance for the...area, no matter how tiny the initial band
of settlers may have been" (ibid.:94). This does not suggest that the German log building tradition is insignificant. Rather, the Germanic background "prevailed in the more-refined log carpentry that followed and partially displaced the cruder Fenno-Scandian pioneer forms" (ibid.). The log building tradition that developed in the Middle-Atlantic source area is thus a mixture of two traditions: the earlier and cruder Fenno-Scandian influence; and the later, more-refined Teutonic one.

But Zelinsky's doctrine of first effective settlement provides only part of the support for my position. There are two additional reasons why some Fenno-Scandian traits persisted. Firstly, the Fenno-Scandian traits, simpler and cruder than the Teutonic ones, were better suited to frontier conditions and were easier for ethnic groups with no previous experience with log carpentry to learn and adopt. Secondly, most Germans who came to Pennsylvania were unfamiliar with log construction and were as ready as the English and the Scotch-Irish to adopt the expedient Fenno-Scandian techniques. In that manner, I suggest, Fenno-Scandian methods were absorbed by the German-speaking population perhaps decades before the first German log craftsman arrived from the Alps and the Black Forest. The German log craftsmen thus encountered on arrival a primitive log-carpentry tradition among their ethnic kin, a tradition that they modified and refined, but did not eliminate. [ibid.]

Evolution of House Types and Forms. In "Louisiana House Types," Kniffen (1936:182-183) identifies form as the "essential" trait of folk house types. In a subsequent study, Kniffen (1965:566) expands on the idea of form as the basic element of folk housing by illustrating how folk architecture consists of modules, or basic structural units, and that the evolution of house and barn types is the result of simple combinations involving a very small number of these units. The genetic relationship among different units—or what Glassie (1974:182) refers to as a "simple arithmetical play with a very few basic ideas within a
homogeneous tradition"—is one of the cardinal principles of house-type geography and is the basis for analyzing Hutterite housing design.

In the Upland South, where log construction became the prevailing (as opposed to only a temporary) mode of construction, the series of house types begins with a single ground-floor room, or single pen, with an outside chimney (Kniffen 1965:561). Because of the taper and the great weight of logs, the size of the single pen rarely exceeds thirty feet in length. Since logs are difficult to splice, the basic problem is how to extend or add to the single-pen structure. There are two solutions: one, add a second level; or two, extend the base structure horizontally. The latter has proven to be almost universal.

The means of lateral expansion include adding a second room or pen by abutting the gable wall to the end without the chimney, thus producing the double pen; another method, one that is much more widespread, is to place the room at the chimney end, producing a central-chimney, or saddlebag, house. The most common solution, however, is the dogtrot,² which includes two pens or rooms, facing gable towards gable, with an intervening area between the two units. This intervening area is covered by a roof and becomes a passageway.

A further illustration of the genetic relationship between form elements is Wilson's (1974) analysis of dogtrot houses in North Alabama. Here, he identifies at least three stages in the evolution of the dogtrot, which he terms "generations," and which are distinguishable by a combination of form and construction features. "First-generation" is used by Wilson (1974:68) for the earliest, permanent log dogtrot;
"second-generation" for the transition from log to frame; and
"third-generation" for buildings constructed of wood frame and weatherboarding.

The sequence of form changes starts with two oblong pens, not necessarily equal in size, with separate outside doors on the front of each room or pen. The passageway is open. In the first-generation dogtrot, certain features are retained from the ancestral single pen, including the loft and chimney-side windows. Front windows, absent in the single-pen house, are frequently left off the front of the first-generation structure, which further suggests a relationship with the earlier single-pen dwelling.

The second-generation dogtrot is marked by a simplification in a number of form and construction features, including the use of cruder notching techniques; smaller, only slightly hewn logs; and weatherboarding. Although the transition phase reflects a lack of knowledge of frame construction, the use of weatherboarding is an indication of a definite preference for wood-frame structures over log buildings. In the second generation, the rooms also become square and equal, as well as slightly smaller than the earlier dogtrot. In the second stage, each pen is accessed from the passageway, through a door located in the center of each unit. The front doors in the first-generation dogtrot become windows in the second generation.

Third-generation dogtrot houses are "reproductions" of the traditional log form in wood frame and weatherboarding. The major form change is a narrowing of the passageway. The passageway may also be
closed off with a door. Frequently, the doorway is embellished with paneling and stained glass.

An even further refinement of the concept of form is associated with the identification of "strains," or levels of subtypification within generations.

Wilson (1969:45-46) uses the term strain to refer to two distinct groupings of housebuilding traits among first-generation dogtrot structures. In an elaboration of the concept by Newton and Pulliam-di Napoli (1977) based on an analysis of log buildings in Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, two groupings are identified: the "half-dovetail," and the "V" strain. The former appears in the southern area of log-house construction and is somewhat earlier, while the V-notch strain becomes more common further north.

The half-dovetail strain has no window on the ground floor, but has small windows in the loft gable. The V strain may have a small window in the front wall, commonly between the door and the chimney wall. Further, the half-dovetail strain has mortised loft joints, while the V strain has loft joists tapered and wedged between wall logs. First-generation houses tend to have cantilever roof supports and roofed chimneys, two items that decline in later generations and with migration westward.

In the second generation, the half-dovetail and V strains converge closely. [ibid.:375]

There are no identifiable strains in third-generation structures (ibid.).

The explanation for the absence of strains in subsequent generations is based on the notion of "convergence," which is defined as "the decrease in distinctiveness between two formerly separate types" and which occurs as a result of "syncretism," that is, "an emphasis on the shared" (ibid.:378). The shape of the pens also becomes increasingly
more square over time and with movement from east to west, a trend that is explained by reference to Kniffen's theory of "Dominance of Contemporary Fashion," which states that new forms find greatest opportunity for dominant expression in new areas of settlement. In other words, square pens achieved greater popularity during the period when areas in the west were being settled.

Another important principle of house-type geography is "simplification" (ibid.) which occurs when there is "gradually increasing predominance of certain forms over others." Simplification in terms of notch types--from technically more- to technically less-complex treatments--is explained by "spreading indifference" towards craftsmanship in log building or by syncretism. The former suggests why there is a gradual conversion of half-dovetail to square notching and of V-notching to the saddle-notch. Simplification also suggests why there is a lessening in the association between notch types and the shape of the pens, with the result that, over time, square pens become more popular, and the earlier association between notch types and pen size (i.e., half-dovetail with oblong pens and V-notch with square pens) weakens. The decrease in the distinction between the two strains occurs when the notch types changed from half-dovetail and V to square and saddle notching, respectively.

Diffusion and Innovation. Development from each of the three seaboard source regions followed different lines. In the New England source area, for example, the westward-extending series of house forms
includes the early development of the central-hallway type. This unit
grew out of the "idea of Georgian symmetry" (Kniffen 1965:558) and is
followed in the late-eighteenth century by the "revival" of the old
storey-and-attic, that is, the one-storey with either a central chimney
or a central hallway and split chimneys (ibid.:558-559). The one-storey
house was the "initial occurrence pattern" in Michigan and westward. In
the New England series, the one-storey dwelling is followed by a form
influenced by the "classical revival," which has forward-facing gables
and side wings. In Michigan and the area to the west, the classical
follows the storey-and-attic and was the "overwhelmingly dominant" form
by the 1830s (ibid.:559).

Although there is some variation, the initial house type adopted by
the Hutterites when they settled in Dakota Territory in the 1870s was a
one-storey, central-hallway structure with more or less complete Georgian
symmetry. Since the one-storey was well known in the areas on the
western fringes of the forested Eastern U.S., it is conceivable that the
Hutterites adopted this plan as an expedient form. There is still much
to be explained, however, especially since the storey-and-attic was not
the dominant house type in the contact zone to the east.

The Hutterites also could have adopted the one-storey,
central-hallway dwelling as it moved out of Tidewater Virginia to the
Southern Midwest and on into the Western U.S. As noted earlier, the "I"
house emerged "full-blown" from the Delaware-Chesapeake section, joining
the migrations out of the Middle-Atlantic source area and spreading into
the Upland South and the Lower Midwest. Beginning about 1760, a new
form—the Georgian house type—appears in the architectural record of Middle Virginia. The new Georgian form has the following features:

Its facade was pierced with five openings instead of three, but the door was located centrally between the windows. Although the door led into a formal hallway, in the old houses there had been an unmarked channel for direct passage from front to back, and the cross passage was a typical feature of medieval British housing. The entrance of the new house was still structured transversely to the ridge. The new type was two rooms deep, whereas the earlier houses were a single room deep, as was usual in the domestic building of the British Middle Ages; yet the new type was symmetrically roofed like the old houses. [Glassie 1975:89]

The entrance of the new house type did not replace the old competence. Rather, house builders continued to build the old forms as well as the new. Most importantly, the new system that developed enabled the builder to construct a "set of compromises" or "syncretistic types which, by being partially older than the novelty, were, as a matter of fact, newer than new" (ibid.). In Middle Virginia, the number of houses designed according to the new form, that is, the two-room deep, two-storey, central-hall Georgian type, is limited to only three extant cases. The most common house type in the Middle Virginia record is a compromise which blends the one-room deep "I" house with the new Georgian symmetry and central hallway. "Thus was born the central-hall I house, the most common type from the old Tidewater, across the Southern Mountains, out through the Bluegrass, and into the lower Midwest" (ibid.:91). Most of central-hall "I" houses designed in Middle Virginia had only three openings in the facade instead of five (i.e., a door between two windows, instead of a door between four windows). These openings, however, have been "brought into exact symmetry" (ibid.).
All of the earliest central-hall, one-room deep houses were "I" houses; that is, they had two storeys. In Middle Virginia, another compromise produced the one-storey, central-hall house. According to Glassie (1975:101), "One-storey central-hall houses were not unknown farther east in the eighteenth century, and they were common from the Georgia-Carolina coast through the Deep South, into the southern Midwest, and from thence to the Mormon West."

Glassie's attempt to explain certain major design changes in early Middle Virginia housing is based on an "increase in the need for privacy" (1975:120-121). In Middle Virginia, early folk houses with two rooms were located well back from the road. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the central-hallway house type and its derivatives were located closer and closer to the road, until, by the end of the nineteenth century, most houses were built right by the public thoroughfare.

Although the early house had been planned so that one entered immediately into the center of the action of its inhabitants, it had been put at a great distance from the road, enabling its family to observe the arrival of strangers. The later house brought this traditional zone within its walls, but the house itself was located closer to the routes of public motion. This change might, then, be counted as a net functional balance, but it is more an approximate equivalence than an identity: the change for the person crossing the threshold was great, for he was standing in a dark, unheated hallway, not within the hearthside glow. The house types affected a greater distancing between the family and outsiders. [ibid.:121]

Another explanation that addresses the way that housing design can change suggests that, while house types do conform in a general way to accepted definitions, the deterministic model is inadequate to explain the large amount of variation observed among the houses that represent
the class. This variation, it is suggested, can be explained more adequately by "historic opportunities" (Newton and Pulliam-di Napoli 1977) that limit or constrain the house-building process. This process is, preeminently, a "public occasion," an event that must reconcile what is deemed "fitting and proper" with the practicalities imposed by such mundane matters as availability of adequate building materials, the "talents and tastes" of the neighbors who participate in the house-raising occasion, and so on.

The nature of the house-building process is one in which the percepts and concepts to be incorporated in the proposed house are shared to a greater or lesser degree by the participants engaged in the construction effort. The extent of the shared knowledge of talents and tastes constitutes, in effect, the culture of the group. Where there are differences of opinion regarding solutions to some or many of the design items, how these differences will be resolved is problematic. Thus, while the particular house produced will be recognizable as belonging to a class of house types, there is also the likelihood that the structure will incorporate new or novel items. "The relation of the party to their situations is not deterministic, possibilistic, or probabilistic, but opportunistic; each takes advantage of what, under his premises, he sees as his opportunities" (ibid.:365).

A group of men, rather than a single individual, is almost always involved in house-raising occasions. And when ideas on certain design matters are not shared by the individuals involved, the possible solutions become the basis for "subtle negotiations concerning status,
expertise, fashion, and like matters" (ibid.:364). The greater the agreement on individual tasks among the various men involved in the house-building effort, "the more the resulting house will look like others in the neighborhood" (ibid.). On the other hand, where the origins of the house builders are varied, that is, where a consensus is lacking on many of the building tasks, the result will be—assuming that the problematics are negotiated satisfactorily somehow—houses that vary considerably.

Once the party has enthymemically gathered the concepts and percepts that they share, they next must rhetorically reconcile their disagreements. Because folk society normally has customary role assignments, the men in the party also have, in addition to beliefs about the house, beliefs about which men should prevail in certain decisions. For certain actions, specific men or men with specific skills ought to decide. Thus, the owner, the best wood worker, or perhaps the man of highest social standing is deferred to with respect to certain actions. In this manner, many of the debated decisions also can be resolved enthymemically. Beyond what all agree on, those whom most respect shall decide. (ibid.:364-365)

And further:

Where neighbors represent diverse backgrounds, as in first-generation Alabama or in Texas, their enactments are most varied; the range of pen sizes and the variety of notches are the greatest. In Texas, where backgrounds were presumably more varied, diversity of houses is greater still. Conversely, where men shared a longer common heritage, as in second-generation Alabama, the range of enactments of public occasions is much smaller. (ibid.:366)

The diversity that may exist in the backgrounds of the house builders is a critical point, since the need to publicly rationalize the way that various tasks are to be carried out is "an occasion for innovation" (ibid.). Accordingly, areas with diverse populations had the greatest amount of change in house types (ibid.:367).
The dramatic changes in Hutterite house types in the last decade are explained both by reference to Marxist theory and to concepts from symbolic interactionism. The former is used to define the sources of change in the Hutterite system, while the social-psychological perspective of the interactionists is employed to indicate how individual definitions of housing are incorporated into a "sense of place" through the process of interaction.

Although Marx refers to no less than the sweep of Western Civilization and its unfolding, this research demonstrates that Marxist reasoning can be used to explain change at all levels, including change among the Hutterites and other groups that maintain face-to-face relationships. The initial step in the explication of change in the Hutterite system involves a description of three models of Marxist theory. Subsequent analyses are guided by these theoretical perspectives.

Marxism. Although the form that Hutterite society has taken is considered an example of extreme defensive posturing (Boldt 1980:392), the greatest amount of change among the Brethren has occurred in the recent past, a period when external opposition has been minimal (Erasmus 1981:196). The fact that change among the Hutterites has been initiated internally rather than imposed from the outside is consistent with the central theme of Marxism that "man makes himself."
1. Basic Concepts

Marx's conceptual approach to history, known as Historical Materialism, is based on a dialectical theory of society which Marx developed from Hegel, including the notion that the essential nature of systems is characterized by tendencies not only to self-harmony and self-maintenance, but also to conflict, change, and development. To Marx, system maintenance in the short run and conflict, dissolution, and transition in the long run are mutually necessary aspects of social phenomena.

Marx enthusiastically endorses the idea that social structures should be viewed as organisms or organic wholes, and often describes them in this way. He is avowedly concerned with the 'inner interconnections' among social phenomena, with 'tracing their forms of development', and grasping the inherent 'laws' or 'tendencies' which govern their history. He depicts these tendencies as arising from the antagonisms or 'contradictions' which constitute a given social whole. Marx often emphasizes that self-maintenance and transitoriness are mutually necessary aspects of any organism, and that it is the business of dialectic to grasp them in their unity. 'The dialectical method includes in the positive understanding of what subsists, also an understanding of its negation, its necessary downfall.' [Wood 1981:214]

Marx derived his theory of the dialectic from Hegel. But unlike Hegel, Marx does not view material reality as a consequence of the nature of thought processes, of reason, but as a "complex empirical fact" (ibid.:209). To Marx, "dialectical thinking only reflects the dialectical structure of the world which is thought about" (ibid.).

While the immediate goal of Marx's theory is to understand the "inner structure of society" (ibid.:218), his ultimate purpose is to identify the underlying tendencies to change in the capitalist mode of
production. Presentation of the various interpretations of Marx's theory of history begins with the definition of a number of concepts that are used to analyze any given society. The material means of production that people use to gain a livelihood are referred to as the forces of production. This concept includes natural resources, machines, and the abilities and needs of human beings themselves. It is the productive forces that determine the way people make their living (e.g., hunting and gathering, sedentary agriculture, industry). Above a certain level, each society produces a social surplus, that part of society's total potential product that remains after basic or subsistence requirements have been met. It is therefore possible to identify two groups: those who produce the surplus; and those who, through some form of coercion--either direct or indirect--appropriate the surplus. A social class is a group of people who have a common relation to the production and appropriation of the surplus. Because the appropriating class benefits whenever it increases the surplus it appropriates, there is an antagonistic interest, or class struggle, inherent in social class relationships.

The social relations of production are defined by the specific manner in which the surplus is produced and appropriated from the direct producers. These relations are concerned with the way people relate to each other in the process of making a living and in the exchange of whatever is produced. Specific examples of production and exchange relationships include lord and serf, master and slave, and capitalist and worker. These relations are revealed in the work process and are, in effect, the class structure of society. Together, the productive forces
and the relations of production constitute the mode of production. Since every society has a dominant mode of production, this concept is used to "periodize" history (e.g., slave, feudal, petty commodity, capitalist).

In any given society, the position of the appropriating class is legitimized by the legal, political, and ideological institutions that form part of the superstructure. This superstructure rests on, and is also essential for, the maintenance of the social relations of production that make up the economic base. Although the relationship between the superstructure and the base is not unidirectional, in Marxism, economic factors are seen as fundamentally determining. This is currently a point of debate, however, and is discussed in the following sections.

2. The Technical Determinist Perspective

The technical determinist perspective views change from one dominant mode of production to another as a result of the growing contradiction between the forces and the relations of production. In this orthodox interpretation of Marx, contradiction develops because the forces of production are more dynamic than the relations of production and expand at a much greater rate. This is because the relations of production serve the interests of the ruling class to preserve the status quo (Edwards, et al. 1978:42). This growing contradiction thus takes the form of a class struggle between the rising class associated with the new means of production and the ruling class whose domination is based on the older forces.

In sixteenth-century England, the rise of trade and commercial
activity became incompatible with the feudal relations whose privileged positions depended on land rights and control of the handicraft (or guild) industries as well as the judicial and military systems. The result was that the feudalist mode of production was changed, in a series of violent revolutions, to a capitalist one.

The technical determinist perspective of history is supported by Marx in one of his famous passages.

At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or—this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms—with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. [in Gurley 1978:45]

3. The Broad Mode of Production Interpretation

An alternative to the technical determinist perspective is presented by Miller (1984:205) and suggests that the growth of productive forces is not the only internal source of change. Unlike the technical determinist perspective, in which development is initiated by change in productive forces that are defined in a narrow technological way and considered primary, Miller (1984:215) indicates that change can occur when the economic system is in "conflict with itself, as well as with the productive forces."

Even though political institutions are seen as maintaining the power of the economically-dominant group, self-destructive processes are political as well as economic. In fact, epochal change has occurred when
there has been little change in the forces of production (ibid.:178-179). For example, most of the producers in both sixteenth-century England and the early Roman Empire were small peasant proprietors. The two are distinguished by Marx, however, according to the way in which surplus labor is exacted. In Roman times, the surplus was appropriated primarily through slave holding, while in manorial England, the surplus was extracted through political domination of free farmers and craft workers. Change occurred in feudal England because the social relations of production became "self-transforming" (ibid.:216).

The self-destructive tendency of the feudal economic structure is implied by Marx's description of the first stage in the rise of capitalism: "The old nobility had been devoured by the great feudal wars. The new nobility was the child of its times for which money was the power of all powers." The literal self-destruction of the old aristocracy and the rise of mercantile supporters of the great royal houses were not the result of productive growth. They were the result of a tendency toward civil war inherent in the feudal economic structure, where a surplus is mostly extracted through dominance over land and its tillers by means of military force possessed by independent family groups. [ibid.:216-217]

4. Critical Theory

Critical theory, of which Jurgen Habermas is probably the leading proponent, argues that researchers should adopt a critical attitude towards the social systems they study and make people aware of what they should do. The ultimate aim of critical theory is social change. Like other theorists from the "Frankfurt School," Habermas draws more on Marx's earlier and more-Hegelian work on alienation than on his economic analysis, which explains the emphasis he places on the role played by "people's ideas and consciousness" (Wallace and Wolf 1980:111).
Habermas's critical theory also incorporates two concepts about modern society proposed by other Frankfurt analysts. One is Horkheimer's idea that culture and ideology are not dependent on economic relations, but a "semiautonomous realm" (in Wallace and Wolf 1980:108). The other is from Marcuse's critique of modern society in which he argues that dissent has been exchanged for material goods (ibid.:110).

Social systems evolve in two ways. One, the system extends its control over the environment (outer nature) through production processes that are governed by technical rules. Two, the system adapts the members of society to society (inner nature) with the help of normative validity claims "that can only be redeemed discursively" (Habermas 1975:10). Both follow a directional process that is "logically independent of one another" (ibid.:11). One of the important characteristics of the integration of inner nature is that in the directional sequence "from myth, through religion, to philosophy and ideology" (ibid.:11), the "demand for discursive redemption of normative validity claims increasingly prevails" (ibid.). So also do "world-views" follow a directional pattern that includes expansion of the secular domain and a shift from "tribal particularism to universalistic and at the same time individualistic orientations" (ibid.:12).

Although goal values vary according to the position of a society on the directional sequence, Habermas (1976:13) contends "that variation in goal values is limited by a ...logic that is not at the disposition of the imperatives of power augmentation" (ibid.:13; emphasis in the original).
We cannot exclude the possibility that a strengthening of productive forces, which heightens the power of the system, can lead to changes in normative structures that simultaneously restrict the autonomy of the system because they bring forth new legitimacy claims and thereby constrict the range of variation of the goal values. [ibid.]

There have been two developments in modern or advanced-capitalist states: one, the rise of oligopolistic market structures; and two, state intervention. This intervention includes both "market-supplementing" and "market-replacing" functions, including measures for guiding the flow of capital into areas neglected by the market. Although the economic sphere has been "recoupled" to the political, investment decisions are still made according to private-sector profit motives. Since the market still provides the steering mechanism, there is a contradiction in advanced-capitalist societies between "administratively socialized production and the continued private appropriation and use of surplus value" (ibid.:36). In order to keep this contradiction from being questioned, administrative decisions are removed from the arena of public debate. This is accomplished by a system of formal democracy that elicits mass loyalty (but which eschews participation) and by promotion of suitable rewards (career success, leisure time, and consumption) within the system.

In the growth of advanced-capitalist societies, problems arise when the political system expands its boundaries into socio-cultural areas that were previously taken for granted. As the political system spreads, cultural traditions are undermined and weakened. Most importantly, the
administrative manipulation of cultural matters has the unintended side
effect of causing meanings and norms previously fixed by tradition to be
debated publicly (ibid.:47). Because traditional patterns whose force
depended on people not questioning them are no longer unquestionable, the "stirring up of cultural affairs that are taken for granted...[only]... furthers the politicization of areas of life previously assigned to the private sphere" (ibid.:72). With expansion into areas that were previously taken for granted, there has been a rising level of demand by the public for collective commodities (i.e., transportation, leisure, health care, education, etc.) that is proportional to the growing need for legitimation. In other words, in order to retain mass loyalty, "[m]issing legitimation must be offset by rewards conforming to the system" (ibid.:73).

The less the cultural system is capable of producing adequate motivations for politics, the educational system, and the occupational system, the more must scarce meaning be replaced by consumable values. To the same extent, the patterns of distribution for non-generalizable interests are endangered. The definitive limits to procuring legitimation are inflexible normative structures that no longer provide the economic-political system with ideological resources, but instead confront it with exorbitant demands. [ibid.:93] In this way, advanced capitalist societies have undermined themselves. That is, the strengthening of productive forces leads to changes in normative structures, but in the process, new legitimating claims are brought forth that restrict the autonomy of the system.

The work of Jurgen Habermas is important for two reasons. One, it does not regard class warfare as inevitable. Instead, it may be possible to avert economic crises permanently (ibid.:40). This is largely because
the ideology of the market has lost some of its power. That is, some needs have developed that cannot be satisfied monetarily (e.g., occupational success, consumption, and leisure pursuits). Habermas is also important in light of the emphasis that he places on the need to validate legitimacy claims through "constant interpretation and reinterpretation" (ibid.:87). The view that "what ought to be" can only be redeemed rhetorically is important to this research, since it is consistent with the theory of public occasions and symbolic interactionism, especially with their emphasis on the way in which meaning arises in the process of interaction.

Symbolic Interactionism. Among symbolic interactionists, there is a consensus that, while many definitions of the situation are "cultural and hence ready-made" (Stebbins, forthcoming), the individual is also capable of transcending culture and of responding to problematic situations in a creative, rather than only in an "habitual" or "preformed" way (ibid.). The essence of this paradox between what amounts to the reification of culture, on the one hand, and the ability of individuals to respond to problematic situations in a novel or creative way, on the other, is captured by Turner (1962:21-22) in his elaboration of "role-taking" and "role-making." Objecting to the widely-accepted view that there is a "neat set of rules--a culture or set of norms" for each occupant of a position, Turner (1962:23) suggests, instead, that each person must, through an ongoing interactive process, define the role that is consistent with the inferences that are continuously supplied by the
roles undertaken by others. The role-taking process is thus a method of shifting "emphasis away from the simple process of enacting a prescribed role to devising a performance on the basis of an imputed other-role" (ibid.:23; emphasis in the original). It is this tendency "to create and modify conceptions of self- and other-roles" which is at the core of the meaning of "role-making."

The importance of role-making in the theory of symbolic interactionism is that it makes two cardinal principles of the interactionist process explicit. One, since a role has to be undertaken in response to the imperatives of each situation, behavior is not necessarily—or, for that matter, very frequently—a simple process of "routine enactment of lines in a script" (Hewitt 1983:81). Two, each performance of a role is a "self-conscious activity" (ibid.:82). Unless one is aware of one's own role performance, it is impossible for an actor to adjust his role performance "to suit personal goals, the demands of the situation, and the expectations of others."

Two concepts from symbolic interactionism are particularly relevant to the explanation of why Hutterite housing is changing. The first is the relationship between behavior and material culture. The second is how individual definitions, once they are formulated, are reconciled through public discourse.

1. The Meaning of Material Culture

The worlds of human beings are made up of objects, and the nature of these objects reflects the meaning that the objects have for individuals who identify them and act towards them (Blumer 1969:10-11). The meanings
attached to objects are thus social creations that result from the way the objects are defined by others with whom the individual interacts. In this way, any physical object toward which an individual responds or acts is reflected in the perspective of the society or group as a whole, or what Mead (1934:154n) refers to as the actor's "total generalized other." Physical objects thus "call out responses in ourselves, and these responses are the meanings or the natures of the objects" (ibid.:280). It is in this sense that we take the attitude of objects about us.

At the individual level, the world consists only of objects that have been identified or recognized by each actor. And it is towards this world of identifiable objects that individuals (as well as groups) must "develop their actions" (Blumer 1969:11). It follows, then, that in order to understand the behavior of individuals and groups, "it is necessary to identify their world of objects" (ibid.). Blumer also notes that the meaning attached to physical objects can change, that the process of group interaction is a process in which the meanings of objects are "created, affirmed, transformed, and cast aside" (ibid.).

Anticipating what is regarded as the cueing function of material culture, Mead (1934:249) notes that the physical objects in our world "come betwixt and between the beginning of the act and its consummation, so that we have objects in terms of which we can express the relation of means to ends." In this manner, material culture becomes what Mead refers to as a series of "collapsed acts, the signs of what could happen if the acts were carried to completion" (in Troyer 1978:251).

The cueing function of material culture has been incorporated in
what is known as the dramaturgical approach. According to Goffman (1959:22), every social occasion has a physical layout—houses, streets, furniture, etc.—or what he refers to as the "setting," and it is this physical setting that "regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation." Elaborating on this theme, Perinbanayagam (1974:534) notes that there must be a "congruent relation" between a social act and the nature of the scene. To obtain congruence, material culture must express the same quality as the action expresses as it unfolds or develops.

In dramatic construction, acts...must bear a particular congruent relation, and one may add here, so it is in real life. Churches are constructed to promote pious sentiments, and streets are constructed so as to drive or walk on them, just as railway stations are built to elicit congruent acts in them. In other words, these "objects" that constitute the scene are utilized rhetorically to create an interaction, establish a meaningful transaction, or define a situation. [emphasis in the original]

2. Definition of the Situation

As defined by Stebbins (forthcoming), definition of the situation is the overall meaning of the immediate situation for each individual participating in it as established through conscious interpretation and synthesis of its relevant personal, social, physical, and temporal considerations and through its relevant preformed cognitive structures that people carry with them from situation to situation.

Stebbins equates the definition of the situation with a sociological theory of motivation. And although Stebbins' view incorporates "the subjectivity believed to precede much of human action," as a theory of motivation, it is preeminently a "generalizing enterprise,
not an idiographic one." While Stebbins does not deny that a great deal of active defining is required in "unique personal" (as opposed to "habitual personal" or "cultural") definitions, there is still "persistent movement toward a goal." The definite timing and direction of goal-directed behavior are explained by the notion of "predisposition," or "acquired states, which are enduring and remain dormant until activated by situational stimuli." And further, "These activated products of past experience impinge upon our awareness, equip us with specific, usually habitual views of the world, and guide behavior in the present" (ibid.).

Because there are many meanings that are available, Perinbanayagam (1974:524) contends that definitions must be negotiated between participants. The central problem becomes, "How these differences can be reconciled—how the question whose usage shall be accepted is answered, and a common definition arrived at or negotiated" (ibid.:525; emphasis in the original).

An interaction is a management of impression between actors, where one proposes a certain definition of the situation by using whatever objects and words are necessary, and the others accept this proffered definition and thereby create a smooth interaction and a consensual definition of the situation. But, the others can also reject the proffered definition and suggest their own version, in which case the initiator now has the choice of refusing it and thereby terminating the interaction, or demanding a new definition altogether, or accepting the one proffered by the others and thereby saving the situation. Whichever of these steps are accepted by self and other, the paramount consideration is that they must be announced, articulated, and dramatized. [ibid.:532; emphasis in the original]
In an article emphasizing the dramaturgical aspects of the definition of the situation which has broad applicability to Hutterite housing, Richardson (1982) suggests that the interpretive nature of the built environment—markets, plazas, streets—unfolds through more or less progressive steps that include a preliminary definition of the situation, interaction, and, ultimately, completion of the definition of the situation. The latter is achieved by joint acceptance of the image of the setting in terms of what is experienced as the "sense of place."

Richardson (1982:421) starts by recognizing the seemingly unconscious matter-of-fact way we respond to the social world on some occasions and the self-conscious way in which we fashion or fictionalize our experience in others. This suggests that we may be "predisposed" to act in a "matter-of-fact way" in certain settings, whereas in other built environments, we behave in a very self-conscious manner. In the latter, the meaning of what is taking place unfolds only in the process of interaction.

In the Spanish American setting studied by Richardson, a "factlike world" where one is "predisposed" to act "opportunistically" is present in the market, whereas in the plaza, an "aesthetic" air pervades, one where the actors are always "conscious" of being participants for those who view the setting. The material features that contrast these two settings include:

A busy street, stores, and railroad tracks surround the market; quieter streets, government buildings, and the church "ruins" circle the plaza. The market, like most places in this highly carpentered environment, is principally indoors and square, while the plaza is uniquely outdoors and circular. The market concentrates individuals into narrow streams flowing past stationary vendors, and the plaza
distributes people into clusters focused primarily on the fountain. Only the enigmatic Sacred Heart of Jesus is on display in the market, while the plaza displays busts, flagpoles, an independence marker, and the Rotarian's wheel. [ibid.:426]

To say that the material component of the market and the plaza in the Spanish American setting provides a preliminary definition of the situation means that the appropriate response to the setting is revealed or "read" by contrasting the context, the arrangement, and the theme of each. By way of this contrast, the material setting provides a "preliminary understanding" of the nature of the interaction ongoing in the situation in which people literally enter.

In contrasting the interaction components between market and plaza, Richardson (1982:430) notes that the austere physical properties of the market are designed to foster "close, two-party, face-to-face" relationships for the sole purpose of focusing on the conduct of doing business. In the market, people are "backstage." Here, they "can appear to be more natural and show themselves as having less concern with the demonstration that they are maintaining certain standards." In the plaza, on the other hand, behavior is characterized by "disengaged observation, serene action, and onstage performance." In contrast to the market where space is a scarce commodity and where personal space is subject to "constant aggressive intrusions" by others, inhabitants of the plaza are distributed in small clusters. In this setting, "interaction necessitates that people self-consciously become observers even as they respond to the action of others." In other words, the inhabitants of the...
plaza are both "onstage" in terms of awareness of their own behavior, as well as the "audience" for the other clusters (ibid.).

In the last step in the process of incorporating material culture into the definition of meaning, "a sense of the situation being defined" (ibid.:431) emerges, a step that is accomplished when the "social situation becomes physically placed," that is, when the setting "becomes a full exposition of what is occurring." This meaning of place is captured by "implicit themes" that arise out of interaction. In the case of the market, the theme is one of nature as a commodity, which is restated in the image of the market as "a place where one is ready to act and to act opportunistically," a place where one is described as being "listo" (ibid.). In the plaza, the theme is one of nature as an ornament, the essence of which is imbued in the image of the plaza as a locus for having "cultura." In the Spanish American setting, this "rationality," this sense of cultura, is located in "the central nexus of urbanity and surrounded by institutions that represent order and authority." Here, "surrounded by ornamental nature, people are in the plaza to applaud each other's performances" (ibid.:432).

Richardson's description of the two realities in the Spanish-American setting is highly suggestive and has lead to the search for realities that capture the essence of Hutterite society. The two modes that capture this essence are in the opposition between "being-on-the-colony" and "being-in-the-world." The contradiction between these two realities and attempts at reconciliation are considered the forces behind the recent, dramatic changes in Hutterite society.
Richardson (1982:433) also notes that we may create "multiple realities." In the Hutterite case, the recent strengthening of the nuclear family indicates such a possibility—the existence of an inner world defined by the "dialectical tension" (ibid.) between the colony and the nuclear family units that compose it. These two realities are antagonistic and mutually exclusive and are further defined by implicit themes, by community in the case of the colony, and by autonomy in the case of the family. The corresponding images are of observability and of privacy, respectively.

The role of housing in the relationship between the colony and the family units is crucial. In the case of shelter that provides little privacy, individuals must act self-consciously. That is, they must be prepared to act "on-stage" in the Goffman sense. In more private housing, where observability is reduced significantly, individuals are "backstage" (if not "off-stage") and to the extent that they are not visible to other colony members, freed from the demands of living-up to certain standards.

Research Methods

Sample Selection Process. The sample was selected from a list of colonies provided by Larry Anderson, Department of Geography, Mankato State University. The list was compiled as of March, 1983, and includes 349 colonies, including twenty-eight extinct colonies and two colonies that have been excommunicated by the Hutterite Church. The list of
colonies is divided according to the three separate branches of the Hutterite church, or leuts, and each colony is arrayed by date of colony formation (i.e., the date that the colony became a separate entity, not the date that the colony site was first occupied). The list also includes the address and telephone number of each colony as well as the name of the colony's first minister.

Eighty-eight colonies were selected for survey (Table 1 and Figures 6 and 7). The sample is large—one out of every four colonies—which reflects what was perceived as considerable heterogeneity in colony housing, particularly on new colonies. Other research supports this perception (Simon Evans, Department of Geography, Memorial University, pers. comm.). The sample includes fourteen extinct colonies and one colony (Pine Creek) that has been excommunicated.

The universe was divided into leuts and stratified by ten-year intervals (i.e., 1870s, 1880s, etc.). Within each strata, the sample was selected from a table of random numbers. It was assumed that new house types would appear more frequently in certain periods than others. These periods, which were over-represented in the sample, include the following:

1. the founding period in North America (i.e., the 1870s and 1880s);
2. the founding period in Canada (i.e., 1918-1919); and
3. the contemporary period (i.e., the 1980s).

So that comparisons can be made between the housing in each of the three leuts for each ten-year interval, the sample also over-represents the
Table 1
Distribution of the Universe and Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEUT</th>
<th>CANADA</th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schmiedelout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leut Sample</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehrerleut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leut Sample</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dariusleut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leut Sample</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Leuts Sample</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="33.6%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="10.6%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="23.0%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="0.3%25" alt="Percentage" /></td>
<td><img src="17.5%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="1.7%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="11.2%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="1.4%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="0.6%25" alt="Percentage" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="30.7%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="6.8%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="18.2%25" alt="Percentage" /></td>
<td><img src="25.0%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="3.4%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="13.6%25" alt="Percentage" /> <img src="2.3%25" alt="Percentage" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Figures in brackets are percentages.
Figure 6
Universe and Sample by Ten-Year Intervals

Figure 7
Sample Size by Ten-Year Intervals
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Lehrerleut, the smallest of the three leuts in terms of number of colonies, and under-represents the Schmiedeleut, the largest of the three.

**Data Collection.** Data were collected by visiting each of the sample colonies. Other sources were also utilized, including personal interviews with the Bishop of each leut, as well as with a number of other Hutterite spokesmen. Contacts were also made with several individuals who are involved in research on Hutterite issues. Individuals contacted during the course of the study (other than those from sample colonies) are identified in Appendix A. In addition to visits to the sample colonies, many other colonies were visited. These extra visits focused primarily on the founding colonies in South Dakota and Manitoba that were not included in the random sample. These extra visits were particularly useful because of the diversity of house types built during the founding period in these two areas.

Appointments were made by telephone at least one day prior to the colony visit. A two-page questionnaire was utilized (Appendix B) to facilitate the interview process. Most of the interviews were conducted with the first, or senior, colony minister. When this was not possible, interviews were held with the second minister or with the colony secretary. On a handful of occasions when neither the ministers nor the colony secretary was present, other colony members were interviewed, including colony women in three instances. Six colony spokesmen refused to be interviewed: three in Alberta; and one each in Manitoba, South Dakota, and Montana. Replacements for these colonies were selected randomly.
The field phase of the study was carried out between April and November, 1984, and included:

1. preparation of a generalized map of the residential portion of each sample colony, including the location, size (number of dwelling units), age, and other characteristics of the housing;
2. preparation of a floor plan of each house type built by the colony; and
3. black and white and color photographs of the dwellings in (2) above (Only two spokesmen would not allow photographs to be taken of colony housing.).

Most of the dimensions of the floor plans were measured, although, initially, the measurements given or cited by colony informants were accepted. Some of the latter proved to be inaccurate.

**Analysis of the Data.** The analysis of the data on house types includes the development of a system of rules to account for Hutterite houses built in North America from 1874 to 1918. The subsequent architectural record is examined with reference to these rule sets.

The rules are based on the methodology developed by Glassie (1975) and draw on his analogy between language and the ability to design artifacts. According to structural linguistics, language is essentially an arbitrary system of sounds, or phonemes, which are meaningless by themselves but which are combined into larger linguistic units according to morphological and grammatical rules. These rules, however, are unknown to most native speakers. But since the speakers of a language are able to use it to communicate effectively, it is assumed that the
grammatical rules must be subconscious in nature. It thus becomes the
task of the linguist to identify the underlying structural principles
that generate language.

The ability to design is based on an "inward capacity" to relate
simple abstract shapes into a "geometric repertoire" (ibid.:19). From
these geometric ideas, concrete things or artifacts are generated through
a "system of transforming rules" (ibid.) that relate form and use.

These rules are the structure that binds distinct elements into a
synchronic system. The set of rules, taken together, is the whole
that is greater than its parts; the rules structure the whole.
[ibid.]

Further,

These rules, precisely like those in a grammar, are unconscious, but
they are not unconscious in the sense that they are unknown, as
their proper use proves, and they can be brought into consciousness
through questioning or contemplation. Normally, they remain as the
unconsidered principles that guide a person's actions throughout
life. [ibid.]

Since it is assumed that there is a degree of isomorphism between the
system of transforming rules and mental processes (i.e., the structure of
human thought itself), the system of rules does not account for how a
house is made, but "how a house is thought" (ibid.:21).

Research Problems. Almost all of the Hutterite informants answered
each of the research questions. However, some of the informants were
reluctant to answer several questions in great detail or to speak
"on-the-record." This reticence was expressed in a number of different
ways: "I've already told you too much;" "Don't tell anybody I said
this;" "Don't write this down;" etc. At the same time, many informants
volunteered detailed information on subjects that were not included in
the prepared questionnaire. Indeed, a few informants appeared to be
struggling under the weight of considerable responsibility, and it seemed
that they were taking the opportunity to "unload" on the interviewer. In
presenting the results of this study, care has been taken not to
over-represent the comments of those informants who, for whatever reason,
appear to have "over-responded."

Although most informants gave freely of their time, a few Hutterite
spokesmen were unwilling or were unable to provide the writer a lengthy
interview. This presented a problem only on colonies where there were
several identifiable house types. In these instances, a great deal of
information had to be obtained in short order, a task that was not made
any easier when the informant announced for the third time, "I still have
two windows to fix before dinner."

In retrospect, the size of the sample proved to be more than
adequate. And except for a few wealthy colonies that have built rather
esoteric types of housing, the dwellings constructed within each time
period conform very closely to one or two particular types. Once the
house type that prevailed in a particular time period was identified,
there was no need to detail each dwelling belonging to the type class.

Probably the most serious limitation of the present study is that
the analysis of the Hutterite building record is based not on what was
built, but on what has survived the ravages of time and other forms of
attrition. The result is that masonry buildings are probably
over-represented to a very large degree relative to the total housing
stock that was built by the Hutterites. This is a major limitation only during the period when stone houses were being constructed, or from 1874 until 1918. It appears that wood-frame structures are under-represented not so much because of inclement elements, but because frame buildings were moved on and off colonies with relative ease.

It is possible that certain information was "lost" by interviewing in English instead of German; however, that seems unlikely, since all of the respondents are conversant in English. Most informants are fluent in both languages, and some informants, in fact, speak English that is indistinguishable from that of native speakers. Most of the interviews were with the first minister or the secretary, colony members who have a great deal of contact with the larger, and predominately English-speaking, society.
CHAPTER THREE

ORIGIN OF THE HUTTERITE BUILDING TRADITION IN NORTH AMERICA

European Antecedents

In Central Europe, the Hutterites practiced a wide variety of arts and crafts, and according to the literature (Hostetler 1974:35) and several Hutterite informants who have visited some of the old Bruderhofs (Rev. Paul Gross, Spokane Colony, Washington, and Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, Secretary, Blumengard Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.), these activities were carried out in workshops on the ground floor of the communal houses (Plates 2 and 3). The second and third floors of these structures were used for residential purposes. The individual living units are very small, however, since Hutterite children slept elsewhere. This separation of parents and children reflects an extreme version of the community of goods, where the community is almost totally responsible for the socialization of Hutterite children (Peter 1975:113).

A sixteenth-century woodcut (Plate 4) shows some of the construction details of early Hutterite housing. For example, the two upper floors receive light through small windows set in the roofing material. Plastered chimneys also project through the thatch covering. The structures have a wood frame with a filling between the timbers and a
Plate 2. Hutterite Workshop and House, Sabatisch, Slovakia (Gross 1965:15)

Plate 3. Hutterite House, Grosschutzen, Slovakia (Hostetler 1974:86)
heavy plaster inside and out (Thompson 1977:60). The hallways on the second floor are narrow and run the full length of the upper floor (Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, pers. comm.), with living quarters on both sides.

A strong connection between the multi-family structures built by the Hutterites in Europe and housing design on colonies in North America is suggested. According to Thompson (1977:59), "The pattern set by these buildings can still be seen in the Hutterite longhouses of twentieth-century North America." This connection, it seems, is based largely on the side entry to these structures, a feature that Bennett (1967:163) attributes to an "ancient European rowhouse plan" (Plate 5).

The lack of available land and soil exhaustion encouraged the
development of crafts over agriculture during the formative period of Hutterite history (Gross 1965:30). When the Brethren moved to Russia, they had access to good arable land; the market for crafts was limited, however. Despite these changes in colony economics, Hutterite housing built during this period still conforms to the pattern established in Central Europe. At Radichev (also Reditchewa), established by the Brethren in 1802,

Every profession had its workshop in the house on the main floor. Every family had an unheated small bedroom on the second floor. The furniture consisted of a bed, one table, and two chairs. At childbirth, the mother could go the children's room which usually was heated. [History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:23]

After living at Radichev for forty years—during which time

Plate 5. Sixteenth-Century Row Houses, Velke Levary, Slovakia (Gross 1965:15)
community of goods collapsed—the Brethren were relocated to the Black Sea area, where they were required to settle on individual farmsteads in villages based on the Mennonite pattern. Documentation on the housing built by the Hutterites in this period comes from The Famine in Russia and Our Trip Around the World by David Hofer (1924), which includes an account of his visit to the former Hutterite settlements in the Black Sea area, including Johannesruh, his birthplace (Plate 6).

In South Russia, the Hutterites lived not only in settlements based on the Mennonite village pattern, but also in individual houses that were constructed according to the Mennonite building tradition. The most distinctive feature of this tradition is the custom of joining the house to the barn. In David Hofer's account of his return to the house where he was born, he indicates that, "The barn was still attached to the house" (in History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:99). The reference to the house-barn combination cited by Hofer is consistent with the comments of Rev. George Waldner (Waldeck Colony, Saskatchewan, pers. comm.), who reported that his grandmother told him that when she lived in Russia, she lived in a house with an attached barn.

**Hutterite Housing in North America**

**The Influence of the Mennonite Building Tradition.** Most of the Hutterites who came to North America decided not to live communally. The majority of these non-colony Hutterites, or Prairieleut, settled around Freeman, South Dakota, a center about ten miles east of Wolf Creek, the
Plate 6. Folk Housing Inspired by the Mennonites. Left: Hutterite House in Dobrischin; Right: Hutterite (Hofer) House in Johannesruh (in History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1975:98)

Dariusleut's founding colony. When the Prairieleut settled on individual homesteads in the Freeman area, many of these independent Hutterites built dwellings based on the Mennonite building tradition they had known in South Russia (Plate 7).

One of the common features of the houses built by the non-colony Hutterites--indeed, what is common of all folk houses--is the use of locally-available building materials. In Plate 7, the structure in the bottom-right photo is made of "home-made bricks," while the house in the lower-left photo is constructed of sod. The photos in the upper row show the same house form reproduced in wood frame. None of the roofs on the houses in Plate 7 are thatched. In addition to home-made bricks and sod, other construction materials used for early house building in South Dakota include mud, tamped (or "rammed") earth, and stone. The use of
Plate 7. "Prairieleut" Houses, near Freeman, South Dakota

(History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:110-111)
these locally-available materials in South Dakota is attributed to a building tradition that is "German-Russian" in origin (Marvin Riley, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, pers. comm.).

The use of home-made bricks is a building practice that was dispersed widely throughout North America by German-Russian groups. Grey, home-made bricks are visible in the chimney in the attic level of one of the stone houses on the Rockport Colony in South Dakota. Home-made bricks were also used extensively for interior bearing walls in most structures that the Brethren built of stone.

On all of the Mennonite houses in Plates 6 and 7, the ridge line of the roof is straight. On Hutterite colonies, the ridge lines are also straight. The only pre-1918 exceptions are on the kitchens and original housing built on three of the Lehrerleut colonies in South Dakota—Old Elmspring, New Elmspring, and Rockport—and at the Rosedale Colony. On these colonies, the ends of the roof on one or more buildings are clipped or broken (gebrochener Dach in German, Plate 8). Clipped gables are a common feature on seventeenth-century houses on former German and Moravian hofs (Thompson 1977:55). At New Elmspring and Rockport, the stone houses built just prior to the exodus to Canada in 1918 have straight gables. A European origin for the clipped gables on early Hutterite houses appears certain.

Although still relatively steep, the roof pitch on the North-American Mennonite and Hutterite houses is much broader or flatter than the examples of the Mennonite house types in Russia. In this case, the
use of roofing material other than thatch is associated with a broader roof angle. This appears to be one example of a form change resulting from a change in material.

In both Hutterite and Mennonite building traditions, the fenestration of the gable end includes four openings, two up and two down. Both rows of openings exhibit symmetry by being equidistant from the center of the gable end. In the top row, the openings may be smaller and generally are not aligned above the windows in the lower level. The fenestration of the gables on Hutterite and Mennonite residential buildings is the only trait that is strikingly similar. Openings on the
gables are present in the sixteenth-century Hutterite residence in Grosschutzen (Plate 3). The gable on the rowhouse in Plate 5 is blank, however, which was a common building practice in Europe, including the British Isles (Glassie 1975:95).

The fenestration on the Mennonite houses in Plate 7 includes four windows on the long side of the house. The spacing of the windows can be seen clearly in the top-left photo in Plate 7. In the floor layout of the Mennonite house, each room has at least one window on the long side of the house. The living room, or grosse-stube, has two.

Unlike the Mennonite housing shown in Plates 6 and 7, the openings on the long side of the Hutterite housing are nearly symmetrical; that is, each of the central-hallway duplexes has five openings, with two windows on both sides of the door leading to the central hallway. The reason the symmetry is not perfect is because one window is usually (but not always) dropped from the end unit.

The floor layout of the Mennonite houses includes two external doors, one on each of the long sides. The doors are close to the end of the house that is attached to the barn and are roughly opposite each other. In houses with simple layouts, the space between the doors is open and provides a passageway from one side of the house to the other. In more elaborate layouts, this passageway may be interrupted by an internal door (Figure 8). In the two houses in the Mennonite Village Museum in Steinbach, Manitoba, the doorways are not exactly opposite. In the earlier example (1876) made of logs, one of the doorways is 1.5 feet closer to the end of the structure than the other. In the later (1892), more-elaborate model, the displacement is 3.5 feet.
In the central-hallway plans built by the Hutterites in South Dakota, the central hallways include the doorways to the individual living units, two on one side of the through hallway and two on the other. Each hallway also contains two stairways that provide access to the attic. In the Prairieleut housing described above, it is noted that, while there is a passageway from front to back, this feature appears to have little in common with the central hallways that are typical of early Hutterite housing design.

![Figure 8. Idealized Floor Layout, Mennonite House ("Mennonite Village Museum" 1984:11)](image)

North American Influence. The housing on the original Hutterite colonies in South Dakota incorporates some form elements and construction techniques that are associated with Hutterite housing in Central Europe and Russia. These include steeply-pitched roofs, broken or clipped gables, windows in the gables, and the use of locally-available materials.
such as mud bricks. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the Hutterites derived the central-hallway house type directly from a Central European or Russian source.

This lack of continuity between European and North-American building traditions appears to stem from a change in the meaning of community of goods. In the earlier examples, the colony assumed most of the responsibility for childrearing, and in the communal housing built in Europe and Central Russia, parents and children were housed separately. When the Brethren re-established community of goods just prior to emigrating to the U.S., a less extreme model was adopted, one where child-rearing responsibilities were shared more equitably by the colony and colony families and where children were no longer housed separately. When the Hutterites moved to Dakota Territory, the colonies built communal housing with dwelling units that were coterminous with the nuclear family.

There are two possible explanations for the origin of the central hallway house on the early Hutterite colonies. One, the central-hallway house type had diffused westward from the New England (Kniffen 1965:558) and Chesapeake (Glassie 1975:101) source areas so that by the time the Hutterites moved to Dakota Territory, the central-hallway house type was nearly ubiquitous. And even though local architecture was dominated at the time by Victorian styles and the Gothic revival (Fracaviglia 1971:68), these "stylistic influences" would have been rejected by the Hutterites on cultural and religious grounds. Like other groups that adopted the central-hallway house type, including the Mormons, the
Hutterites also would have found this plan easy to build in local materials such as stone. Two, while some American communards retained the building customs from their homeland, other utopians looked to each other for architectural models. Since the Hutterites were in contact with other communal groups as soon as they arrived in North America, it is possible that the Hutterites copied the central-hallway plan from one of these groups rather than their gentile neighbors.

In America, some of the basic ideas for building utopias were circulated by a few individuals who were influential in the communal building process. One of these individuals was Sidney Rigdon, the first convert of Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormon church. Rigdon, a preacher with a communitarian background, was influenced by the Harmonists, who were ascetic German Communists, and the model settlements they built in the early 1800s in Pennsylvania. In 1831, Smith moved his congregation from New York to Kirkland, Ohio, where it united with Rigdon's communal group. While in Kirkland, Smith and Rigdon began their work on the design of Zion, the earthly paradise that the Mormons would attempt to create at Nauvoo, Illinois. According to Hayden (1976:110),

Rigdon's knowledge of town building undertaken by the members of the Harmony Society can only be surmised from circumstantial evidence, but comparison of the plan of Harmony, Pennsylvania with the 'Plat of the City of Zion' reveals similarities of goals, conception, and detailing.

In Utah, the central-hallway plan, including the narrow "I" and the wider "Four over Four" forms, was referred to as the "Nauvoo-style house" (Francaviglia 1971:65). This reference to Nauvoo is reflected in the
close similarity between the housing styles established in Illinois and Utah. This Pennsylvania-Illinois-Utah relationship is illustrated in Plate 9.

The Harmonists had adopted celibacy, and in an effort to perpetuate their material and spiritual world, The Harmony Society offered its lands to the Hutterites on very generous terms provided all of the Schmiedeleut moved to Pennsylvania. After the colony at Tripp, South Dakota, failed, the Tripp Colony members moved to Tidioute, Pennsylvania, in 1884. The houses at Tidioute were two-storey, wood-frame structures measuring thirty-two by ninety-six feet (Plate 10). The structures had two central hallways and Georgian symmetry. Members from the Trippe Colony stayed only two years in Pennsylvania, returning to South Dakota to establish Milltown Colony.

During their early years in North America, the Hutterites also had considerable contact with the Amanas, another influential utopian society. Between 1855 and 1865, the Amanas, who originated in Germany as a "pietist response to the official Lutheran Church" (Hayden 1976:225), established several towns in Iowa where they built communal houses with central- and side-hallway plans (Plate 11). A connection between the Amanas and the Hutterites is suggested by the first residential structure built at Bon Homme, the Schmiedeleut's founding colony. This residence is two storeys high and when constructed originally, had central hallways on the lower and upper floors (Plate 12). This communal building has more similarity with the central- and side-hallway plans built by the Amanas (Plate 11) than with Hutterite housing that follows at Bon Homme and at other Schmiedeleut colonies in South Dakota.
Plate 9. Folk Housing Inspired by the Harmonists. Top Left: Communal Dwelling (after 1824), Economy, Pennsylvania (Hayden 1976:249); Top Right: Duplex (after 1839), Nauvoo, Illinois (ibid.:123); Bottom: Central-Hallway Plan (1865), Nephi, Utah (Francaviglia 1971:66)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Plate 11. Amana Frame and Stone Houses (Hayden 1976:248)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Development of the
Hutterite Building Tradition in South Dakota to 1918

Locational Factors. The initial Hutterite settlements in Dakota Territory are located on river courses. In addition to providing a source of power for colony mills and water for livestock, the valley locations provided shelter from the elements and wood for cooking and heating. In the perception of most early settlers, a water course or water body was also deemed essential for raising ducks and geese, a site requirement now recognized as unfounded (Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, pers. comm.).

Most of the early colonies were located on the James River and had water-powered mills. Since there is an adequate flow and the channel is relatively fixed in many locations, the James River is ideal for the development of water-driven mills. Bon Homme, on the other hand, is located on the bluffs above the Missouri River. At this point, the Missouri is situated in a broad, flat valley, and because the location of the channel kept changing, it was not a reliable source of power.

When masonry construction was used, a nearby source of building stone was a factor to be considered in the location of a colony. Prior

Note: Porches and end-entries are not part of the original construction.
to the widespread introduction of frame construction, areas without an adequate supply of field stones were not considered suitable locations for colonies (Rev. John Kleinsasser, Glendale Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.). Some of the original colonies in South Dakota, such as Bon Homme and Rockport, are located in areas where building stone was quarried. At the quarry about a half-mile southeast of the Rockport Colony, a number of blades that were pounded into the stone in order to make it cleave into slabs are still imbedded in the rock outcrops. The wagon track from the quarry to the Rockport Colony site is also evident.

Although almost all of the colonies established in South Dakota prior to 1918 are on water courses, there are some that are not. Tripp, the Schmiedeleut's second colony in South Dakota (1878), is one of these exceptions. While the Tripp site is located in what is considered today to be a good farming area, the colony failed because it could not locate well water (Mrs. Susie Kleinsasser, Blumengard Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.). The lack of technical capability to drill water wells to sufficient depths was the limiting factor (Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, pers. comm.). Other colony building sites not located on a water course include New Elmspring, Milford, and "Yale."

Many of the Hutterite colonies were established on the site of existing farmsteads, thus taking advantage of the opportunity to use still-standing housing and other buildings. An example is the Dariusleut's purchase of the Richards' Mansion for the Richards Colony (1906). This structure was built in 1890 by a wealthy Huron, South Dakota, banker who was unsuccessful in two bids for governor of the
state. How the Hutterites dealt with the opulence of this twenty-six room country showpiece is described as follows:

The new owners were a group of forty-four Mennonites who had fled from Russia. Oh, I can't complain; they treated me pretty well. I was washed and scrubbed, but it wasn't the same. My beautiful mirrors were turned against the walls and finally removed for fear that the members of the colony would look into them and become vain. Many of my other frills were also done away with so that I no longer deserved the title of a showplace. The Mennonites started a school in one of my buildings making me more stodgy than ever. [No author (Mrs. Sherman Judy?) no date:4]

Building Materials. On the three founding colonies, each leut built houses of native stone. At Bon Homme, the first colony to be occupied, the houses are built of pale-yellow chalkstone (limestone) that the Schmiedeleut obtained from nearby bluffs along the Missouri River. The chalkstone is soft enough to be sawn into building blocks. The original house on the homesite purchased by the Bon Homme Colony was built of chalkstone and is still standing. According to the minister at Bon Homme (Rev. Jacob Waldner, pers. comm.), all of the original farms in the immediate area had a building made of chalkstone. At Bon Homme, the Hutterites not only used building materials that were available locally, but which were being used locally. The minister at Bon Homme also reported that the colony probably hired a number of Bohemians to assist with the sawing of the chalkstone. The use of outside help to shape and form the rock work is a typical pattern on colonies that built with stone. While this may be interpreted as a lack of masonry skills, the Hutterites built a large underground storage room and wine cellar at Bon Homme. The structure is made of brick and has a high vaulted ceiling.
The construction of the ceiling is technically complex and indicates that the Hutterites were capable stonemasons.

Although the original housing at Bon Homme is constructed of chalkstone, the housing at the former site of Tripp, the second colony established by the Schmiedeleut, had mud walls. One of the original structures at the Tripp site still exists; however, the exterior mud walls and interior walls of colony-made mud bricks have been replaced by wooden supports and the exterior covered by tin sheathing. Mud-wall construction is common in the area and is considered part of the German-Russian building tradition referred to earlier.

Why the Tripp Colony people built with mud instead of stone is not clear. Since the colony is well-removed from water courses, an adequate supply of rock for building may not have been exposed. It is also possible that the Tripp Colony was low on funds or only planned to use the mud houses for a short period. With regard to the latter, it is noted that when the Hutterites established Hutterthal in South Russia in 1843, "mud houses were constructed for occupancy during the summer months until the building of dwelling houses could be completed" (History of the Mennonites 1974:16).

There appears to be no question that the Hutterite housing built during the Brethren's early years in South Dakota was spartan in nature, which undoubtedly reflects what were financially difficult times. Limited to only bare essentials, it is reported that many of the early structures built in the Dakotas had earth floors, for example (Gross 1965:21).
Many of the Hutterite houses in South Dakota are built of field stones (called "niggartoes" or "niggarheads" by some informants). At most of the early colonies, the field stones vary considerably in size (Plates 13 and 14). In later structures, reflecting either improved skills or a more leisurely building pace, or both, the stones are shaped more uniformly and the courses appear even. Lentils over windows and doorways also are used in later construction. The use of lentils appears in dwellings where the courses of rock are still very uneven, however (Plate 14).

The minister at the Rosedale Colony reported that when he replaced the windows in one of the stone houses, he "discovered" that the wall is two-walls thick (Rev. John Waldner, pers. comm.). In places, the two walls are "tied-in" by a field stone that spans the inner and outer course. Two courses of stone are visible in the ruins of the foundation walls at the site of what was the Richards Colony (Plate 15). It appears that the practice of building stone walls two-courses thick was well established in the area and was used in the construction of Hutterite houses built of field stones.

The stone work with the most uniform courses is at Huron (now Riverside) Colony. On this colony, a stonemason named Peterson split the rock during the winter for board and laid the stone during the summer for wages (Mr. John Grosz, Hillcrest Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.). To add to the time-consuming process of locating and preparing the building stone, it is reported that because the wet mortar could not support two courses of heavy field stones, only one course was laid per day (Mr.
Plate 13. Stone House, Wolf Creek Colony, South Dakota
(History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:124)

Plate 14. Stone House, Kutter (now Tschetter) Colony, South Dakota
Grosz, pers. comm.). The stone buildings at Huron (now Riverside) include a house, a kitchen, and a church.

What is not clear is which, if any, design features can be attributed to non-Hutterites. At the Huron/Riverside Colony, for example, where Peterson, a non-Hutterite, was employed to do the masonry work, the upper level in the one-and-a-half storey structure has gables on the sides as well as the ends of the roof (Plate 27). Building gables on the sides as well as the ends of one-and-a-half storey houses is considerably more complex than construction of straight gables, and because the technique makes only a single appearance in the architectural
record, the design of the stone house may be due to outside influence. Alternatively, since the Huron Colony was founded much later (1906) than most of the pre-1918 colonies in South Dakota, the complexity of the building design may reflect an architectural competence that improved with time. Another anomaly at Riverside is the church building, a structure that is not without considerable embellishment (Plate 16).

One of the characteristics of folk housing is that construction is based on an oral rather than on a written tradition. For example, "an old carpenter in Amana reports that he never worked from a plan but knows that houses were constructed with sixteen-foot bays, and halls eight feet wide" (Hayden 1976:251). According to Rev. Joe Tschetter (New Elmspring Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.), the Hutterite building tradition is also oral, that Hutterite builders measured everything by "eyesite," and that they never used a square, tape measure, or level. When the original stone buildings at New Elmspring were remodelled, pre-cut panels would not fit the walls. "No room was ever square; nothing was level."

Even though all of the houses on the founding colonies were built of stone, frame construction was present from the start. Most of the colonies had mills, and according to photographs of these structures (Plate 17), several were frame construction. Since these mills were typically in excess of two storeys, height may have made masonry construction more difficult. At Wolf Creek and Milltown, the communal kitchens were also of wood frame (Plate 17).

Since wood-frame buildings can be moved with relative ease from one site to another, the absence of frame structures is not evidence that a
Plate 16. Church, Huron (now Riverside) Colony, South Dakota

colony never built in wood. At Milltown, for example (a Schmiedeleut Colony that was never repossessed), there are two original frame buildings (a grain elevator and the communal kitchen) and several stone structures, including three residential buildings, on the site. However, Mrs. Susie Kleinsasser (pers. comm.), who grew up at Milltown, reported that the colony built several frame buildings, including a church, a school, and several residences, that were moved away after the colony was abandoned. One of the frame houses that was moved away is a two-storey structure.

Generally, wood frame construction replaced the masonry building tradition. Among the Schmiedeleut, wood-frame construction was used for
housing on colonies built after 1906 (Buffalo, 1907; James Valley, 1913).

The change from stone to frame was not sharp or abrupt, however, since several Schmiedeleut colonies—Milltown, Maxwell, Rosedale—built both stone and wood-frame houses. Unlike the Schmiedeleut, all of the

Plate 17. Frame Buildings, Wolf Creek Colony, South Dakota.
Left: Water Mill; Right: Communal Dining Hall
(History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:124,126)
Dariusleut colonies built central-hallway houses of stone. Despite this very homogeneous tradition, when the Dariusleut founded pre-1918 colonies outside of South Dakota—at Dominion City, Manitoba, in 1893 (Plate 18) and at Spring Creek and Warren Range, Montana, in 1912 and 1913, respectively—they built frame houses. Although the last pre-1918 Lehrerleut colony (Milford) made extensive use of frame construction, most Lehrerleut colonies built houses of stone. Two Lehrerleut colonies—New Rockport and New Elmspring—were still building masonry dwellings only two or three years prior to moving to Alberta in 1918.

Among the factors to consider when choosing building materials, expediency and the relatively high cost of lumber may have been the most crucial. With regard to the former, there was probably some urgency to construct the mills, which were sources of revenue, and the communal kitchens, which are still the hub of colony residential activity. Where there was an urgent need to construct colony buildings, it would have been more expedient to purchase lumber than to locate and shape building stones. Where there is surplus manpower, and when the need to construct certain buildings can be postponed through the use of temporary facilities—as in the case of housing—then it would have made sense on purely economic grounds to utilize local building materials.

When the Dakotas were first settled, lumber could not be obtained locally. In the chronicle of his trip through the United States in 1873 in search of a location to which the Hutterites in South Russia might immigrate, Lorenz Tschetter notes that in the Columbus, Nebraska, area, "lumber for building purposes must be shipped from Minnesota. The cost
Plate 18. Wood-Frame, Central-Hallway Houses, Former Site of the Dominion City Colony, Manitoba (File No. NA-728-4, Glenbow Museum, Calgary)

of this lumber is $25.00 per M. feet. Planed and polished lumber costs $40.00 per M. feet" (History of the Hutterite Mennonites 1974:44).
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS OF HUTTERITE HOUSE TYPES IN NORTH AMERICA

Changes in House Types to 1918

Five house types were developed by the Hutterites from 1874 to 1918. The types include: one-storey, one-and-a-half storey, and two-storey structures with central hallways; and one-storey and two-storey buildings with external doors to each dwelling. The major difference between the central-hallway house types and the structures with external doorways is that the former has the entrance to each dwelling off the through-hallway inside the structure. In the latter, the entrance door for each unit is located externally. While all five types appear on early Schmiedeleut colonies, with one exception, only the one-storey, central-hallway plan was built by the Dariusleut and Lehrerleut.

In the following section, the variation in the architectural record on the early colonies in North America is discussed in terms of: (1) identifiable house types; (2) generations, or stages in the development or evolution of house types; and (3) strains, which are levels of subtypification within generations.
1. One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type

The one-storey (or storey-and-attic or single-storey), central-hallway structures built in North America to 1918 include two generations. All of the first-generation structures are built of locally-available materials. The second-generation one-storey, central-hallway structures were built in Manitoba (circa 1893) and in Montana (circa 1912) of wood frame.

The first generation has two strains. The base case for the first strain, shown in Figure 9 and Plates 19 and 20, is a chalkstone structure located at Bon Homme Colony. The building, constructed in 1891, has hallways six-feet wide and living rooms that measure eighteen feet, three inches. The internal and external walls are twelve inches and twenty-two inches wide, respectively. The overall dimensions are thirty-four by ninety-two feet. The second, or clipped-gable, strain in the first-generation central-hallway tradition includes the original residential structures at Old Elmspring, New Elmspring, and Rockport—all Lehrerleut colonies.

The traditional and clipped-gable strains have considerable variation. For example, at Old Elmspring, one of the residential structures with clipped gables had four central hallways. At Rosedale, one of the stone structures had three central hallways. At Milltown, there is one building that contains four living units and only one through hallway (Plate 21). Except in length, the structures at Old Elmspring and Rosedale do not appear to vary in any other way from other structures in their respective strains. In the "half-house" at Milltown,
Figure 9. First-Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)

Plate 19. First-Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota (1930 photo)
Plate 20. First-Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota (1984 photo of the building in Plate 19)
however, each of the three stairways to the attic is located in separate rooms rather than in the common hallway. Two of the attic rooms had been "finished" and were for the exclusive use of the occupants of the lower room (Mrs. Susie Kleinsasser, pers. comm.). Except for the structure at Milltown, all first-generation one-storey, central-hallway structures have the attic stairways in the common corridor.

The buildings at the Old Elmspring and Rosedale colonies are the only structures in the North American architectural record that have more than two central hallways. The "half-house," on the other hand, although limited in frequency of occurrence, appears again in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Montana.
Clipped gables are not present on the stone buildings that the Lehrerleut built at New Elmspring and Rockport just prior to 1918. By abandoning clipped gables, there is a loss of distinctiveness, a process that Newton and Fullam-di Napoli (1977:378) refer to as "convergence." As a result, on the eve of Hutterite migration to Canada in 1918, there were no separate strains within the first-generation of one-storey, central-hallway structures.

The storey-and-attic, central-hallway structures that the Dariusleut built when they established pre-1918 colonies in Manitoba and Montana were second-generation wood-frame residential buildings. There were no separate strains. These structures were built on the site of the former Dominion City Colony in Manitoba and at the Spring Creek Colony in Montana and are the first-generation central-hallway tradition reproduced in wood frame.

2. Two-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type

The original chalkstone structure built at Bon Homme Colony in 1876 is the only appearance that the two-storey, central-hallway house type makes in the architectural record on Hutterite colonies in North America (Plate 22). This building measures thirty-eight by seventy-two feet. Although altered considerably from major renovations and additions in 1912 and 1980, the original ground floor plan had two through-hallways (Rev. Jacob Waldner, pers. comm.). There were four rooms off each passageway. The upper storey had ten rooms (presumably for couples or for very small families), five on each side of the hallway that ran the length of the structure. Access to the second storey was provided by
Plate 22. Two-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota. Top: View from the Northeast; Bottom: View from the Southwest. (1984 photo of the building in Plate 12). Note: Because of extensive renovations, fenestration of the sides and ends is not symmetrical.
covered, external stairways at each end of the building. Designed for eighteen families, the structure now has four separate units.

3. One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type

There are two generations of the one-storey, external-doorway house type in South Dakota. The first-generation structures are located at the former site of the Milltown Colony and are built of stone. The second generation is a wood frame structure and is located on the former site of the James Valley Colony.

The first generation has two strains. What is considered the earliest has external doorways but an internal and shared stairway to the attic (Plate 23), while the second, or later, strain has external access to both the individual units and the attic stairway. The former has six units, including two units that have two rooms which extend from front to back. Four of the units consist only of one room (Figure 10). It is reported that the two-room units were constructed originally as opposed to single units that were subsequently joined by cutting an opening for a door in an adjoining wall (Mrs. Susie Kleinsasser, pers. comm.). Differentiation in the size of units within the same structure (and between separate units on the same colony) is a feature that is common among the Schmideleut, especially on newer colonies. Internal differentiation in the size of dwelling units was noted previously between the two-living floors at Bon Homme.

The second, or later, strain at Milltown has six rooms. There are three pairs of external doors; each pair shares an external porch. The external access to the stairway to the attic is located about one-third
Plate 23. First-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Former Site of the Milltown Colony, South Dakota

Figure 10. First-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Former Site of the Milltown Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)
Figure 11. First-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Former Site of the Milltown Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)

of the way down one side of the structure. No porch is associated with the attic door. The second-strain structure at Milltown has one paired end-entry. Since placement of doors transversely to the ridge line is a common principle of folk housing design, the Milltown structure with the end-entry is an anomaly. In a structure with six units arranged in two rows of three units, it is impossible to have three pairs of doors on the sides of the building. At Milltown, the solution was to put one of the pairs of doorways (and the shared porch) on the end of the structure.

The second generation of the one-storey structure with external access is located at the former site of the James Valley Colony (Figure 12 and Plate 24). This structure has eight dwelling units accessed by
external doors that are paired and covered by shared porches on the sides of the building. The stairway to the attic is incorporated in one of the porches. This second-generation structure was duplicated on several colonies in Manitoba in 1918.

4. Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type

There are two generations of two-storey residential structures with separate, external doorways. The base case for the first-generation is a two-storey masonry structure located at Maxwell Colony. The structure has four rooms on the main floor and four rooms on the upper level. The latter are accessed by individual stairways from the lower-floor rooms (Figure 13). There are two first-generation two-storey structures at Maxwell. The first level of one of these buildings is constructed of field stones that were picked up around the colony site (Plate 25). The second storey was built of "burnt brick." The minister at Maxwell reported that an "outsider" was responsible for the masonry work and that the field stones were heated so that they would split easily (Rev. John Wipf, pers. comm.). The other two-storey stone structure at Maxwell, also built with "outside help," is constructed of "colony-made bricks."

What is particularly striking about the two residential stone buildings at Maxwell is their pyramid-shaped roofs. None of the other Hutterite residential buildings in North America to 1918 have pyramid-shaped roofs. There is also no evidence to suggest that this roof shape evolved from an earlier Hutterite building tradition in Europe. A possible explanation for this feature is that the stonemasons hired to form the rock work were also involved in the overall design of the buildings.
Figure 12. Second-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Former Site of the James Valley Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)

Plate 24. Second-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Former Site of the James Valley Colony, South Dakota
Note: The doorway to the attic stairway is on the front side of the porch.
Figure 13. Ground Floor, First-Generation Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Maxwell Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)

Plate 25. First-Generation Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Maxwell Colony, South Dakota
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The second generation of two-storey, external-doorway house types is located at the Rosedale Colony (Figure 14 and Plate 26). The wood-frame structure has six rooms up and down. Each dwelling unit has one ground-floor and one upper-floor room connected by an internal stairway.

![Figure 14. Ground Floor, Second-Generation Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Rosedale Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)](image)

When it was built, the two-storey, external-doorway structure at Rosedale had two sets of paired doorways. Two single doorways were located on each side, near the end of the structure. The original roof of the two-storey frame building had clipped gables (Rev. John Waldner, Rosedale Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.).

5. One-and-a-Half Storey House Type

The stone residential building at Huron (now Riverside) Colony (Plate 27) and the frame structure at the former site of the Warren Range Colony (Plate 28) in Montana are the only one-and-a-half storey communal residences encountered in the architectural record to 1918. These two
Plate 26. Second-Generation Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type, Rosedale Colony, South Dakota

Plate 27. First Generation One-and-a-Half Storey House Type, Huron (now Riverside) Colony, South Dakota
structures represent separate generations. The former measures thirty-four by ninety-two feet and appears to have had central hallways on the ground floor and living rooms seventeen by nineteen feet. The stone walls are thirteen feet in height; eight feet of this wall is in the lower storey. The striking feature of this residential building is the four side-facing gables in the upper level.

In the structure at Huron, the central hallways have been eliminated, and the stairways to the upper level are located in the rooms off the former passageway. Although it is not clear from the contemporary use of the building, it appears that the stairways to the upper level were located in the hallways. It also appears that there were two central hallways on the upper level, which is suggested by the wide gaps between the ends and the interior, side-facing gables. If the stairways to the attic were not located in the central hallways, then the passageways would have served a very limited purpose.

As discussed earlier, Huron Colony hired non-Hutterites to do the masonry work. Since incorporating side-facing gables is a fairly technical design matter, it is conceivable that, at Huron, like Maxwell, outside sources were responsible for design features that have no continuity with the earlier architectural tradition.

The second generation one-and-a-half storey wood-frame structure on the former site of the Warren Range Colony in Montana has gables on the ends of the roof and small windows in the four feet of wall that extends into the upper level. Except for a small room next to one of the gables which appears to have been used as a classroom, the upper level in the structure at Warren Range is open.
In addition to the higher walls on the upper level, the one-and-a-half storey house type is distinguishable from the one-storey house types by the fenestration of the gables. With the former, the windows in the upper level are directly over the openings in the lower floor. In the storey-and-attic, they are not. This difference is apparent between Plates 27 and 28 and Plates 19 and 24.
The System of Rules

Since the basic house types and their derivatives in North America to 1918 have been identified, the analysis turns to development of sets of rules that are sufficient to account for the structures in each class. These rules express the relationship between massing and piercing, that is, between imagining the structure as substance (mass) and "imagining the existence of holes...[piercing]...that allow passage through the substance" (Glassie 1975:26). The former means either walls (first massing) or fireplaces and stairways (second massing). Differential piercing means openings must be either doors or windows. In the following rules, openings that are not doors become windows (fenestration).

The numbering system used in the following discussion corresponds to the notation system developed by Glassie (1975). Rules that are not applicable in the Hutterite case have been omitted; some additional rules have been added.

RULE SET I: FORMING THE BASE STRUCTURE

I.A. **Selection of the Geometric Entity.** The basic geometric entity is the square, or s.

I.B. **Transformation of the Geometric Entity.** The square is transformed to provide a scale of shapes.

The plan of each living unit is transformed by adding or subtracting units to or from the width of one or more squares. Since the widths of
most of the structures are around thirty-two feet, it is assumed that the basic geometric entity is a sixteen-foot square. It is also assumed for the sake of the argument that the basic unit of measurement, or \( u \), is the yard, or three feet.

Any room or component that differs from being square by only one \( u \) will be considered square: for example, rooms fifteen by eighteen feet; fourteen by seventeen feet; etc. There are thus two classes of shapes: those which are square by definition and those which are not. Units that are square are designated "X." Non-square units are further subdivided into classes of shapes that are less than square by definition, or "Y," and those that are larger than square, or "Z."

Using the above designations, the one-storey, central-hallway structure at Bon Homme can be described as a XYX arrangement of rooms, that is, two living rooms fifteen by eighteen feet (X) separated by a six-foot hallway (Y). In terms of the overall structure, it can be described as a four-XYX type with each XYX unit having two common walls.

In the central-hallway structure, the basic unit of analysis is a duplex rather than a single living unit. This is so since the hallway, in effect, belongs to both dwellings. In the structures with external doorways, the basic unit is composed of two XX or ZZ components. In the example from James Valley, each of the components is seventeen by twenty feet. At Milltown, the components in the structure with the end-entry are sixteen by nineteen feet. The structure at Milltown that has the internal shared stairway to the attic has components 16.5 by 21.5 feet. Although each of the X units in the structure at James Valley is
self-contained, it appears that the basic structure is a duplex. Although the porches are external to the living units (and therefore not covered by these rules), these structures, in effect, unify the whole. Stated differently, the location of the individual doors makes sense only in relation to the shared porch.

I.C. **Addition.** The transformations of the square are selected and related.

I.C.1. The whole may consist of a single entity; in which case it must be square (X) or a larger transformation of the square (Z).

I.C.2. The whole may consist of more than one of the transformations of the square; in which case, one must be square (X), while the others may be square (X) or smaller (Y).

I.C.2a. Not more than two different classes of shapes may be employed in the same whole.

I.C.2b. Not more than three shapes may be employed in the same whole.

I.C.2c. When three shapes are incorporated in the same whole, one of the three shapes must be of a different class from the others (which by rule I.C.2. above must be the same), and it will be located centrally.

I.C.3. Addition is always made symmetrically along the same axis so that all parts of the whole will be exactly _s_in depth.
Although application of the rules outlined above yields a number of possible combinations, the architectural record on Hutterite colonies to 1918 is limited to XXY (central hallway) and XX and ZZ (external doorway) base units.

I.D. Invariability
I.D.1. The base structure will not be reordered.
I.D.2. Shapes of the same class will be treated identically.

According to the rules of "invariability," the base structure may not be reordered, and identical shapes must be treated identically. With regard to the latter, this means that whatever is done to one component must also be done to the other. The rule of invariability does not apply totally to most Hutterite houses, however, since the component closest to the gable end of the overall structure has one window on the front, whereas the interior components have two.

RULE SET II: EXTENSION

The base structure is extended into space three dimensionally and equally.

RULE SET III: MASSING AND PIERCING THE EXTENDED FORM

III.A. Massing Rules: Partitioning
III.A.3. Internal Subdivision.
III.A.3a. X and Y components are not subdivided.
III.A.3b. When the component is Z, internal partitioning is optional.
When Z components are partitioned, the partition will not be centrally located and will run parallel to the shortest side of the component.

III.B. Piercing. Partitioning requires piercing.

III.B.1. Piercing Obligation. All partitions must be pierced.

Rule III.B.1. requires at least one opening be made in the wall of each component. Here, too, there are obvious exceptions, since the common walls of the living unit are not pierced (although some units are expanded sideways/backwards as families increase in size).

III.B.2. Piercing Position. The piercing must be central.

III.B.2a. For Y components in XYX forms,
the one opening will be central to the component and to the whole.

III.B.2b. For X components in XYX forms:
III.B.2b.1. When one opening is cut, it will be:
III.B.2b.1a. Central to the component, or
III.B.2b.1b. Displaced asymmetrically towards the gable end.

III.B.2b.2. When two openings are cut, they will be equidistant from the midpoint of the component.

III.B.2c. For XX and ZZ forms:

III.B.2c.1. When the X or Z component has two openings, one will be displaced towards the end of the structure that is opposite the gable, while the other opening will be
equidistant from the midpoint between the first opening and the gable end.

III.B.2c.2. When three openings are cut, one opening will be displaced towards the end of the structure, while the other openings will be equidistant from the midpoint between the first opening and the end of the unit.

A possible explanation for the asymmetrical displacement of the window on the end units in XYX structures is to create a longer wall in order to facilitate furniture placement. If the window is located centrally, the result is two short walls. With the window displaced as it is, the interior wall has one relatively long segment and one short one.

Although the door in the external-doorway structure does not exhibit centrality with respect to the component in which it is located, it is noted that, when the XX or ZZ components are viewed together, the placement of the paired doorways (or external, shared porch) does exhibit centrality by being at the midpoint of the overall XX or ZZ unit.

III.B.3. Piercing Relation. Piercing is dependent on the length of wall that is pierced.

III.B.3a. The Y component can be pierced only once.

III.B.3b. The X and Z components can be pierced two or three times.

III.C. Differential Piercing. Piercing requires the opening to take shape.
III.C.1. Entrance Position.

III.C.1a. The outside door is on the long side of the whole.

III.C.1b. In XYX units, by prior rules, the door is in the Y component and is central in two ways:

III.C.1b.1. By being central to the whole, and

III.C.1b.2. By being central to the component in which it is located.

III.C.1c. In XX and ZZ units, the doors are located in X or Z components and exhibit centrality by being equidistant from the midpoint of the XX or ZZ unit.

III.C.2. Fenestration of the Facade.

III.C.2a. All piercings of the facade that are not doors become windows.

III.C.2a.1. X and Z components on the ends of the structure have one window.

III.C.2a.2. All other X and Z components have two windows.

By prior rules, the facades of all Y components must be pierced once and pierced centrally by a door. This eliminates the possibility of a window in Y components.

The rules for piercing the facade of Hutterite houses have considerable diagnostic value. On several of the Lehrerleut and Dariusleut colonies, central-hallway houses were converted into kitchens. The fact that these structures were originally central-hallway residential buildings is evident in the familiar window-door-window-window-window-door-window pattern on the facade. Plates 29 and 30
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compare the fenestration of an original kitchen (Plate 29) with the pattern on a central-hallway residential structure that has been converted to a kitchen (Plate 30).

III.D. **Second Massing.** Differential piercing requires a second massing.

III.D.2. **Stairway.**

III.D.2a. In XYX forms, the stairway is within Y and is paired.

III.D.2a.1. There is one stairway on each of the lateral walls.

III.D.2a.2. The stairway is positioned towards the front of the living unit.

Exceptions to the above include the "half-house" at Milltown and the storey-and-a-half residential structure at Huron (now Riverside). In these cases, the stairway is located in a room off the central hallway and not in the common passageway (or Y).

III.D.2b. In XX and ZZ forms, the stairway is on the lateral wall that is closest to the external doorway.

With respect to structures with external doorways, rule III.D.2b. applies only to the two-storey structures at Maxwell, both of which have internal stairways from the ground floor to the second-floor living area. In the structure at Milltown that has the internal, shared stairway to
Plate 29. Communal Kitchen, New Elmspring Colony, South Dakota

Plate 30. Communal Kitchen (formerly a residential structure), Spink Colony, South Dakota
the attic, the rules apply only to one of the Z components. In the structures with external doorways and external access to the attic stairway, rule III.D.2b. does not apply to any of the X or Z components. In the case of XX or ZZ structures with external access to the attic, the stairways are prized apart from the living units. The stairways that are accessed only from outside of the building are, like the porches, external to the interior arrangement or layout of the residential units.

III.E. Second Piercing. The second massing requires a second piercing, that of the lateral walls.

III.E.1. All internal walls are pierced with a door, the opening for which is located centrally unless,

III.E.1a. The wall has a stairway, in which event the opening for the door is displaced towards the rear of the component.

In XYX base structures, this means that the openings for the doors off the central hallway will not be directly opposite each other.

III.E.3. End Fenestration.

III.E.3a. Ends of living units are pierced by a window.

Rather than being located centrally within the X or Z component's lateral wall, the window is displaced towards the front of the living unit. When the structure is viewed from the gable end, however, the two openings—that is, one window in each of the components adjacent to the
gable end—do exhibit centrality by being equidistant from the midpoint of the end wall. Again, this displacement is probably made to facilitate furniture arrangements. In virtually all of the dwelling units on the ends of central-hallway structures, the head of a double bed abuts the longest of the two wall segments.

RULE SET IV: EXPANSION BACKWARD

This rule is required only for the two units in the structure at Milltown that has the internal shared stairway. In this case, the base structure is doubled to the rear.

RULE SET V: MASSING AND PIERCING THE BACKWARD EXPANSION

In the case of the two units in the structure at Milltown which has the internal shared stairway, the backward extension is massed and pierced the same as the component on the front of the structure.

RULE SET VI: EXPANSION UPWARD

The extended base structure is doubled upward.

RULE SET VII: MASSING AND PIERCING THE UPWARD EXPANSION

The upward extension of the lower-floor structure is not based on an independent set of rules; instead, the upward expansion is dependent on the rules for massing and piercing the ground floor (Glassie 1975:32). This is not the case, however, in the original two-storey structure built at Bon Homme in 1876. In this structure, there appears to be no
connection between the two storeys. As noted previously, even the access
to the upper level was via independent, external stairways. Also, the
doorways and hallways on the ground floor run transversely to the ridge
line, while the second-floor hallway and the external doorways run
parallel to the ridge line. The fact that each level is independent of
the other suggests that two quite different building traditions are
represented in one structure: a nearly-contemporary American
central-hallway ground-floor plan, and an upper-storey that resembles
still-standing examples of Hutterite architecture in sixteenth-century
Europe.

Given the above exclusion, the following rules apply to the
multi-storey residential structures to 1918 at the Huron (now Riverside),
Maxwell, and Rosedale colonies.

VII.A. First Massing: Partitions

VII.A.1. The partitions are the same as those on the lower level.

VII.B. First Piercing

VII.B.1. All upstairs openings are located over lower openings.

VII.B.2. Upper Piercing.

VII.B.2a. The upper piercing is identical to that of the lower
storey except that:

VII.B.2a.1. There are no openings over doors, or

VII.B.2a.2. Openings over doors become windows.

VII.B.2b. On the ends of the structure, ground-floor windows have
second-storey windows directly over them.
RULE SET VIII: ROOFING

VIII.A. Roof Massing

VIII.A.1. The ridge of the roof is aligned transversely to the entrance.

VIII.A.2. The roof is symmetrical over the entire mass.

The relationship between the entrance and the ridge line is what Glassie (1975:30) refers to as "a powerful connective," serving as "a unifier for the system." There are a number of major exceptions to this rule, however, including the structure at Milltown with the end-entry and the two-storey structures at Maxwell with the pyramid-shaped roofs. These deviations from the norm may have been out of expediency (in the case of Milltown) or through the introduction of new design elements considered preferable for whatever reason.

VIII.B. Piercing the Roof Mass

VIII.B.1. On one-storey structures, the ends of the roof mass are pierced by two openings that are equidistant from the midpoint of the gable.

VIII.B.1. On one-and-a-half and two-storey structures, the ends of the roof mass are pierced by:

VIII.B.1a. One central opening, or

VIII.B.1b. Two openings that are located equidistant from the midpoint of the gable.
The discussion in the following section traces the Hutterite building tradition from 1918 to the present. The basis for this discussion are the rule sets developed in the preceding pages. Generally, the basic rules identified to account for the various house types and their derivatives in the architectural record from 1874 to 1918 are adequate to account for the housing built by the Hutterites when they moved to Canada. When the rules are no longer sufficient to account for identifiable house types, then these new forms may not be defined as folk housing.

The Hutterites built five house types in North America from 1874 to 1918 (Figure 15). All five types appear on Schmiedeleut colonies. All of the Lehrerleut and, with one exception (Warren Range), all of the Dariusleut colonies built only the one-storey, central-hallway plan. All five house types were built originally in stone. By and large, the house types that would be taken to Canada were second-generation structures built of wood frame (e.g., the one-storey, central-hallway and the one- and two-storey, external-doorway plans).

Hutterite architecture evolved in America from a central-hallway structure with almost complete Georgian symmetry. The Hutterite house types that were taken to Canada in 1918 are derived from this tradition. Although the house types that were taken to Manitoba no longer retained central hallways, affinity with the earlier central-hallway structures is evident in the familiar window-door (or porch)-window-window-window-door (or porch)-window pattern on the facade.
Figure 15. Evolution of Hutterite House Types in North America to 1918
Dariusleut and Lehrerleut Colonies. When the Lehrerleut and the Dariusleut moved to Alberta, all of the colonies built second-generation (i.e., wood-frame) one-storey, central-hallway structures. Although the Schmiedeleut stopped building central-hallway dwellings in South Dakota after 1906 (at the Huron, now Riverside, Colony), the Lehrerleut and Dariusleut continued building these structures in Alberta, Montana, and Saskatchewan into the late 1960s (1969 at Cascade, a Lehrerleut Colony in Montana).

1. One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type

On the founding colonies in Alberta, the dimensions of the central-hallway residences are very close to the second-generation central-hallway structures built in the U.S. prior to 1918. At the Rockport Colony in Alberta, the original structure measures thirty-two by ninety-two feet (Plate 31). A later central-hallway structure at Rockport is ninety-four feet in length. The original (pre-1918) structure at the Spring Creek Colony in Montana measures thirty-two by ninety-four feet.

The central-hallway structures built much later are considerably longer than the 1918 version. At the Ferrybank Colony in Alberta, the central-hallway structures measure thirty-two by one hundred feet. Invariably, the extra length is incorporated in the central hallways. In other words, regardless of the variation in overall length, the living rooms off the hallways are always the same size (i.e., sixteen by
eighteen feet). The central hallways in the structures at Ferrybank are fourteen feet wide.

With hallways sixteen by fourteen feet wide, the passageway can no longer be expressed as a Y component, that is, a component that is less than square. Neither can the duplex be visualized as a XYX unit. Instead, with the enlarged central hallway, the duplex is now an XXX arrangement of rooms. By prior rules, however, the doorway in central-hallway structures can be located only in the transformation of the square, or the Y component. This rule would have to be suspended to incorporate the structures at Ferrybank.
In the early central-hallway structures, the narrow central passageways are unheated. At Ferrybank, there is a heater in the central corridor. With the advent of larger, heated hallways, it would appear that the passageways are no longer simply adjuncts to the adjoining bedrooms, but living areas in their own right.

At Ferrybank, a window also appears in the central-hallway component. Since two openings can be cut in an X unit, a window in the hallway is not inconsistent with the general rule for piercing relationships. It is noted, however, that at the Red Willow Colony, a window is also included in the hallway even though the hallway is less than square, or Y (Plate 32). At Red Willow, the longhouses measure ninety-six feet in overall length. The central hallways are twelve feet wide. It appears that windows were placed in the central hallways in an effort to upgrade the hallways from corridors used only to move people inside the structures to additional internal livable areas. The strain with the windows in the hallways appears only at Ferrybank and Red Willow, both Dariusleut colonies.

There is also some variation in the central-hallway tradition at the Standoff and Rimrock colonies. At Standoff, one of the Dariusleut's founding colonies in Alberta, all of the original structures are "half-houses" (Plate 33). According to the minister at Standoff (Rev. Mike Wipf, pers. comm.), it was intended that the smaller structures would be converted later to granaries. These structures are still occupied. Since the essential difference between the half-houses and the other central-hallway residential buildings is only length, the
Plate 32. Second Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Red Willow Colony, Alberta

Plate 33. "Half-House," Standoff Colony, Alberta (File No. NA-1752-6, Glenbow Museum, Calgary)
half-houses are not considered a separate generation or even a separate strain. A "half-house" is also located at the King Colony Ranch (Montana) and at the Waldeck Colony (Saskatchewan).

At Rimrock, a Lehrerleut Colony in Montana, one of the structures has three side (as opposed to central) hallways (Plate 34). There are six separate living units in the structure. The side-hallway structure at Rimrock is regarded as a separate house type and makes only one appearance in the architectural record.

Although the attics in the central-hallway dwellings are not intended for habitable use, it is not uncommon, as families increase in size, for small rooms to be constructed in the attic next to the gable. These rooms are usually assigned to older boys. The interior of the attic, which has no source of natural light, cannot be developed into living rooms unless dormers are placed in the roof. Although not common, several colonies in North-Central Alberta, all belonging to the Darius group, have attic units with dormers.

Originally, the hallways in the traditional longhouse extended the full width of the structure. Subsequently, these hallways were closed by a partition located in the center of the structure. Without the partitions, up to four families would be using the same hallway. Without the partitions, families expanded into the adjacent living unit on the same hallway. When the through hallway was closed off, families, as they grew, expanded into the living unit across the passageway. When this occurred, the hallway became the exclusive domain of one family. With partitioning of the hallway, half of the units could no longer be
accessed on the side of the structure facing towards the center square of the hof.

According to the "old rules," a family with less than six children was entitled to one room; with six children, a family was entitled to two rooms or units; and with more than twelve children, three units. The above rules were modified when a family had an invalid, older teenagers of the opposite sex, a "bachelor uncle," a "spinster aunt," etc.

When accommodation was limited, there were cases of overcrowding. One minister reported that his parents and eight children occupied one room; the informant and two of his brothers slept on the floor.

Expanding into an adjacent room—a procedure outlined above—was not always possible, since all of the adjacent rooms might have been occupied.
fully by other families. In this event, a growing family would have to either move into housing units elsewhere on the colony if they were available or, alternatively, try to utilize existing space more effectively.

At New Dale, a Lehrerleut Colony in Alberta, the solution to overcrowding is to build a shed addition onto the central-hallway structure (Plate 35). Unlike the additions that will be discussed shortly, at New Dale, every unit does not have an extension, only those units which house very large families.

Although one room in the traditional longhouse is considered adequate for a young family or for a family where all of the children have grown up and moved out, a single room is not adequate for a large family. Changes that have occurred in the housing on Dariusleut and Lehrerleut colonies are due, in part, to the efforts of Hutterites to produce a dwelling unit that is adequate to meet the requirements of a family as it expands. It is not simply a matter of building three- or four-bedroom units, however, since larger units are not only more costly to build, but can create problems in terms of fair allocation of space (i.e., a married couple without children could get as much house as a family with ten children). Part of the problem seems to stem from the reluctance of the Lehrer and Darius groups to build different-sized units on the same colony. The typical solution on Darius and Lehrer colonies is to build small units side-by-side so that two units can be occupied by two small families or one large one.
Beginning in the early 1950s, it became commonplace to construct additions (called "extensions," "annexes," or "porches") onto the traditional longhouse. Initially, the extensions were small and were intended as a wind-break (Plate 36). Later, the extensions became larger and were added in order to create more room. Subsequently, many colonies constructed extensions in order to incorporate indoor plumbing. Although many of the additions do not have bathrooms, when bathrooms are provided in the traditional longhouse, they are almost always located in the add-on structures. If the extension has a bathroom, the roof will always be peaked, and the exterior door will be on the side of the extension. The bathroom is always on the side wall not occupied by the external door. A dwelling unit with an extension that includes a bathroom is illustrated in Figure 16 and Plate 37.
Plate 36. Second-Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Ewelme Colony, Alberta

Plate 37. Second-Generation One-Storey, Central-Hallway House Type, Granum Colony, Alberta
All extensions with plumbing have basements. At the Granum Colony, the stairway to the basement is on the same side of the extension as the bathroom. At Granum, only the extensions have basements. In some cases, the original longhouse was raised and a full or partial basement placed under it too. Raising the structures, digging the basements, and adding the extensions are expensive undertakings, however. At the Riverview Colony in Saskatchewan, for example, the cost to dig basements and to plumb and renovate four central-hallway structures was $500,000 (Mr. Paul Tschetter, Secretary, pers. comm.).

2. "Brant-Style" House Type

The shape of the Brant-style house type is similar to the shape of the traditional longhouse with extensions or porches added to the long sides of the structures. The major advances are: (1) a full basement instead of an attic; and (2) a bathroom inside the structure. The bathroom and the stairway to the basement may be shared by the duplex occupants. This house type is known widely as the "Brant-style" house type even though the Brant Colony was not the first colony to build this particular house type.

While full basements were incorporated in the design of the Brant-style house type, bathrooms were often added later. For example, at the Kyle Colony, a Lehrerleut Colony in Saskatchewan, the original housing constructed in 1970 had full basements but did not have indoor toilets. When the Kyle Colony was established, basements were deemed acceptable, while indoor plumbing was considered too worldly. Bathrooms were not
installed in the communal dwellings at the Kyle Colony until 1980, ten years after initial housing construction.

There are two generations of the Brant-style house type. One is designated "Arm River" and the other "Parkland." The first (Arm River) generation of the Brant-style house type (Plate 38) has extensions or ells with only one bathroom. There are four duplexes in the overall structure. If a small family lives in each of the duplex units, then the bathroom (and the entrance door and the living/sitting room) is shared. The second (Parkland) generation also has eight units. However, unlike the first-generation structure, each unit in the second generation has a separate bathroom.
Plate 38. First-Generation Brant-Style House Type, Arm River Colony, Saskatchewan

Figure 17. Second-Generation Brant-Style House Type, Parkland Colony, Alberta (scale 1:240)
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Both generations of the Brant-style house type have two strains. In the first (Figure 17 and Plate 39), the ells have a side entry (in which case, the bathroom is on the end of the extension). In the second strain (Plate 40), the ells have an end entry (with the bathrooms on the side of the extension). As in the earlier central-hallway house type, large families may occupy both sides of the duplex. In the second-generation structures, access from one side of the duplex to the other is through the pair of doors at the top of the shared stairway to the basement.

In the Brant-style house type, one or more sleeping rooms are provided in the basement, either at the time of original construction, or later, as the family's needs expand. As a general rule, girls occupy bedrooms on the main floor, while boys occupy those in the basement.

The first generation Brant-style house type (i.e., with one bathroom in each ell) is known only on Dariusleut colonies; whereas second generation structures are found only on Lehrerleut colonies. The first-generation structures at the Kyle Colony are the only exception to the former.

A major disadvantage of the Brant-style house type is that the extensions add measurably to the cost of construction but not appreciably to the overall floor area. What is particularly interesting about the Brant-style house type is that it is distributed rather widely throughout Alberta and Saskatchewan even though it involves relatively expensive construction. It appears that the popularity of the Brant-style house type was attributable largely to the fact that it was the first house type in Alberta and Saskatchewan to incorporate aspects of modern housing.
Plate 39. Second-Generation Brant-Style House Type, Parkland Colony, Alberta

Plate 40. Second-Generation Brant-Style House Type, Verdant Valley Colony, Alberta
design, including basements and indoor plumbing. At least initially, the appeal of the modern conveniences obviously outweighed the additional costs.

Because a portion of the structure has been extended forward, and is thus no longer exactly s (or uniform) in depth (or width), the Brant-style house type does not conform to the rules of folk housing design. Since the Brant-style house type originated as a compromise that incorporated the older central-hallway type with subsequent additions, it is more accurate to regard the Brant-style house type as a transitional type, a type that cannot be produced or generated in whole by the rules that account for folk housing.

3. Neo-Traditional House Type

The next house type that appears in the chronological record is an overall rectangular structure similar in shape to the original longhouse without extensions or porches. The building contains eight units, each with its own bathroom. There is also a full basement for the exclusive use of the occupants of the individual units. The basement may have rooms for sleeping. This house type has four units on the "front" side of the structure and four units on the "back" (the latter being the "front" that faces away from the center of the residential square). With this arrangement, the modules that make up the individual dwelling units are arranged side-by-side or parallel to the length of the building.

The neo-traditional house type has two generations. The first has two bedrooms side-by-side. In interior units, this arrangement presents
some problems. At the Winnifred Colony, the floor layout includes a "dark bedroom," that is, a bedroom without a window (Figure 18). At the Kyle and Golden View colonies, this problem was circumvented by taking a part of the first bedroom for a hallway to serve the second bedroom. The first-generation neo-traditional house type is present on four colonies, all Lehrerleut.

The second-generation of the neo-traditional house type is represented at the Big Bend Colony. In this case, the two bedrooms are separated by the living room and the entry-way (which also includes the bathroom). The second-generation structure is illustrated in Figure 19 and Plate 41. The second-generation neo-traditional house type is located only at the Big Bend and Spring View colonies, which are also Lehrerleut.

Several possible explanations exist for the lack of popularity of the neo-traditional house type. One, half of the dwelling units are on the back side of the structures, in the opposite direction from the center of the residential square. Two, in both generations, at least one of the bedrooms is separated from the bathroom by the living room.

It is difficult to reconcile the neo-traditional house type with reference to the rules to account for Hutterite folk houses. Although the room arrangement in the neo-traditional house type can be visualized as four Y components or two X components that are partitioned, both cases are inconsistent with the prior rules. With this house type, the rules to account for folk houses do not apply.
4. "Motel-Style" House Type

The next house type, which some informants refer to as the "motel-style," is a rectangular structure with separate units extending the full width of the building. Several generations and strains are represented. The type-case for the first generation is from the Abbey Colony (1971) in Saskatchewan. The distinctive feature of the Abbey example is that two bedrooms are placed side-by-side along the end or rear of the unit.

The Abbey generation has the following variations (or strains):

1. one exterior door on the same side as all of the other exterior doors; or
Figure 18. First-Generation Neo-Traditional House Type, Winnifred Colony, Alberta (scale 1:240)

Figure 19. Second-Generation Neo-Traditional House Type, Big Bend Colony, Alberta (scale 1:240)
2. two exterior doors with access to the rear door through,
   a. the bedroom(s), or
   b. a hallway.

A sample of the variation within the Abbey generation is illustrated in Figure 20 and Plates 42 and 43.

The first (or Abbey) generation of the two-bedroom structures is restricted almost exclusively to Lehrerleut colonies. The only Dariusleut colony with the units running the full width of the structure and with both bedrooms at the rear of the unit is Huxley.

The second-generation of the motel-style house type—which appears only twice, both times on Dariusleut colonies—has the two bedrooms running along the width of the unit, that is, from front to back (Figure 21 and Plate 44). This generation has the following variations:

Plate 42. First-Generation Motel-Style House Type, MacMillan Colony, Alberta
Figure 20. First-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Milford Colony, Alberta (scale 1:240)

Figure 21. Second-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Ribstone Colony, Alberta (scale 1:240)
Plate 43. First-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Jenner Colony, Alberta

1. one external door on the opposite side of the structure from the adjacent doors; or
2. two external doors.

The purpose of alternating the external doors is apparently to disperse the children—one-half to the front and the other half to the rear—in order to reduce noise, etc. One obvious disadvantage of alternating doors is that half of the units do not have direct access to the center square of the colony.

The third and most recent generation of the motel-style house type is the three-bedroom variant. The levels of subtypification or strains are similar to the two-bedroom examples. There are:

two external doors, with the rear door accessed through either,

a. a bedroom, or
b. a hallway.
All of the three bedroom units encountered in the sample are on Lehrerleut colonies. Four of the five colonies with three-bedroom units are in Montana. Some of the variation within the three-bedroom generation is shown in Figure 22 and Plates 45 and 46. The three-bedroom unit with the hallway appears to be the latest and most popular strain among the colonies building three-bedroom dwellings. According to some informants, the three-bedroom unit is getting close to providing housing that meets the requirements of a typical family. It also has all of the sleeping rooms on the main floor, although bedrooms can be developed in the basement to meet the space requirements of very large households.

5. Bi-Level House Type

The most recent house type is called a "split-level," although it is more correctly referred to as a bi-level. All of the structures belonging to this house type have front and back doors. The major characteristic of the bi-level structure is that there are steps inside the front entry that lead to the upper level and descend to the lower floor or basement. This house form is easily recognized by the back entry, which is located several feet above the ground. A typical bi-level structure is illustrated in Figure 23 and in Plate 47.

In most of the bi-levels, the bathroom is located next to the bedrooms, almost in the center of the unit. According to some informants, this arrangement offers the ultimate in privacy.

With the bi-level structures, the various components or rooms have become functionally specific. Particular note in this regard is the area
Figure 22. Third-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Seville Colony, Montana (scale 1:240)

Figure 23. Upper Level, Bi-Level House Type, Lomond Colony, Alberta
Plate 44. Second-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Ferrybank Colony, Alberta

Plate 45. Third-Generation Motel-Style House Type, Waldeck Colony, Saskatchewan
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devoted to food preparation and eating, designated as the kitchenette (even though most meals are prepared and eaten in the communal dining room).

Even though the bi-level structure provides two living floors, there is some ambiguity about the lower level. According to some spokesmen, the lower level in the bi-level is still a basement. To these informants, bedrooms developed on the lower level are there for use only in a pinch—for visitors, for very large families. Ideally, it is visualized that all of the bedrooms should be on one living floor. Consequently, bi-levels are not being accepted universally as the solution to the enigma of providing colony housing to suit the needs of colony families as they expand and contract in size.
The Dariusleut is largely responsible for the construction of bi-level residential buildings. The only Lehrerleut colony in the sample survey to build bi-levels is New Elmspring in Alberta.

6. Washington State House Types

The four Dariusleut colonies in Washington—which Evans (forthcoming) calls an "outlier" of Hutterite settlement—have developed their own distinctive housing styles. At the Spokane (also known as "Reardon," "White City," and "Espanola") Colony, the residential structures are duplexes (Plate 48) and when constructed in 1959, were some of the earliest Hutterite dwellings with indoor toilets (Rev. Paul Gross, Spokane Colony, Washington, pers. comm.). The unit inspected has four bedrooms on the main floor and a full basement. At the Stahlville
Colony, there are four dwelling units per structure. The units have three bedrooms on the main floor and three in the basement. Like all Hutterite housing built in Washington, the structures at Stahlville were prefabricated in Spokane (Rev. Paul Gross, pers. comm.).

Probably the most elaborate of all Hutterite housing in North America is now being constructed at the Warden Colony. These bi-level units have a lower level with a separate external entrance (Figure 24 and Plate 49). The construction employed at Warden utilizes prestressed concrete tilt-up panels that have insulation already inserted in the wall sections. While the use of concrete for housing construction may appear novel, the colonies in Washington make extensive use of concrete for farm buildings, such as shops, potato storage facilities, etc.

The Warden Colony is unique in so many ways that the housing there cannot be taken as a reflection of trends in Hutterite architecture. In terms of size, the Warden Colony is probably the largest in North America. Currently, it owns or leases 18,000 acres, of which 12,000 acres were seeded to wheat and 1,500 acres to potatoes in the 1983-84 crop year.

Outside of Washington, the only colony in the Lehrer and Darius groups to build duplexes recently is Lajord, a Dariusleut colony in Saskatchewan (Plate 50). Each dwelling unit has three bedrooms on the main floor and one on the lower level. Provision is also made for a sitting room in the basement, and according to the secretary, it would be possible to have a separate family live downstairs "for the first couple of years" (Mr. Ben Hofer, pers. comm.).
Plate 48. Duplex Unit, Spokane Colony, Washington

Figure 24. Upper Level, Bi-Level Structure, Warden Colony, Washington (scale 1:240)
Plate 49. Bi-Level Structures, Warden Colony, Washington

Plate 50. Duplex Units, Lajord Colony, Saskatchewan
The building record on Dariusleut and Lehrerleut colonies from 1918 to present is summarized in Figure 25. Two trends are apparent. One, there was a considerable period of time in which the central-hallway structure was the only house type to be built on Hutterite colonies in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Montana. Two, beginning about 1975, there has been a proliferation—almost an explosion—of house types and their derivatives. While this proliferation of house types and forms may be regarded as an indication of a lack of consensus regarding the preferred house type, there appears to be considerable within-leut regularity in terms of housing choice. At the present time, the Dariusleut appears to favor bi-levels, while the Lehrerleut is showing a preference for units with three bedrooms on the main floor.

Schmiedeleut Colonies. The Schmiedeleut took one- and two-storey, external-doorway house types to Canada. The former was built up until the mid-1940s. The two-storey plan, on the other hand, is still being built on contemporary colonies.

1. Second-Generation One-Storey, External-Doorway House Type

Four of the six colonies established in Manitoba in 1918—Rosedale, Huron, Milltown, and James Valley—built second-generation one-storey structures with external doorways. Except for the much-altered one-storey structure at James Valley, none of the original residential buildings are still standing on the four founding colonies.

The structures built at the Rosedale (Figure 26 and Plate 51), Huron, and Milltown colonies are replications of the storey-and-attic
Figure 25. House Types on Dariusleut and Lehrerleut Colonies from 1918 to Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRAL HALLWAYS</th>
<th>SIDE HALLWAYS</th>
<th>&quot;BRANT-STYLE&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockport ('18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Raley ('18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cardston ('18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standoff ('18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewelsie ('27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granum ('30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrybank ('48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Willow ('49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller ('49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dale ('50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River View ('55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B. ('57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimrock ('63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiley ('68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade ('69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimrock ('70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pitt ('69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Lake ('69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle ('70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgeville ('71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinville ('73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland ('69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdant V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structure from the James Valley Colony in South Dakota. In the Manitoba examples, there are two stairways to the attic (instead of one), and both are located in external porches on the same side of the structure. A separate strain of the second-generation single-storey structure was built at the James Valley Colony in Manitoba. In this example, the attic was accessed by an uncovered stairway located on one of the ends of the building (the end not visible in Plate 52).

At the James Valley Colony in Manitoba, the upper level in the storey-and-attic was used for storage and for drying clothes and grain. The latter became evident when grain was found in the walls of the structure when it was remodelled.

Although not intended for living and sleeping, portions of the upper floors in most, if not all, of the one-storey structures were developed subsequently into habitable rooms (Figure 27). This occurred as the need for additional habitable space arose. Typically, newly-weds and small families occupied the separate units developed on the upper floors. On some colonies, the ground floor units were expanded to take in the upper level as families increased in size. This required the development of an internal stairway. One of the problems of developing the upper level of the storey-and-attic structures for habitable use is that the space along the exterior walls on the sides of the attic is difficult to utilize because of low ceiling height. In many of the attics that were developed for habitable use, the area immediately adjacent to the side walls was divided off by a "dummy wall." The sealed-off area is referred to as a "blind hole" and is used generally for storage.
The second-generation single-storey house type continued to be built in Manitoba until the late 1940s (1946 at the Lakeside Colony).

2. One-and-a-Half Storey House Type

Barrickman is the only colony established in the 1918-20 period that has one-and-a-half storey residential structures. These buildings have side-facing gables (Figure 28 and Plate 53). The individual units have a two-over-two arrangement of rooms. Although each unit extends the full width of the structure, there is only one external door, which alternates from one side of the building to the other. With this door arrangement, the system of shared porches is no longer possible. Without the porches, the basic unit at Barrickman is an X, rather than an XX, arrangement of rooms.

The original structures at Barrickman are still standing. Porches with bathrooms were added in 1976.

3. Two-Storey, External-Doorway House Type

Two-storey structures were built at Maxwell in 1918 (third generation) and at Iberville in 1919 (fourth generation). Although it has been altered considerably, one of the original two-storey structures remains at Maxwell. The two-story structures at Iberville are extant. The ground floor layout of the structure at Maxwell is illustrated in Figure 29. The two-over-two arrangement of rooms is almost identical to the floor layout at Barrickman. Both floor plans are much different, however, from those in any of the two-storey structures discussed up to this point.
Figure 26. Second-Generation One-Storey House Type, Rosedale Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)

Plate 51. Second-Generation One-Storey House Type, Rosedale Colony, Manitoba (1956 photo)
Plate 52. Second-Generation One-Storey House Type, James Valley Colony, Manitoba

Figure 27. Attic Level, Second-Generation One-Storey House Type, Huron Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)
Figure 28. Ground Floor, One-and-a-Half Storey House Type,
Barrickman Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)

Plate 53. One-and-a-Half Storey House Type,
Barrickman Colony, Manitoba
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Because of its gambrel roof (Plate 54), the residential structure at Maxwell in Manitoba was called a "barn-house." Although the roof type on the original structures at Maxwell is unlike the roofs on housing built on any of the other Schmiedeleut colonies, the facade still has the typical fenestration, that is, one window on the front of end units and two windows on the front of interior components. The external doorways alternate from one side of the building to the other.

The floor layout at Iberville (Figure 30) is similar in many respects to the floor plan in the first-generation two-storey, external-doorway house type at the Maxwell Colony in South Dakota. Both floor plans have four separate units on the lower level, each with a second-floor counterpart. In both floor layouts, the stairway to the attic is located just inside the entry-way and turns as it ascends to the upper level.

Figure 29. Ground Floor, Third-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Maxwell Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)
Plate 54. Third-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Maxwell Colony, Manitoba

Figure 30. Ground-Floor, Fourth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Iberville Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)
The structures at Iberville have hipped roofs (Plate 55). This roof style is common in the architectural record in Europe; it also appears frequently on early farm houses in rural Manitoba.

The living quarters at Iberville measure seventeen by thirty feet and can be reconciled as Z units, that is, a single component that is greater than square. Although partitioned originally with a curtain, the ground floor unit was subsequently divided with a permanent wall, with the smallest of the two rooms becoming a bedroom. The upwards expansion of the ground floor was partitioned originally, however. The piercing of the upward expansion includes a window over each of the doors.
Although the structures at Maxwell and Barrickman appear to be unrelated, the floor plans are very similar. Both living units have two components on the main and upper floors. However, the stairway to the attic is positioned somewhat differently. At Maxwell, the stairway begins in the room at the front of the structure, while at Barrickman, the stairway starts at the wall between the front and rear rooms. At both Maxwell and Barrickman, the basic component is an X unit that is extended backwards. The ground floor, in turn, has been doubled upwards. At Maxwell, the rooms are fifteen-foot squares; whereas, the rooms at Barrickman are sixteen-foot squares. Another important similarity at Maxwell and Barrickman is the location of the external doorways which alternate from one side of the structure to the other.

The similarity in the floor layout of the communal houses at Maxwell and Barrickman is not unexpected, since both structures were built under the direction of a non-Hutterite carpenter named Booth (Rev. Joseph Hofer, Lakeside Colony, Manitoba, pers. comm.).

Most of the founding colonies in Manitoba that started with one-storey structures subsequently built one or more "doubledeckers," that is, two-storey residential buildings. A fifth-generation two-storey, external-doorway structure is illustrated in Plate 56. This form had seven units on the first floor: three two-room units on the ground floor in the middle of the structure and two one-room units on each end. The two-room units extended the width of the building. Each ground-floor unit had only one external door. Except for the end-units, the floor layout of the second storey was identical to the lower-floor
arrangement of rooms. The end-units on the upper floor were subdivided into two small rooms.

In the fifth-generation two-storey structure built at Milltown (circa 1927), the original ground-floor plan had four external doors on one side and three on the other. Over time, some of the units on the ends were converted to use by one family, instead of two, and one of the external doors closed off. Before it was demolished, the structure at Milltown had four doors on one side and only one on the other.

Fifth-generation two-storey structures were also built after the 1918-1920 founding period at Bon Homme and Rosedale colonies.

Except for the end-units, the floor plan at Milltown is very similar to the arrangement of rooms at Maxwell and Barrickman. At the same time, it appears that the roof type was adopted from the original housing at Iberville. The new form at Milltown was thus "syncretistic;" that is, the floor plan from Maxwell and Barrickman and the roof from Iberville were combined in a new generation of the two-storey house type. This is another example of how house forms "advance."

The sixth-generation of the two-storey house type has two strains. What is common to both is that the entry-way is displaced so that it actually lines-up with the adjacent unit. The first strain is located at the Glendale Colony in South Dakota (Figure 31 and Plate 57). This structure, built in 1949, has clipped gables, an uncommon feature of housing on Schmiedeleut colonies. According to the minister at the Glendale Colony (Rev. John Kleinsasser, pers. comm.), the idea for the clipped gables "came from the Lehreleut." At the Glendale Colony, the
broken or clipped gables had been removed from the communal kitchen and will also be eliminated from the two-storey residential structure (pers. comm.).

Except for two windows and one door that have been removed during renovations, the lower- and upper-floor piercing relationships on the sixth-generation dwelling at the Glendale Colony conform exactly to the rules outlined earlier. One, end units have one window on the front, while interior components have two. And two, except for doors which have no corresponding openings on the upper level, all openings on the main floor are duplicated on the upper level (that is, end-units on the upper floor have one opening; interior units on the upper floor have two). The
Figure 31. Ground Floor, Sixth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Glendale Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)

Plate 57. Sixth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Glendale Colony, South Dakota
upper openings are also aligned directly above the openings in the lower storey.

The second-strain of the sixth-generation two-storey structures is located at the Clearwater Colony in Manitoba. The housing was erected in 1960. Its entry rooms are off-set so that they line-up with adjacent units (Plate 58), and they are much larger than the entry-ways at Glendale. Although designed for six families, the two-storey structure at Clearwater has been converted to a three-family residence. According to the Minister at Clearwater (Rev. John Waldner, pers. comm.), the colonies "built too small in the 1960s."

One of the unique features of the two-storey structure at Clearwater is the absence of first- or second-storey windows on the gable ends. The gables were probably left blank because each room has only one window on the front of the component. If the gables had windows, then each of the rooms in the end-units would have at least two windows, one more than interior rooms. If the interior units had two windows on the facade and end units only one, then the gables would not have been left blank. Beginning with this house type, blank gables are a common feature.

The seventh and last generation of the two-storey house type built by the Schmiedeleut is located at the Sommerfeld Colony. This structure was built in 1974 and has a four-over-four arrangement of rooms (Figure 32 and Plate 59) and was built without plans (Rev. Mike Hofer, Sommerfeld Colony, Manitoba, pers. comm.). Although the displacement is slight, the openings on the facade are no longer aligned one above the other.
Plate 58. Sixth-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Clearwater Colony, Manitoba

Figure 32. Ground Floor, Seventh-Generation Two-Storey House Type, Sommerfeld Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)
4. Bungalow-Style House Type

In the 1950's, the Schmiedeleut started to build "bungalows," that is, one-storey structures without attics. Some of the bungalows have full or partial basements. The bungalow is ubiquitous and was considered stylish until the mid-1970s.

There are two generations of bungalows. The first, found almost exclusively in Manitoba, has all of the bedrooms at the rear of the dwelling. The second generation has bedrooms in the front as well as the rear of the structure. With one exception, all of the second-generation structures are located on sample colonies in South Dakota.
In the first generation of the bungalow-style house type, there are two strains. A still-standing example of the first strain is at the Brightstone Colony (Plate 60). The structure was built in 1959 and has two units, each with three bedrooms arranged along the rear wall. The front of the unit includes the living room and an entry-way. The latter includes a commode (or "flush"). A bathtub is located in the basement. Each unit measures twenty-eight by thirty-two feet. The second strain of the first-generation bungalow, built in 1971, is a duplex and is located at the Waldheim Colony. The living units also have three bedrooms arranged at the rear of the ground floor (Figure 33). The unit measures thirty-two by forty feet. In the second strain, the bathroom can be accessed without going through another room.

In subsequent examples, the bungalow structures become much larger. At the Mayfair Colony (Plate 61), the dimensions of the sample living unit are thirty by forty-eight feet. There are three bedrooms. At the Rosedale Colony, the sample dwelling, measures thirty-four by sixty feet and has six bedrooms. Another unit at the Rosedale Colony is reported to have eight bedrooms. At Rosedale, some of the bedrooms are located in the front half of the dwellings.

The bungalows in South Dakota are considered second-generation structures. In this generation, the floor plan is arranged so that there is at least one bedroom in the front half of the dwelling. The first strain is located at the Hillside Colony (Figure 34). In this sample unit, there are four bedrooms: three in the rear half of the unit and one in the front half. As with the first strain in the first generation in
Plate 60. First-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Brightstone Colony, Manitoba

Figure 33. First-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Waldheim Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)
Manitoba, there is no hallway or corridor within the unit. The dimensions of the separate living units at Hillside are thirty-two by forty feet. Other colonies that built first-strain structures include Maple River and Spring Valley. The sample unit at Maple River is one of the largest units in the sample, measuring 27.0 by 69.5 feet. The family occupying this unit has ten children.

As in the second strain in the first-generation bungalow, each bedroom in the second-strain in the second-generation structure is
accessed from a hallway or corridor. Also, the bathroom can be accessed from any bedroom without going through the living room. Examples of the second-strain bungalows are found at Rolland, Hillcrest, and Oaklane colonies. Oaklane is the only colony in Manitoba or South Dakota that has bungalows with hipped roofs (Plate 62).

Two of the sample colonies in South Dakota have bungalows with bedrooms only in the rear half of the unit. In both cases, the floor layout does not have an internal hallway or corridor. These buildings, which include a 1975-structure at the White Rock Colony and a 1973-structure at the Cloverleaf Colony, resemble the first strain of the first-generation bungalow-style house type found on Manitoba colonies.

Figure 34. Second-Generation Bungalow-Style House Type, Hillside Colony, South Dakota (scale 1:240)
5. Bi-Level House Type

The most recent and currently the most popular house type on Schmiedeleut colonies is a bi-level structure (usually referred to as "a split-level"). The facades of the bi-levels have two windows, one on each side of the external door. This pattern is common to all bi-levels. Internally, the two rooms in the front of the unit include a living room and a bedroom. The only exception to this pattern is the first-generation bi-level structure at the Bon Homme Colony in Manitoba (Figure 35 and Plate 63), which has the kitchen and the living room in the front half of the unit. The sample bi-level unit at Bon Homme is a thirty-two foot square.
All of the second-generation bi-levels have the kitchen at the rear. There are two strains represented in this generation. The first strain has rear access through a door located in the kitchen. Examples of the dwellings in this class are located at the Hillcrest and Sundale colonies in the U.S. and at the Greenwald Colony in Manitoba. The second strain has rear access through a corridor and is located at the Beaver Creek Colony in Manitoba (Plate 64).

The second-generation structure at the Sundale Colony in North Dakota is the only bi-level in Manitoba or the U.S. with a hipped roof (Plate 65).

With the advent of the bungalow (and bi-level) structure, it is no longer possible to express these housing forms with reference to the rules to account for folk housing. For example, the rules that apply to the backward extension of the mass no longer apply (i.e., the rear half of the dwelling is not massed and pierced identically to the front half). Similarly, since the rooms in the front half of the structure are not used for the same purpose, the fenestration of the facade is usually not symmetrical. For example, the windows in the living room are usually much larger than windows in the bedroom. With the advent of the bungalow, the rules of invariability apply only to units that serve the same function. In other words, two similar-sized components arranged side-by-side can have a different-sized opening or more openings. One example in this regard is the different treatment afforded a kitchen and a bedroom. With the advent of the bungalows, there is even variation among components that serve the same function. For example, in most
Figure 35. Upper Level, First-Generation Bi-Level House Type, Bon Homme Colony, Manitoba (scale 1:240)

Plate 63. First-Generation Bi-Level House Type, Bon Homme Colony, Manitoba
bungalows, one of the components is designated the master bedroom, and, invariably, it is larger than the other bedrooms.

When the threshold is crossed from folk housing to housing-produced by modern industrial methods, the house is no longer visualized in terms of shapes, but in terms of specific functions. At some point, the rear external doorway is no longer in a unit that is the transformation of the square, for example, but in the kitchen. The old rules are not abandoned totally, however, since the kitchen will be situated so that the doorway is still central to the unit as a whole.
6. Other Housing

Several wealthy colonies in Manitoba have constructed housing that is modern and stylish by any standard. Two examples are the Milltown and Rock Lake colonies. The former has built four large "tri-levels," (i.e., split-levels) (Plate 66), while the latter has built two-storey, single-family structures (Plate 67). Spokesmen at both colonies consider their housing to be fairly complex technically and therefore do not expect their respective styles to be copied extensively.

There are also some novel solutions to the problem of providing housing. One very common solution in Manitoba is to utilize barracks structures that have been declared surplus on nearby military bases. In
Plate 66. "Tri-Level" Residential Structure, Milltown Colony, Manitoba

Plate 67. Single-Family Dwelling, Rock Lake Colony, Manitoba
the colonies sampled, renovated barracks provide all or virtually all of
the housing on the Pine Creek and Fairholme (Plate 68) colonies. Several
other colonies have one or more barracks buildings.

On all of the older Hutterite colonies in North America, it is not unusual to find one or more residential buildings not built by the Brethren. The use of housing built elsewhere and hauled onto the colony is particularly common in the U.S. On one of the sample colonies (Fairview), all of the colony housing has been hauled in. At several other Schmiedeleut colonies, only one residential building was constructed by the colony (Hillside, Spring Valley, and Cloverleaf). A sample of these structures is illustrated in Plate 69. In the U.S., farm buildings became vacant as a result of the Land Bank and other farm programs which reduced the rural-farm population very substantially (Marvin Riley, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, pers. comm.). As a consequence, many colonies established in the U.S. in the 1950s and 60s purchased vacant housing from surrounding farms. The long-term benefits of utilizing existing farm houses are questionable, however. According to the minister at the Glendale Colony, "we thought it was cheaper, but it wasn't by the time you fitted it to our needs" (Rev. John Kleinsasser, pers. comm.).

The building record on Schmiedeleut colonies from 1918 to present is outlined in Figure 36. Several conclusions are evident. One, the storey-and-attic structure brought from the James Valley Colony in South Dakota was not copied extensively after the founding period in Manitoba. Two, the "doubledecker," or two-storey, house type has been represented.
Plate 68. Former Barracks Structure, Fairholme Colony, Manitoba

Plate 69. Residential Structures, Fairview Colony, North Dakota
consistently in the architectural record and is still being built at the present time (at the Rock Lake and Good Hope colonies). Three, beginning in the late 1950s, the bungalow-style house type appears in the architectural record. Although the popularity of the bungalow has waned in Manitoba, it is still being built in the U.S. (at the Rolland and Oaklane colonies). Lastly, the bi-level is the most popular contemporary house type and appears in the sample of both U.S. and Canadian colonies. In Figure 36, both bungalows and bi-levels appear on U.S. and Canadian colonies at about the same time. Although many informants reported that bi-level structures originated on U.S. colonies, this is not supported by the data.

The building record in North America from 1918 to present (Figures 25 and 36) indicates that while the development of modern house types started earlier on Schmiedeleut colonies—thus rendering some support to the assertion that there are degrees of conservatism among the branches of the Hutterite church—there has been extensive development of modern house types in all three leuts. Stated differently, even the Lehrerleut, the most conservative branch of the Hutterite church, is currently building housing that is contemporary with the other leuts. Similarity in terms of housing types across leuts and various other cultural and physical boundaries is due to uniformity in construction materials and building practices. Efforts to improve energy efficiency of Hutterite housing, for example, has led to adoption of a number of standard practices, practices which are common to the housing industry in general. There is also the levelling effect from the enforcement of national and
Figure 36. House Types on Schmiedeleut Colonies from 1918 to Present
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local building and occupancy codes. This acceptance of modern housing
design and construction techniques was indicated in a conversation with a
material supplier in Calgary. According to this informant, the colonies
in Alberta are no longer building "apple-boxes;" they accept modern
design and construction techniques and "don't chisel anymore."

It appears that the greater the colony's financial wherewithall, the
more modern the housing. This statement must be qualified, however, by
distinguishing between housing on mother and daughter colonies. Even if
the mother colony has to get assistance from some other colony, the
housing built on the daughter colony will be a contemporary house type
and will be as functional as the housing built on more prosperous
colonies. In this case, the great leveler is a lesson from the past.
This lesson was discussed earlier with regard to the colonies in
Saskatchewan that built housing without indoor plumbing only to come back
ten years later to renovate and to install water and sewer. This lesson
was an expensive one and underlies the present attitude regarding
deferral of some of the construction work. On this point, a Lehrerleut
minister in Montana went so far as to say that "we ever encourage
colonies that can't afford it to do it right," and "it costs less to do
it now--not to do it twice" (Rev. Paul Wipf, Riverview Colony, Montana,
pers. comm.). On the mother colony, on the other hand, the condition of
the housing is, to a large extent, a reflection of financial capability.
According to several Hutterite spokesmen, if a colony cannot afford to
upgrade its housing with its own resources, then the colony should make
do with its existing housing (as long as it is livable). Generally, a
colony that borrows money to replace existing housing is looked upon with suspicion. Indeed, many spokesmen trace the problems on financially-strapped colonies to the construction of housing that is "beyond their means."

On average, it appears that the colonies in the U.S. are not as financially well-off as their Canadian counterparts. This was inferred from statements by several informants. For example, in response to a question on observed differences in the housing on more- versus less-prosperous colonies, a Lehrerleut minister reported that "no colonies in Montana are rich" (Rev. Issac Wurz, Miami Colony, Montana, pers. comm.). The bishop of the Schmiedeleut (Rev. Jacob Kleinsasser, Crystal Spring Colony, Manitoba, pers. comm.) also reported that, in general, the colonies in the U.S. are not as financially well-off as the colonies in Manitoba. According to this spokesman, "we might have to dissolve a few [Schmiedeleut colonies in the U.S.]."

A number of informants on colonies in South Dakota indicate that the housing built in the last few years in Manitoba is more modern than the housing on the U.S. colonies. "I haven't seen colonies in South Dakota with houses like at Rock Lake and Good Hope. It's unnecessary to have houses like this" (Rev. Joseph Waldner, Hillside Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.). Another Schmiedeleut spokesman (Rev. John Kleinsasser, Glendale Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.) suggested that the building practices in Manitoba are extravagant. "They're taking their old buildings down and putting up new ones. I just can't believe it; it's just wasteful."
Some Hutterite informants are under the impression that there are colonies that could afford to build modern housing but, for some reason, choose not to. This assertion is difficult to disprove, since some colonies have built very conservatively. At West Raley, one of the Dariusleut's founding colonies in Alberta, for example, the newest housing has been built to look like the old. At West Raley, the elderly minister is obviously very proud that the colony has been able to maintain simple housing standards.

Although most colonies that add new housing units build what is considered modern by the standards of the period, some colonies adopt a conservative approach on what is reported to be egalitarian grounds. According to the secretary on a Dariusleut colony in Saskatchewan (Mr. Darius Hofer, Arm River Colony, pers. comm.), when a new housing unit is added, it will have to resemble the existing (Brant-style) house type. "You have to be careful. If you build a new one, they'll want to tear the old ones down."

Some informants are quite cynical about the houses being built by more prosperous colonies. A Dariusleut minister who is still living in a central-hallway structure without indoor plumbing suggests that "some with the dollar will do anything" (Rev. Andy Gross, Ferrybank Colony, Alberta, pers. comm.). According to another Dariusleut informant, "Human nature is a great thing. If you have money, you're going to show it" (Mr. Ben Hofer, Lajord Colony, Saskatchewan, pers. comm.).

With some exceptions, it appears that, by-and-large, the housing on existing colonies reflects the financial wherewithall of the colony. At
Standoff, which still has 1918-vintage housing, the minister reported that, "if we had the money, these houses wouldn't be here" (Rev. Mike Wipf, pers. comm.). Another remark says the same thing: "I don't know of any colonies that have lots of money that don't have good housing" (Rev. Jacob Wipf, Miller Colony, Montana, pers. comm.).

The most significant difference between the Schmiedeleut and the other two groups is the former's preference for structures with only two or three units under one roof. This preference is related to the extension of the inside of the dwellings to the outside—to the exclusive use of the lawn area immediately outside one's dwelling. One informant in Manitoba indicated that the use of the area outside of a dwelling is "pretty touchy." According to Rev. Thomas Waldner (Brightstone Colony, Manitoba, pers. comm.),

They all want their own yard, to sit as a family, for privacy. That's why it's a maximum of two [dwellings per structure]. I have one end, and my neighbor has the other. That's why it's a pretty good area.

In Alberta, on the other hand, it is not uncommon to find new housing with six, seven, and even eight dwellings under one roof (as noted earlier, the strategy on many Lehrerleut and Dariusleut colonies is for large families to occupy two adjacent units). Obviously, interior units in structures with six, seven, or eight dwellings are severely limited in terms of adjacent open space.

One consequence of the extension of the inside of the dwelling to the outside is that many Schmiedeleut hofs have very attractive landscaping, including flower beds, rock gardens, and decorative
shrubbery (Plate 70). The result is that the open areas on many Manitoba colonies, in particular, provide a park-like ambience, a facade that stands in sharp contrast to the austere appearance of the residential section on many Dariusleut and Lehrerleut colonies.

Another difference between the Schmiedeleut and the other two groups relating to matters other than house form is the former's use of elaborate furnishings. The use of "soft" furniture is still not considered acceptable among the Lehrerleut or the Dariusleut, and by comparison, the inside of the housing on most Lehrer and Darius colonies is exceedingly spartan. Among the Dariusleut and the Lehrerleut, the use of soft furniture is making inroads, however. On one of the Montana
colonies (Riverview), for example, there are rugs in the bedrooms. On a Dariusleut colony in Alberta, there are rugs in the front room. When asked if a rug is considered "too worldly," the informant said, "I don't think it's too worldly. They don't complain when they come around" (Mrs. Mary Hofer, Elkwater Colony, Alberta, pers. comm.). This informant maintained that if the rugs had a pattern with "roses" on it, it would be a different matter.

The evidence suggests that colonies related by marriage or fission do not necessarily look to each other for ideas for new housing. Instead, when a colony is ready to build, one or more members of the colony will take a trip to view housing that, through word-of-mouth, has been identified as worth viewing for ideas, if not copying. These colonies may not be related even remotely. A minister on a Lehrerleut colony in Montana that had just formed a daughter colony reported that they "spent close to a week going around" and that they "went all over" (Rev. Joseph Hofer, Rimrock Colony, Montana, pers. comm.).

A number of informants indicated that the final product is syncretistic, that it incorporates what the colony thinks are the best elements or aspects of several plans, "things that we think would be an improvement" (Rev. Joseph Waldner, Cascade Colony, Montana, pers. comm.).

On a few colonies, the final plans are prepared by one of the colony members. In many instances, however, the colonies use lumber yards and other suppliers to furnish working drawings. A builder-supplier in Calgary who has prepared plans for various colony buildings, including housing, noted that among the colonies that use his services, "some want
to copy," while others "want to start from scratch." One colony in Saskatchewan (Lajord) has housing that was designed with the help of an architect.

Continuity in housing design is evident on several colonies in Alberta. This continuity is expressed largely in terms of superficial features, however. For example, at Winnifred, a Lehrerleut colony, each dwelling has distinctive windbreaks made of bright yellow fibreglass. Also, the steps up to the main floor level are inside the structure rather than on the outside. These features are present at Jenner, Winnifred's daughter colony. The floor layout at Winnifred, which has a dark bedroom, was not duplicated. Instead, the housing at Jenner is a first-generation motel-style house type.

Although several informants contended that new house types appear initially on U.S. colonies, this research suggests that ideas flow in the other direction. For instance, the idea for the design of the pre-stressed concrete tilt-up panels being used at the Warden Colony comes from Calgary (Mr. Albert Wollman, Warden Colony, Washington, pers. comm.). At the Blumengard Colony, reported to be the wealthiest Schmiedeleut colony in the U.S., the Secretary (Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, pers. comm.) reported that when the colony decided to build new housing, the colony members went to Manitoba to look for ideas.

None of the evidence suggests a strong connection between building design and adaptation to local environmental conditions. Since one of the cardinal rules of folk housing is that form persists through changes in material and environment, the lack of association with climatic or
other extremes, for example, is consistent with the principles of folk housing. One exception may be the impact of the warm, muggy summer evenings in Manitoba and South Dakota. The use of the lawn area immediately outside of the dwelling is related to the need to find some respite in this regard. As noted earlier, this use of the lawn area immediately adjacent to one's dwelling is not inconsequential, since it appears to be responsible for the preference for no more than two living units in each residential structure. The popularity of the bi-levels may also be related to environmental factors. Since this house type does not require a deep basement, it is suitable in areas where the depth to the groundwater table is relatively shallow.

Two major conclusions are drawn from the preceding analysis. One, although the Schmiedeleut started building modern housing much earlier than the other two leuts, all branches of the Hutterite church are presently constructing housing that is fully-modern and contemporary. This similarity in the housing on the three leuts stems largely from acceptance of modern industrial design and construction techniques. Two, the differences that exist between the housing on the various colonies in North America are explained largely by two factors: colony financial resources; and leut affiliation. Other factors, such as social distance (that is, degree of relationship established through colony fission and intra-colony marriage), political jurisdiction, and environmental factors, do not contribute significantly to differences in colony housing.
CHAPTER FIVE

CHANGES IN THE MEANING OF HUTTERITE HOUSING

Contradictions Inherent in Hutterite Society

Contradictions in social systems "arise" because of: (1) the inevitability of differing value systems; (2) incompatibility between social reality and the ideology that explains that reality; (3) contrary developments in the social structure; and (4) conflicts inherent in social organization (Lauer 1982:141-142).

The specific contradictions in the Hutterite system, based on the distinctions outlined above, are identified as follows:

1. between "being-in-the-world" and "being-on-the-colony,"
   a. between the need for full integration in the market economy, on the one hand, and the sectarian beliefs in withdrawal from the world and in an other-worldly heaven, on the other, and
   b. between the need to maximize economic production and the ideal of consumption austerity;

2. between group goals and individual expectations,
   a. between the belief in the primacy of group interests and the need for status differentials in order to create
b. between the need for a hierarchical management system and the ideal of egalitarianism;

3. contrary developments in the social structure,
   a. between the reduced manpower demands of highly-mechanized North-American agriculture and a surplus of young, relatively-unskilled colony men; and

4. conflicts between controls based on appeals to tradition and individual autonomy,
   a. between the use of tradition to resolve disputes and to guide personnel policies and the ideal of democratic freedom, and
   b. between the need for surveillance and the desire for privacy.

These contradictions capture what was referred to earlier as tendencies not only to self-maintenance, but to conflict, dissolution, and transition. Each of the contradictions outlined above is thus both a unity and a conflict of opposites, because each is inextricably united in the same society, yet in conflict with each other.

The Hutterites are aware of many, if not all, of these contradictions and, to a greater or lesser degree, have attempted to respond to these opposing tendencies through structural adjustments and other mechanisms. In fact, much of the literature on communal societies in general and the Hutterites in particular focuses on mechanisms to reconcile these divisive conflicts. Serl (in Bennett 1967:274), for
example, claims that the ability of the Hutterites to incorporate technological aspects of the modern world is supported by a world view that does not limit choices in all spheres. As long as the communal basis of the Hutterite system and basic values are maintained, each colony is autonomous in terms of solutions to economic problems and expediencies. A specific solution to ameliorate the conflict or tension between rigorous commitment to economic production and adherence to the sectarian belief in withdrawal from the world is dual leadership (Kanter 1972:155). In the case of the Hutterites, this includes the minister, who is the guardian of colony traditions and personal values, and the colony secretary and various agricultural managers, who are responsible for the economic viability of the communal group and who are relatively free to make decisions on pragmatic rather than on ideological grounds.

The conflicts and tension in Hutterite society are pervasive and deeply-rooted, and all attempts to reconcile the divisive tendencies inherent in the system only illustrate that the resolution of a contradiction does not eliminate contradictions. As Lauer (1982:141) indicates, "the novelty that emerges from the clash of opposing tendencies contains within itself new opposing tendencies." An example of this dilemma is illustrated in the changing perception of colony ministers. Recently, Peter et al. (1982:332) note that in the selection of Hutterite ministers, more and more emphasis is being placed on business acumen. This reflects "technological/economic forces which have forced Hutterites to adopt an aggressive business stance in order to remain financially competitive." One of the consequences of the shift in
the perception of ministers from "spiritual shepherds" to "secular, business leaders" is that some of the colony preachers are not able to deal successfully with critical questions about fundamental religious tenets. When questions posed by inquiring members cannot be answered effectively, this can lead individual Hutterites to look for outside help to resolve questions about religious beliefs and practices. Such individuals (and their families) become "potential converts" for evangelical Protestantism. By trying to maximize economic production by shoring-up their leadership, the Brethren have only heightened the tension between social control based on appeals to tradition and "increasing individualism and outside contacts" (ibid.:336).

Many of the Hutterite leaders encountered in this research are justifying, rationalizing, or otherwise brushing aside many changes in their way of life because the changes are in "non-essential" areas. A Schmiedeleut minister in Manitoba, critical of the traditional dress worn by the Lehrerleut, the most conservative of the three branches of the Hutterite church, indicated that, "As our elder says, clothes don't make a Hutterite."

Some changes cannot be brushed aside as trivial, however. The practice of birth control, for example, is strongly opposed. Nevertheless, the population of all branches of the Hutterite church has fallen dramatically in the last decade. And even though alternative explanations have been proposed, such a loss of fertility due to postponement of marriage for five or six years, these explanations cannot be taken seriously. The only satisfactory explanation of the dramatic
decline in Hutterite fertility is that Hutterite women are terminating their child bearing much earlier than was the practice even a decade earlier.

As suggested in this research, housing is considered an essential element of the Hutterite system, and the shift in emphasis from building housing that is "simple and cheap" to building housing that is "modern" is, like the matter of birth control, an indication of a fundamental change in Hutterite family and community organization.

**Different Value Systems.** The nature of the contradiction between "being-in-the-world" and "being-on-the-colony" was summed up by a senior Lehrerleut minister in Alberta who indicated that for individual Hutterites, "our system has a tendency to want," a tendency that is expressed largely by the desire for personal consumer and luxury goods. Officially, the position on acceptance of material possessions is that they are an area of individual concern and personal desire and therefore should be resisted; that is, "We do not believe in making everything nice for the flesh" (Hostetler 1974:297).

In terms of housing, this tension between "being-in-the-world" and "being-on-the-colony" is expressed in such comments as, "I can serve God just as well in a good house as I can in a poor one." This informant indicated that prior to the introduction of modern heating and plumbing, there were several aspects of colony living that he considered drudgery: getting up very early in the morning to light the fire in the communal kitchen; and in the evening, after a hard day's work, having to carry water back from the kitchen to his own residence.
The response of a senior Lehrerleut minister on the relationship between the quality of housing and ability to serve God was expected, that "it's easier to serve God in a simple [house]."

Modern housing is, undeniably, contrary to the official Hutterite doctrine of austerity with regard to personal possessions and pleasures. Hutterite doctrine is also expressed in the belief in an other-worldly heaven rather than paradise on earth. In this light, modern housing is unrelated to religious beliefs and thus can serve no useful purpose.

The crux of the problem between "being-in-the-world" and "being-on-the-colony" is that the adoption of production and organizational techniques advantageous for business operations conflicts with the mechanisms that function to preserve community. This conflict is heightened considerably on many colonies that are wealthy and could easily afford to build modern housing and to equip each dwelling with the most modern labor-saving devices.

One rationale that has emerged from this conflict is that "we farm with the best machinery--the best tractors--why shouldn't we have the best housing." While this statement acknowledges that construction of modern housing has lagged behind technological developments, it indicates that the introduction of modern shelter should not be postponed indefinitely. This particular theme underlies the theory of "cultural lag" in which Ogburn (in Lauer 1982:153) suggests that non-material aspects of culture must adjust to the introduction of new technology. Technological development is the prime mover, and "people seem to be forever gasping to keep up and adapt to the world which technology is
ever creating anew." According to the informant who compared modern housing with modern farm machinery, it is apparent that in a system that places a great deal of emphasis on the use of large, modern, and efficient farm machinery, it is inevitable that housing should develop along a similar path.

The relationship between tractors and housing was discussed with several ministers. Again, the response from the conservative informants was expected. The secretary on an Alberta Dariusleut colony that does not have indoor toilets, for example, sees no connection between modern tractors and modern housing. According to this spokesman, a modern tractor is viewed in terms of lowering unit-production costs, which is for the betterment of the entire colony. Housing, on the other hand, if it is modern, is associated with individual "pride," which this informant regarded as totally contrary to Hutterite principles.

On many colonies, the issue is no longer whether housing should be "modern." On these colonies, housing is more than a depository of up-to-date labor-saving devices; it is now a source of prestige, of status. This is evident in the comments of a Lehrerleut minister in Alberta who, critical of the housing being built on a daughter colony, reported that "it would never be copied." More generally, a senior Lehrerleut minister in Alberta described this situation as "everyone...striving to outdo the other." The problem is that there are colonies that cannot afford new housing and this creates feelings of dissatisfaction. There is "a steady conflict, a steady yearning, when he comes from a colony that can't afford [new] housing, instead of yearning
for what he should."

Modern housing is not a matter of little import to individual colony members. A Montana informant provided a specific example. The spokesman's mother colony did not have housing with modern conveniences. When it came time to branch, lots were drawn to decide which group would stay on the mother colony and which group would move to the new colony. When the result of the draw was announced, all of the members of the group who had to remain in the old housing apparently registered their extreme disappointment by immediately leaving the room. Similarly, another Lehrerleut minister in Montana who had recently moved into a new three-bedroom dwelling indicated that his son, who had to stay on the mother colony which was also lacking in modern living conveniences, was disappointed that he, too, was unable to move to new housing. All the father could tell his son was to be patient, that in time his colony would also have modern housing.

The importance of prestige as a factor in social change is well documented, particularly in studies of change in traditional societies. Foster (1973:155), for example, notes that "there are standards of behavior that are deemed worthy of emulation; that is, if successfully executed they confer prestige and status." In Nigeria, a spirit of competition or emulation between adjacent villages led to progress and development when all other methods failed.

"[W]hen one village acquires for itself some amenity that its neighbors lack this is a matter for intense pride." This causes envy among neighboring villages, which often strive to keep up. Thus...encouraging competition between villages is a very useful developmental technique. [ibid.:159]
At the same time:

Competition can also be dangerous in that it leads people to spend money for prestige symbols that they do not really need. Friedl found that urban-inspired competition for prestige "often encourages spending beyond the boundaries of economic wisdom, quite on the 'keeping up with the Joneses' pattern." [ibid.:159-160]

There is a parallel in terms of the potentially harmful aspects of colony competition, since some Hutterite colonies are reported to have had little regard for their financial capabilities and as a result, have built housing that is "well beyond their means." Hutterite leaders are, of course, aware of the potentially divisive nature of prestige. Riverside Colony, for example, which is probably the richest colony in Manitoba and which has large, modern, attractive housing, has reportedly been "told" to "ease-up."

Group Goals Versus Individual Needs. Although the Hutterite system is reported to be lacking in incentives, there is, in actuality, a hierarchy of jobs. Consequently, the individual Hutterite male is taught "to entertain high hopes for advancement and social privileges" (Peter 1975:114).

The importance of the hierarchical order in Hutterite communities, and the emphasis on even very small status differentiations and the significance of the behavioural validation of status attainment in all aspects of the daily life of the communities demonstrates the existence and the extent of this motivational reward system. The second reward system consists of a limited, but legitimized, access to material resources and other privileges stratified according to the status positions obtained in a community.
In addition to the practical need to assign colony members to
different tasks, the Hutterites learn from the outside world that
"individuals do strive for personal success and are accorded recognition
for their accomplishments" (Bennett 1967:243). With recognition of
individual desires to achieve, considerable effort is expended to instill
egalitarian patterns and to repress competition and other destructive
tendencies. This suggests that one way of looking at the Hutterite
system is to consider the opposition between the individual and the
colony world (ibid.:254). While the individual is expected to find
satisfaction in the communal setting, Hutterites also feel that the
personal sphere exists and "that individualism will out" (ibid.:251).
Since the individual is expected to denounce the personal sphere, the
system can be considered "repressive." For this reason, "a certain
emotional price must be paid for being a Hutterite" (ibid.:265). At the
same time, the colony system does provide the individual with
gratification and security.

The way an individual reconciles the costs and benefits of living in
a communal society is provided by what Kanter (1972:71) refers to as
"commitment mechanisms." "The person must give up something as well as
get something in order to be committed to a community; communes, like all
other social systems, have their costs of membership" (ibid.:70). The
success of a commune will thus depend on the extent to which it has been
able to implement strategies or mechanisms to secure commitment of the
membership to the group's work, to its ideals, and to each other.
All three branches of the Hutterite church have seen an increasing number of defections. These defections indicate, in Kanter's terms, that, on an individual basis, the gains to be made by joining the larger society outweigh the benefits that one renounces when leaving the colony.

The threat posed by colony defectors underlies the nature of the conflict between group goals and individual needs and is especially apparent in areas such as Hutterite religion, a faith that stresses "outward conformity" rather than "inner submission." This routinization of religion is reflected in the practice whereby sermons are read verbatim without personal comment or opinion, just as they were copied over 400 years ago (Peter et al. 1982:330). Hutterite religion is thus considered devoid of any personal involvement, of any conscious reflection. In its stead, there is a "ritualistic affirmation of...the submission of the individual to the collectivity." This view stands in sharp contrast to the idea of Christ as an "eminently approachable" savior, the central position of the "born again" theologians, a contrast that "gives rise to the dynamics of successful proselytization among Hutterites" (ibid.:329).

The conflict between group goals and individual needs is also highlighted very clearly in attempts to increase privacy through housing design. The minister on a Lehrerleut colony in Alberta related how, when he got married, he had no privacy; he and his wife had one of four rooms on a central hallway that also included his parents in one bedroom, his grandfather in another, and his "bachelor" uncle in the other. Some examples of "privatization" that this informant thought worthwhile
include being able to go from one room to another and from a bedroom to
the bathroom without "interfering" with the living room.

Some of the criticism of the desire for more privacy claims that
construction of private living accommodation is at the core of the
breakdown of community. For example, the secretary on one of the few
Lehrerleut colonies in Alberta that still does not have indoor toilets
said that, "The root of the problem is that we seem to be isolating
ourselves from our neighbors." According to this spokesman, "There is no
use fighting here [in the traditional longhouse]. With new housing...if
you can't live with him, you avoid him."2 The obvious implication is
that with the older, "tighter" living arrangements, you have little
choice but to accommodate the behavior of others sharing the same duplex
unit. In the newer and almost totally segregated dwellings, impingement
is much less pervasive, and according to this informant, the alternative
to accommodation is withdrawal from neighborly interaction.

A Lehrerleut minister in Montana made a similar criticism, albeit
somewhat less extreme. Although he was over-ruled by almost all of the
voting males, this minister had voted against the construction of the
housing that was ultimately built on what was then a daughter colony.
His opposition was directed primarily to the installation of indoor
plumbing.3 Much of the basis of communal life is centered on the sharing
of facilities, and as this informant explained, when water can be
obtained only from the communal kitchen,4 trips to the central dining
room result invariably in encounters with other colony members, an
occasion that produces a "little visit." With self-contained living
units, this minister indicated that if he wanted to minimize his contacts with other colony members, he could stay inside his house all morning; there is no physical necessity to go outside.

**Contrary Developments in the Social Structure.** The minister on a Lehrerleut colony in Montana claimed that, "There are too many men out of work, which doesn't make it good for our system." This problem stems from the taboo on birth control, on one hand, and from structural changes in the nature of North American agriculture, on the other.

Until the late 1940s, it was not uncommon for colonies to have as many as twelve six-horse gangs (Rev. John Wipf, Rosetown Colony, Saskatchewan, pers. comm.). Today, with the large four-wheel drive tractors that are commonplace on the Great Plains, 1000 acres can be summer-fallowed in twenty-four hours with a single unit and only two or three operators. Rapid population growth and the decline over the past thirty-five or forty years in the number of men required to operate a colony is one of the major conflicts that exist in the Hutterite system.

Much of the published literature and many Hutterites give the impression that all of the colonies farm with very large, efficient machinery. At a Lehrerleut colony in Saskatchewan, however, this is not the case. Although they could farm more efficiently with large, four-wheel drive tractors, the Smiley Colony has a surplus of young men, and because under-mechanized farming requires more manpower, the colony has kept its smaller machinery. The labor surplus at this colony includes twenty young men who are not in management positions; that is, there are twenty general laborers who work under the direction of the
field boss. On one Lehrerleut colony in Alberta, the informant noted that there are only two men not in management positions. On the Alberta colony, farming is done with large machinery.

Several colonies are attempting to address the problem of under-employment by development of on-colony industries. Notable examples are Crystal Springs Colony in Manitoba and Millbrook Colony in South Dakota. The former is manufacturing ferrier crates, while the latter operates a large, computerized feed mill.

Despite some success, development of colony industries is not regarded as a universal solution to colony under-employment. By some, it is considered a source of problems, especially since it brings colony members into increasingly greater contact with the outside world. Industrial development can also create special problems when production is rationalized only in terms of profit. Among the kibbutzim, for example, the push for profits has led to the cessation of agricultural enterprises that were marginal economically but which provided positions of responsibility (Erasmus 1981:202).

Pushed by market competition toward even greater and more costly economies of scale, the kibbutz becomes more and more like a business corporation. Only the few capable of managing the operation understand what is going on, and they tend to become a special class apart from all those performing the routine, uncreative work.

Different Methods of Social Control. Because privacy is limited on Hutterite colonies (Hostetler 1974:203), deviation from prescribed patterns is very much evident and subject to immediate discipline. This emphasis on mutual surveillance was highlighted in an interview with a
Schmiedeleut minister in Manitoba. According to this informant, the Rock Lake Colony in Manitoba had recently constructed single-family houses, and while they had copied the Rock Lake plan, they decided to build duplexes rather than single-detached structures. When asked why the colony decided to build duplexes instead of single-family residences, he replied, "Why can't two families be together to watch each other and to live together?"

Although considerable emphasis is placed on maintaining a high level of observability, the shift towards modern and more-private housing has lead, unalterably, to a considerable reduction in mutual surveillance. Although construction of modern housing was undertaken presumably to introduce labor-saving devices and other convenience items—a move towards what Bennett (1975:124) refers to as "a town or farmhouse middle-class standard"—the result of this shift has been to reduce much of the communal basis of Hutterite society.

The shift from accommodation that entails much sharing to housing that provides quarters for the exclusive use of one family is regarded with mixed feelings. Indeed, a Lehrerleut minister in Montana went so far as to claim that "to want our own [housing] is our downfall."

Another Hutterite leader, while falling short of attributing changes in family and community organization to more-private accommodation, remarked that there is a "profound difference in the people with new housing."

Just as contradictions in Hutterite society cannot be resolved without creating new opposing tendencies, certain changes can have major, and largely unforeseen, consequences. In few areas have the unforeseen
consequences of change been as dramatic as the introduction of modern and
more-private housing. As the secretary of a Saskatchewan Lehrerleut
colony remarked, "Going from the attic to the basement has made a lot of
changes in our social life." With the old living arrangements, where
everybody slept in the same room, "If one of the boys had a radio, the
girls would squeal on him. If he's in a room in the basement, he could
have a TV--who knows what he might have."

Regardless of how much direct effect private living arrangements
have had on Hutterite family and community organization, the cumulative
impact of the changes that have been set in motion by new housing design
is not inconsequential.

Reconciliation of the Basic Contradictions: The Cause of Change

Several factors have heightened the tension between the basic
contradictions in Hutterite society. Since the heightened tension
between these opposing tendencies can no longer be maintained, the need
to resolve these contradictions becomes the driving mechanism of change.

Occupational Specialization. Colony agriculture has been marked by
increasing specialization, specialization that requires development of
expertise that cannot be reduced to routine procedural rules. On
individual colonies, the result is that farm managers have become more
autonomous in their areas of specialty. As a result of this shift,
individual obedience to traditional authority has also become weakened.

The key assumption underlying the process outlined above is that as
an individual's contribution becomes more valuable relative to the
contribution of others, then that individual will become more assertive
in his demands for relaxation of personnel policies and for receipt of
status and material rewards. Support for this assertion comes from
exchange theory, from Blood and Wolfe's (in Wallace and Wolf 1980:210)
study of decision making in 700 "contemporary" Detroit families. In this
case, "the more crucial the husband's skills to the family's survival and
well-being the more completely he controlled its wealth and resources."

When the specialized farm worker can find support for proposals,
then the basis for the erosion of authority is in place.

Until very recently, Hutterite leaders were known for the tight
controls they held over increases in domestic consumption and changes in
personnel policies, incorporating innovations only as pressures for
change became unmanageable. This process of bending before breaking is
what was referred to earlier as "controlled acculturation" (Eaton
1952:338) and is what Hostetler (1974:285-302) considers the genius of
the Hutterite system. In the contemporary period, however, the rank and
file on many colonies are no longer accepting the traditional
interpretation of their doctrine or the decisions of their elders as the
sole basis for dealing with changing times.

To a great extent, change in the Hutterite system has originated
from "the middle" (if not "the bottom"). As several informants have
phrased it, the decision-making process--particularly among the
Lehrerleut, the most conservative of the three branches of the Hutterite
church--is one where, "the young guys tell the old guys what to do."
Similar comments were made by the secretary at a Dariusleut colony in Saskatchewan. Relating how the "bosses" on a neighboring colony proposed to construct only partial basements under the existing houses, the informant indicated that, "The young guys just wouldn't go for it." This loss of ability to control changes in domestic consumption and personnel policies is expressed in terms of anguish by some of the people at the top. An elderly minister, noting that colony members no longer have any desire to "live common," described the situation as one where "we [the leaders] can't hold it."

Once concessions have been made to individualism, the consequences are cumulative and circular. Remarking on the shift in kibbutzim structure in the direction of industrialization and profitability, Erasmus (1981:202) notes:

Since all this increases membership dissatisfaction and makes it more difficult for the kibbutzim to keep their young, the greater doses of hedonism and individualism that result only intensify the process more. Threatened by the prospect of diminishing numbers, the communities are afraid not to meet membership demands unthinkable twenty years earlier. When members want television sets, for example, they all get them. At least one kibbutz...has tried to provide all its members with cars.

Similar observations are reported with regard to the Hutterites. Boldt (1980:395), for example, notes that the major consequences of the shift towards greater individual autonomy is "a more liberal interpretation of official policies." Whereas, in the past, each leut adopted and successfully enforced uniform regulations, Boldt notes that the Schmiedeleut, in particular, has become reluctant to sanction
colonies that deviate from official leut regulations.

The result has been that some colonies have opted for a more liberal interpretation of official policies, and one colony, for example, now has television sets in each home [although they have since been removed]. This movement toward greater interpretability of normative standards obtains at the level of individual colonies as well, where preachers are becoming less inclined to exercise their local authority and allow individual members to determine for themselves "what is right."

Oppositional Process. In the contemporary period, the Hutterites are becoming increasingly assimilated, which, according to Bennett (1975:130), reflects a conscious effort "to develop awareness and understanding" of the larger world as well as recognition of the fact that, as the major producers of specialized farm products in many communities, the Hutterites cannot afford to "remain aloof" from the affairs of the larger society. Integration thus involves a "trade-off" (ibid.) in terms of reduced freedom for an increase in security and acceptance by the gentile world. Obtaining greater security and acceptance may exact a stiff price, however. Some observers even suggest that acceptance, rather than opposition, imposes the most severe threat to the perpetuation of the Hutterite system.

Two commentaries on the Hutterites that have emphasized the oppositional process are by Erasmus (1981) and Boldt (1980). The former suggests that the oppositional process is generated and maintained by the Brethren, themselves, while the latter views the posture taken by the Hutterites to be largely in response to external threats.

Erasmus (1981:197) contends that since the Hutterites have been able
to expand rapidly in the recent past—a past that has been relatively peaceful—external opposition has obviously not been a major factor in this growth. Instead, the Brethren "generate and maintain their own oppositional process." The ability of the Brethren to sustain the self-generated oppositional process is based on a rigid indoctrination process that keeps the history of the group's suffering and individual martyrdom alive, deliberate limitations on the educational level attained by Hutterite children, and on their ability to maintain a "dynamic growth pattern" that provides rewards for adherence to communal practices.

Maintaining social isolation as much as possible through spatial and linguistic separation from the world and limiting education and external communication, they have resisted re-entry into the syntropic milieu of information exchange as well as its legal and state consequences. [ibid.:198]

Further:

Given strong branching goals, efficient management, and effective indoctrination procedures (all of which reinforce one another), the members of a strong colony will be too involved in playing the Hutterite game to negatively appraise its "opportunity costs" vis-a-vis alternative games within the larger society. [ibid.]

While "polyarchal states" seem to encourage pluralism, at the same time, the market economy "ties together all the diverse elements of the polity through their interdependence as consumers and producers" (ibid.:199). For this reason, among many communards, including the Hutterites, "egalitarian consumption" is a deliberate oppositional component in the economic sphere. Nevertheless, Erasmus (ibid.) notes that while the Hutterites have been able to control participation in the larger economy in terms of production, the Brethren "have been more
susceptible to market seduction as consumers."

The ability to maintain an effective oppositional process is largely a matter of "economic success and successful management" (ibid.:197), and on strong colonies, the system is in jeopardy only when "the branching process delays or breaks down" (ibid.:198). Boldt (1980:393), on the other hand, is considerably more pessimistic, suggesting that the Hutterite system is in some peril. This assessment is based largely on the increase in the number of colony defectors.

Boldt's point of departure is Siegal's (in Boldt 1980:392) interest in "a class of societies whose members attempt to establish and preserve a cultural identity in the face of what they feel are external threats to that identity." The result of this posture is what Siegal refers to as "the structure of defensive adaptation," which results in identities and relationships characterized by "structural tightness," a "society that is rigorously formal and orderly" (ibid.:391). The key is that when external threats ease substantially, the defensive characteristics will change substantially also. It follows, therefore, that in the current period when relatively amiable relations with the host society prevail, a "loosening" or waning of structural controls should be expected. And further:

[I]ndividual autonomy would increase, and that this would manifest itself in a less rigid adherence to traditional norms and values. In short, one would be led to predict a gradual process of cultural erosion, brought about not by external harassment and oppression, but from within through increased individualism and innovation in responding to cultural ideals. Role expectations would be increasingly viewed as "proposed" rather than "imposed," and open to individual interpretation.

Observation of current Hutterite practices suggests precisely such a
Differing Value Systems. This discussion of the conflict between different value systems is more speculative and more concerned with socio-psychological variables— with people's feelings of self-identity—and is based largely on Habermas' notion of legitimation crisis. It also serves to integrate the two previous analyses.

On many contemporary Hutterite colonies, social control no longer rests on normative standards, but on a combination of material rewards and coercion. This has occurred not only because individual Hutterites have become more autonomous or because the social structure has become looser, but because ideals can no longer be maintained in light of social reality. That is, it is no longer possible to turn one's back on the world when the colony is inextricably entwined with the larger society as both an economic producer and a consumer. The reason social control based on claims to tradition has been eclipsed is because these claims have become increasingly subject to debate as ideals and values have become less and less real or apparent. Much of this debate, as already noted, has focused on the propriety of "living simple."

With the basic shift in the method of social control, there has been a realignment of the colony authority structure. Under conditions stressing normative control, two nascent classes exist: the upper eschelon of the colony hierarchy that imposes the rules; and the rank-and-file that receives these rules without questioning the former's basis for legitimacy. On a Lehrerleut colony in Alberta, the minister
referred to the decision-making process under this two-class system as "whipping-up the backbenchers." In this light, the Hutterite ideal of egalitarianism becomes a "legal fiction" (Kai Nielson, Department of Philosophy, University of Calgary, pers. comm.). Where tradition no longer supplies the rationale for social control and where claims for legitimacy are debated publicly, the colony authority structure has become more egalitarian in the sense that decision-making is no longer a pro forma. Stated differently, demands for participation are causing an erosion of authority, a situation that a Hutterite minister referred to earlier as one where "we [the leaders] can't hold it."

1. Material Rewards

The old value system, which has largely become untenable, has been replaced by demands for collective consumption. Both Erasmus and Boldt note that this has occurred among the kibbutzim and the Hutterites, respectively. In case of the former (and probably the latter), these "doses of hedonism" have occurred as a direct effort to stem member dissatisfaction and defection. The crucial point is that the demands placed on the public or common fisc are potential sources of crisis. In the case of the Hutterites, a number of observers (Bennett 1975:128; Peter 1975:117) indicate that one of the reasons that the Brethren are losing their competitive edge vis-a-vis their ability to finance colony expansion is that a large portion of colony resources is now being "appropriated" for consumer items, especially for housing.

What is crucial about the shift to an emphasis on collective
consumption is that a different set of psychological needs provides the "interpersonal cement" (Turner 1981:231). Not only are personal tastes and expressive styles replacing such virtues as "ambition, morality, and altruism" (ibid.:219), but the source of cohesion for the family unit is no longer economic production but "interpersonal response" (ibid.:213). Again, the impact of more-private housing design on the Hutterite way of life has been both unforeseen and significant. Bennett (1975:128), for example, notes that the installation of private bathrooms has strengthened family ties and "may have unforeseeable effects on the delicate balance between the commune and the nuclear units which compose it."

2. Coercion

The fact that social control on Hutterite colonies is maintained, in part, through coercion is very important to this discussion because it explains why issues surrounding colony housing are so critical. It illustrates why individual colony members should place such a high priority on the need for modern and more-private shelter.

As Collins (in Wallace and Wolf 1980:153) notes, "people wish to maximize the degree to which they give rather than receive orders." What is crucial about the relationship between giving and taking orders is that "because of the nature of human psychology, those who give orders will tend to identify with the ideals of the organization in which they hold power." On the other hand, "the more people receive orders, the more alienated from organizational ideals they are likely to be, the more fatalistic, subservient, concerned with extrinsic rewards, and the more
distrustful of others" (ibid.; emphasis in the original).

An effective measure to reduce order-taking—one which highlights the function of privacy in inter-group relations—is to reduce "observability." To a great extent, the person who must take orders is also the person who finds it difficult to "hide" from others. As Boldt (1979:23) notes, effective surveillance "significantly reduces autonomy because it limits opportunity to improvise on, or deviate from, role expectations with impunity."

The long-run tendency on Hutterite colonies is thus towards a reduction of "co-presence." This is a result, on the one hand, of the increasing need for farm managers to become highly specialized in agricultural production and management, a need that gives rise not only to individual autonomy, but individualistic and self-centered attitudes. On a different level, co-presence of colony members is reduced by the provision of more-private housing, to a decrease in effective surveillance and thus the "opportunity to improvise on, or deviate from, role expectations" (ibid.). With more-private housing, each Hutterite is thus moved further towards the pole where "persons strive to fulfill their own expectations of themselves, not social expectations" (McCall and Simmons 1978:88).

The Negotiated Aspect of the Housing Selection Process

The meaning of Hutterite housing is subject to negotiation when a colony begins preparations for branching and must decide what kind of
accommodation to build. A colony may also decide, for whatever reason, to replace existing housing. The decision to rebuild, including the choice of what kind of housing to construct, is much more problematic, however. In some cases, the decision to rebuild may involve a very protracted process, one that may span more than a decade.

There are two questions. One, under what conditions are decisions to rebuild withheld? And two, when decisions to build new housing (on either daughter or on existing colonies) have been made, whose definitions of the situation (i.e., whose definitions of colony housing) prevail? Both of these questions can be answered by reference to several "decision-making models" that can be placed on a continuum that includes social control at one end and conflict at the other. The former is "achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which the others come to formulate" (Goffman 1959:3-4). At the conflict end, the rank-and-file are able to force the colony leadership to bend or break through the process of negotiation.

The Social Control Model. On some occasions, the definition of the situation is one that is imposed. Although the rank-and-file may voluntarily accept this definition of the situation, the plan of action (or, just as importantly, inaction) is largely an outcome that is removed from their purview.

In the social control model--as in all aspects of colony decision-making--the minister plays a very decisive role, since only the minister can bring proposals for new housing, new machinery purchases, etc. before the voting members for approval. The decisive role played by
the minister is most apparent in opposition to proposals to upgrade existing housing. For example, a minister in South Dakota reported that he is under considerable pressure to upgrade the colony's housing. Nevertheless, this informant made it clear that he is not prepared to budge, at least not yet. "Some people say take this down, take that down, but I say it's not time for that." This same informant also made it known that when the colony branched not so long ago, the selection of what type of housing to build on the daughter colony was not left up to the whims of all of the colony members. Apparently, the selection process involved sending "the carpenter and a few other people around to decide. Otherwise, you'd be squabbling all the time."

On colonies where housing remains little changed from when it was constructed forty, fifty, or even sixty years ago, the minister is almost always elderly and almost always espouses the view that, "the simple life is better to live our faith." While this is not to imply that all elderly ministers are opposed to modern housing--since, in fact, some elderly ministers are very progressive--by and large, many elderly ministers have resisted proposals to upgrade colony housing.

The key to resisting change in the area of housing is the support that the minister can garner from other members of the Board. As a Saskatchewan Lehrerleut minister pointed out, when elders are not appointed to the Board until past middle age, the Board will tend to act conservatively and to resist pressures to modernize colony housing. It appears that when the Minister does not have the support of other conservative members on the Board, it is difficult to resist change
indefinitely. On a number of colonies where old housing had been replaced with modern facilities, it was explained that it was done even though "the 'old man' wasn't for it" (At this point, there has been a shift from a control to a conflict model of interaction.).

A senior Lehrerleut minister in Alberta explained that on his home colony, the minister rejected proposals to upgrade housing for some time. According to this informant, this was not due to lack of financial resources, since this colony was extremely wealthy and "we could have built the best." The roofs of the houses had been leaking for some time; however, the minister at the mother colony was able to postpone plans for rebuilding indefinitely under the guise that the colony was in the process of branching. Several years later, after the colony had branched, the roofs were leaking more than ever, and this, apparently, served as the trigger that resulted in the minister bringing forth a proposal for new housing.

The minister also has the burden of considerable responsibility, and on some occasions, the minister's unwillingness to bring forth proposals for certain undertakings is deemed to be the source of a colony's financial problems. Among the Schmiedeleut, the bishop has the authority to appoint "trustees" to assume administrative control over a colony that is considered lacking in good management. In extreme cases, the minister on a financially-troubled colony may be stripped of his authority. A Schmiedeleut minister who is acting as a trustee on a nearby colony suggested that, "you could have a good secretary, but the minister may refuse to budge" (Rev. Mike Hofer, Sommerfeld Colony, Manitoba, pers.
comm.). On those few occasions when the minister is demoted, he is told that, "you're nobody until you learn to get along with your people."

Another dimension of the control model occurred over a period of almost ten years at a Lehrerleut colony in Saskatchewan and highlights the conflict among Hutterites over what is perceived as "right and wrong." What this example illustrates is close to what Kanter (1972:70) described as "transcendence," which is the means by which an individual "attaches his decision-making prerogative to a power greater than himself."

The original housing on the Smiley Colony in Saskatchewan was built in 1967 and had neither basements nor running water. Basement development was new, and at the time of construction, the colony members debated whether they should build basements. However, basements were "voted down" and the houses constructed accordingly. The Springside Colony in Saskatchewan also built houses without basements about the same time as the Smiley Colony, while the Kyle Colony branched to Saskatchewan two years later and built structures with basements but without bathrooms. In 1975, the members at the Smiley Colony "started to think about bathrooms." At the time, some colonies had inside bathrooms, while others did not. According to the minister, in 1975, indoor bathrooms were still considered by some to be too worldly. For this reason, the Smiley Colony decided to wait a year before deciding if indoor plumbing would be installed. In 1976, indoor bathrooms and basements were "voted in." Construction was completed in 1977.

The foregoing example highlights two important points. The members
of each colony must come to grips with what they perceive to be the objective circumstances or "situation." At the Smiley Colony, basements and indoor plumbing were both considered "too worldly" in 1967. Although both became acceptable, from the experience cited above, basements were accepted much earlier than bathrooms. Additionally, the Smiley Colony had to build twice: the first time in 1967 when the colony moved to Saskatchewan; and the second time in 1976-77 when the residential structures were raised and basements and indoor plumbing installed. As noted earlier, this experience has been duplicated on other colonies, and in all cases, it has come to be regarded as an expensive lesson and is reflected in the attitude of a number of colony spokesmen who indicated that they have advised various colonies "to build right the first time." This attitude, it is suggested, is less than a conservative factor in the approach to colony building.

The "trigger-effect" in the decision-making process was also identified at Kyle, a Saskatchewan Lehrerleut colony. Like the Smiley Colony, the members at Kyle had voted against installation of indoor toilets. Ten years later, the need to build some additional housing forced the issue, or served as the trigger which resulted in bathrooms being installed in the existing dwellings. In 1980, it made no sense to build new housing without indoor plumbing; neither did it make any sense on egalitarian grounds to have some units with inside bathrooms and some without.

The Consensus Model. On many colonies, the initial selection of the type of housing to build involves either the colony minister or the
colony secretary and almost always the colony carpenter. Typically, the
decision reached by this group is presented to the colony's voting
membership for approval. On numerous occasions, it was reported that a
housing plan was presented to the membership and that it was approved
without a lengthy discussion, sometimes without even a vote. The
following two vignettes illustrate this process.

The minister at the Milltown Colony in Manitoba explained that his
son is the colony carpenter, and that he would "sit down and draw up a
plan" that the two of them would discuss. They would also discuss the
plan with the colony secretary, who was formerly the colony carpenter.
When it was decided that it was time to build, the minister called a
meeting "to tell them what we want." In the particular case under
discussion, the colony needed another dwelling to accommodate one man who
was going to get married. Apparently, only one corner of the residential
square could still be developed, and although only one extra dwelling was
required at the time, it was proposed that the site be developed with a
four-family structure. The proposal was apparently approved without a
vote. There was "a little discussion" and "a few questions."

The secretary at the Rock Lake Colony in Manitoba noted how the
former housing on the colony was replaced with new single-detached
dwellings. The colony decided that they didn't want to build
bi-levels—even though most colonies were building this type—because
this type of unit affords "no privacy." What the colony wanted to build
was a "double-decker" with a basement, similar to the units built at
Sommerfeld, Rock Lake's most recent daughter colony. The colony was not
satisfied with the appearance of the housing at Sommerfeld, however, which was described as a "box." According to the secretary, he and the carpenter "kicked it around" and "drove around," looking for ideas. The plan or concept that was finally worked-up is similar on the "outside" to the house owned by a nearby provincial politician. And when a meeting was called to present the concept, "Everybody fell for it."

While the secretary's choice of words suggests that the rank-and-file was duped, so to speak, this is not the case when the circumstances or "situation" on the colony is understood. When the colony was established, several single-family farm houses were "pulled-in" and occupied by individual Hutterite families. One four-family structure was the only housing built by the colony. The families that lived in the single-family houses were "happy" with these arrangements, and when it came time to rebuild, everybody wanted detached units.

The Rock Lake Colony is an interesting example, since it is the only colony encountered in the sample survey that has built single-family dwellings. This colony is also well known for its innovativeness in a number of areas. For example, it has developed the largest hog operation of all the Hutterite colonies in Manitoba.

The Conflict Model. According to the rules of the Hutterite church, two or more individuals must be in opposition to a proposal in order to force a vote. According to the senior elder of the Schmiedeleut, "a vote only means that there is a need for further discussion" (Rev. Jacob Kleinsasser, Crystal Spring Colony, pers. comm.). Presumably, with an
adequate presentation and full discussion, there should be a consensus.
There are instances, however, when this is not the case.

According to a Lehrerleut minister in Alberta, when the mother
colony was in the process of branching, support for the type of housing
to be built "split just about down the middle," with one group in favor
of one style and the second group in favor of another. The minister
explained that he proposed the style that had been adopted by the
Ponderosa Colony. With this type, the units run the full width of the
structure. This style was built initially by the Abbey Colony in
Saskatchewan and had been copied by Ponderosa. The other choice was for
an older style that had been built at a number of colonies, including the
Parkland Colony in Alberta. This style incorporates separate entrance
ways and bathrooms in extensions or ells. Each ell serves two separate
family units.

Before the vote, everyone who was interested, including the colony
women, visited the two prototypes. Subsequently, the "Ponderosa" style
was selected by vote.

Because of the closeness of the vote, the informant was very
apprehensive about how the new housing would be accepted. However, when
lots were drawn, the group that came to the daughter colony was, by and
large, the one that had supported the more-modern housing design.

In a postscript to the housing selection process described above,
the minister indicated that it wasn't until several years later that he
felt fully exonerated for lobbying for the newer housing design. When
the mother colony decided to rebuild, no support existed for the
"Parkland" example because it was no longer being built by any of the colonies.

Conflict over the choice of a particular housing style is not always so extreme. In some cases, it appears rather subtle. On a Schmiedeleut colony in Manitoba, for example, the minister indicated that the colony "ended up rebuilding here sooner than I would have liked. I'd rather have waited financially." The reason they built earlier than planned was because the "public wasn't satisfied any more." On the design of the new housing, the informant indicated that he "pushed for the back door and the basement. I got the basements, but couldn't get the back door."
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Theoretical Concepts, House-Type Geography

Origin of the Hutterite Building Tradition. When the West was opening, local architecture was dominated by Victorian styles and the Gothic revival. However, as Francaviglia (1971:68) notes, most sectarian groups rejected these "stylistic influences" on religious grounds. This suggests one of the reasons why the Hutterites adopted the central-hallway plan when they came to North America. It was not only because central-hallway structures were "crude and simple" and therefore easy and cheap to construct with local building materials, but also because such simplicity was consistent with the Brethren's world view.

Two sources of inspiration provided the model of the central-hallway plan that the Brethren adopted when they settled in the Dakotas. According to Kniffen (1965) and Glassie (1975), the central-hallway plan originated in the New England and Mid-Atlantic source areas, respectively, and was carried westward by successive waves of migrants. As a result of diffusion through this process of "contagion," the central-hallway house type spread relatively uniformly from east to west. Glassie (1975:101), for example, says that the central-hallway plan built...
in Utah diffused from Virginia to "the Georgia-Carolina coast through the Deep South, into the southern Midwest and from thence to the Mormon West."

This research suggests an alternative, "two-step," process of diffusion. Among communal groups in the U.S., many received their inspiration for building from other utopian societies that were influential builders. The Mormon building tradition is a case in point, since the central-hallway structures built first at Nauvoo, Illinois (the second step), and later in Utah were influenced by (if not copied from) the central-hallway residences that the Harmonists built in Pennsylvania (the first step).

When the Hutterites came to North America, they were in contact with the Harmonists and the Amanas—both influential utopian groups—and it is suggested that one of these two sects provided the model for the central-hallway house type built on the early Hutterite colonies. Particular note is made in this regard of the similarity between the initial two-storey structure built at the Bon Homme Colony in 1876 and photographs of multi-storied, central-hallway residences in the Amana villages.

The Hutterites not only adopted a contemporary, or nearly-contemporary, American house type, they also accepted the construction methods that had been established in Dakota Territory by the earlier pioneer and post-pioneer settlers. At Bon Homme, the first hof established in North America, the original communal dwellings were built of yellow chalkstone, a material used extensively by the first settlers.
in the Bon Homme area. While several of the early colonies used stone that was quarried nearby, many of the houses were built of field stones. The communal houses on one pre-1900 colony had mud walls.

The finding that the Hutterites adopted local masonry building techniques is consistent with Zelinsky's theory of "first effective settlement," which suggests that the building tradition established by the initial settlers in a region will tend to be perpetuated by later settlers, even by those whose origins may be distinctively different. Two reasons underly the persistence of the building practices of the pioneer settlers: one, their building techniques were crude and simple, and if they were effective, they could be copied with little difficulty; and two, groups with no previous experience building with local materials were eager to adopt expedient practices (Jordan 1983:94).

On Schmiedeleut colonies, the use of lumber replaced locally-available materials. The change was not abrupt, however, since several Schmiedeleut colonies built both stone and wood-frame structures. The switch from locally-available materials to lumber was not clearcut on Lehrleut colonies either, since two Lehrer colonies built stone houses only two or three years prior to moving to Alberta in 1918. Unlike those of the Schmiedeleut and the Lehrerleut, all of the residences built by the Dariusleut in South Dakota to 1918 were stone structures. But when the Dariusleut founded colonies outside of South Dakota (at Dominion City in 1893; Spring Creek and Warren Range in 1912 and 1913, respectively; and in Alberta in 1918), they built frame residences. The use of frame construction in areas outside of South Dakota is also explained by
reference to Zelinsky's theory of first effective settlement. When the Dariusleut colonized Manitoba, Montana, and Alberta, they used lumber instead of stone not only because lumber was readily available, but because a stone-building tradition had never been established in these areas.

Of particular note is the great consistency in the form of the central-hallway structures regardless of the building material used or the area settled in. The evidence suggests that this consistency was based on an oral tradition. That is, the housing was built without plans.

Although all of the founding colonies built stone houses, lumber was utilized in the construction of most (if not all) of the water mills and some of the communal kitchens. Even though lumber was expensive to obtain when the Hutterites settled in Dakota Territory, it appears that lumber was the preferred material when there was a need to build quickly. This would certainly apply to the water mills, which were sources of colony revenue, and probably also to the communal kitchens, which are the focus of the residential square.

The significant findings of this research that relate to the origin of the Hutterite building tradition are summarized as follows:

1. "folk houses are built of local materials" (Newton 1976:154-155);
2. "form persists through change in material and environment" (ibid.);
3. the building tradition established in an area will have an
imprint that is "long lasting, surviving even where a new ethnic stock has succeeded the original settlers"—Kniffen's (1965:551) concept of "Initial Occupation" (and Zelinsky's— in Jordan 1983:94—theory of "first effective settlement");

4. pioneer and post-pioneer building techniques are particularly persistent if:
   a. the methods are effective and are easy "to learn and adopt," and
   b. subsequent settlers have no previous building experience with local materials and are "ready" to adopt "expedient" practices (Jordan 1983:94);

5. because folk housing is based on an oral tradition, plans that are "crude and simple" should be distributed more readily and more widely;

6. building practices that are "crude and simple" have special appeal to communal groups that reject "stylistic influences" on religious grounds (Francaviglia 1971:68);

7. the need to build quickly over-rides the higher cost of lumber relative to the use of locally-available building materials.

The present research suggests that the concept outlined in (1) above should be modified slightly, to wit: "folk houses are built of local materials" that are being used locally. In the case of the Hutterites, this recognizes that the materials used in the construction of early colony housing—whether quarried stone, field stones, or mud—were local materials that had already been incorporated into the building tradition.
established by the early settlers in Dakota Territory.

Identifiable House Types in North America. This research identifies two generations of the one-storey, central-hallway house type. The first is built in stone and has two strains. The first of these two strains was built by the Schmiedeleut and the Dariusleut. The second strain was built by the Lehrerleut and has ridge lines that are clipped or broken, a feature that was abandoned on later buildings built by the Lehrer group, however. When this trait is dropped, a loss of distinctiveness in the first generation follows, a process identified as "convergence." The second-generation one-storey, central-hallway house type is a reproduction of the first generation structure in wood frame. When the Darius and Lehrer groups moved to Canada in 1918, both of these leuts built the second-generation central-hallway house type.

On Schmiedeleut colonies, experimentation with various house types began very early in South Dakota. The two house types taken to several of the founding colonies in Manitoba include a one-storey and a two-storey structure, both with an external doorway to each unit on the ground floor. On most of the early colonies with house types with separate, external doors, two doorways share a common porch.

The development of the one-storey, external-doorway house type is an excellent example of the "advance" in house types, that is, the development of a new type out of an earlier one. When the single-storey structure with external doorways is compared to the original central-hallway residences, there is the same number of rooms (eight) of roughly the same size. The central hallways were dropped, however, a
process which is considered an example of "simplification" (Because the new form did not replace the old one--since central-hallways continued to be built by the Lehrer and Darius groups--it may be more accurate to refer to this process as one of "divergence."). Several informants reported that simplification occurred because: one, the central hallways provided very little privacy; and two, the hallways, themselves, were considered "wasteful" (i.e., uneconomic). These two considerations are powerful forces, ones which continue to provide much of the impetus for development of contemporary house types.

How are the major differences that developed in South Dakota between the housing built by the Schmiedeleut and the other two leuts explained? Why, for instance, did the Schmiedeleut build five different house types from 1874 to 1918, while the Lehrerleut and the Dariusleut built only one? While the suggestion that the Schmiedeleut is much less conservative than the other two groups is plausible, the "theory of public occasions" appears to be a more powerful explanation.

In the theory of public occasions, the diversity in the architectural record reflects the background of the builders. When the background of the builders is varied, the diversity in house forms will be greater than when the builders share a common background. Since folk houses are almost always built by a group of men, individuals with diverse backgrounds provide the potential for the introduction of new design items. An essential feature of the theory of public occasions is that this potential can be activated only through discursive means.

The theory of public occasions suggests that diversity is greatest
in areas "where migration is attenuated and rapid" (Milton Newton, Department of Geography and Anthropology, Louisiana State University, pers. comm.). In a modification of the theory of public occasions, this research suggests that anything that expands the pool of ideas available for building design has the potential to introduce new building forms. Probably the most important source of new ideas for building on early Hutterite colonies in South Dakota was non-Hutterite builders. On three Schmiedeleut colonies where new house types appear, it was reported that non-Hutterites were involved in (or responsible for) the masonry work. Some of the design features on these colonies are unique, including a pyramid-shaped roof on the two-storey structures at Maxwell and large side-facing gables on the one-and-a-half storey structure at Huron.

A system of rules based on the methodology used by Glassie (1975) in his analysis of house types in Middle Virginia is developed to account for Hutterite housing built in South Dakota to 1918. This system of rules provides the basis for the subsequent analysis of the architectural record on the colonies from 1918 to the present.

The assumption underlying the development of the rule sets is that the form that folk housing takes results from different combinations of basic units, or what Glassie (1974:182) refers to as a "simple arithmetical play with a very few basic ideas within a homogeneous tradition." Consistency within the Hutterite folk building tradition is provided largely by two rules. One is addition, which is always made symmetrically along the same axis so that all parts of the whole have the same depth. The other rule is for expansion, both backward and upward.
Neither expansion backward nor expansion upward is based on an independent set of rules, but is dependent on the rules for massing and piercing the base structure. The transition from folk to modern housing occurs when the rules of addition and expansion are no longer applied.

The major findings of this research that relate to the form of Hutterite housing and its evolution are summarized as follows:

1. "folk houses are built of modules" (Newton 1976:155);
2. "specific combinations of modules become fixed solutions to the exclusion of equally logical arrangements" (ibid.);
3. new dwelling types emerge as a result of "form changes" (Wilson 1974:65);
4. house types evolve through a series of form changes, "stages of which can be termed generations" (ibid.);
5. within generations, form and construction elements cluster in identifiable associations called "strains" (Newton and Pulliam-di Napoli 1977:373);
6. formerly separate forms may "decrease in distinctiveness," thus illustrating "convergence" (ibid.:378);
7. the "advance in generations" results from the convergence of sub-generations or strains (ibid.:380);
8. "convergence" occurs as a result of "simplification," in which certain forms become "gradually increasing predominant" over others (ibid.:378);
9. "simplification" results from:
   a. "syncretism," an "emphasis on the shared" (ibid.), and
b. "spreading indifference" toward craftsmanship (ibid.); and

10. evolution or advance of house types and forms occurs more rapidly under conditions where the pool of ideas for building has been diversified through contact with the larger society.

Beginning in the late 1940s and early 50s, Dariusleut and Lehrerleut colonies in Alberta started adding porches or extensions to the central-hallway houses. Many of these porches were constructed in order to expand the amount of living area within the structures. In the late 1960s, the design of the houses on Lehrer and Darius colonies started to incorporate the ells in the original construction. However, with the introduction of this house type, all parts of the structure no longer have the same depth. At this level, the rules of folk housing are no longer sufficient to account for this new house type, a type that is transitional between folk housing and shelter produced by modern industrial design.

Since the mid-1970s in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Montana, a significant increase in the number of house types and their derivatives has occurred. Currently, among the Dariusleut, the preferred house type is a bi-level structure, while the contemporary house type on Lehrerleut colonies is a three-bedroom unit which may have one or more additional bedrooms in the basement. Some of the recent housing on Dariusleut and Lehrerleut colonies may have as many as eight units under one roof. In many instances, two adjacent units are occupied by a large family.

Distinctive colony housing has been developed by the "outlier" of Hutterite settlement in the State of Washington. This distinctiveness is
due to migration, which has resulted in colony housing taking on some of the characteristics of the housing in the area in which the outlier has been established. Some insight into how this process operates is provided by the new housing at Warden, which is being constructed of concrete. While this appears to be a novel solution, concrete is used extensively in Eastern Washington for construction of potato storage facilities and other farm buildings. This suggests that some innovations in housing design appear first in structures or agricultural purposes. Because the agricultural regime in Washington is much different than its Great Plains counterpart, there is considerable potential for the diversification of the ideas for building that the colonies had when they branched from Alberta.

After the founding period in Manitoba, the Schmiedeleut built two-storey structures with hip roofs and a two-over-two arrangement of rooms. This particular style is considered an example of "sycreticism," since it incorporates an earlier two-over-two arrangement of rooms from the Maxwell Colony and a hip roof from the two-storey houses on the Iberville Colony. Although two-storey dwellings are still being built on colonies in Manitoba, by 1950, it became increasingly more difficult to reconcile this type according to the rules of folk housing. At the Glendale Colony in South Dakota, for example, the entry-ways in the two-storey structure are offset so that they line up with the adjacent dwelling units.

In the 1950s, the Schmiedeleut started to build bungalows, that is, one-storey structures without attics. The bungalows may have a full or
partial basement. The bungalow is ubiquitous and was considered stylish until the mid-1970s.

The bungalow house type has two forms. In the first generation, the bedrooms are aligned along the rear of the unit, whereas in the later generation, there may be one or more bedrooms in the front of the unit. Generally, the former is located on Manitoba colonies, while the second-generation is found on Schmiedeleut colonies in the U.S. Over time, there is a considerable increase in the size of bungalow units. A bungalow unit in Manitoba is reported to have eight bedrooms on one floor. The fact that the bungalow units on any one colony may differ significantly in size is a characteristic of the Schmiedeleut and stands in sharp contrast to the Lehrer and Darius groups, which tend to build dwellings that are uniform in terms of the number of bedrooms.

The most recent and currently the most popular house type on Schmiedeleut colonies is the bi-level structure. This house type has a shallow foundation and is particularly well-suited where the groundwater table is shallow. All of the recent housing units on Schmiedeleut colonies in Manitoba are bi-levels. While many of the Schmiedeleut colonies in the U.S. are building bi-levels, some of the colonies in South Dakota are still erecting bungalows.

Although all three branches of the Hutterite church are now building housing that is fully-modern, the Schmiedeleut in Manitoba and South Dakota not only started much earlier, but have carried the housing concept to the point where some colonies in Manitoba have embellished their houses far beyond utility. This opulence has also been extended
from the inside to the outside of the dwellings, to the exclusive use of
the lawn adjacent to the unit. Exclusive use of the lawn outside one's
dwelling is not a matter of little import and appears to be directly
responsible for the Schmiedeleut's preference for only two dwelling units
in one structure. Although many colonies in Alberta are building housing
that is modern by any standard, in comparison to some of the housing
units in Manitoba, the Alberta colonies are relatively devoid of
stylistic influence and extensive landscaping. Again, conservatism does
not satisfactorily explain these differences. While conservatism may
explain why the Lehrerleut has tried to maintain spartan standards in
terms of interior furnishings and decorative landscaping, it does not
explain why the Schmiedeleut in Manitoba started building modern and
more-private housing much earlier than the other two leuts.

One possible reason why the Schmiedeleut adopted modern housing much
earlier than either the Dariusleut or the Lehrerleut is that the
agricultural economy that the Hutterites in Manitoba are participating in
is much more specialized than the agricultural regime in Alberta, for
example. This specialization involves not only more contacts with the
outside world, but more-varied contacts. Greater involvement in the
affairs of the larger society is, again, the means by which the pool of
ideas for building becomes more diversified.

Theoretical Concepts, Social Change Theory

Marxist Theory. To explain why Hutterite housing has changed so
dramatically in the recent past, this research adopts the Marxist perspective that change originates within the system itself. The following assumptions are also adopted: (1) all societies contain contradictory tendencies to system maintenance and transition; (2) the tension between these inherent contradictions is heightened or reduced by developments in the "forces" and the "relations" of production; and (3) this tension may become untenable, requiring attempts at reconciliation of the inherent contradictions. Changes in the social structure that heighten the tension between the inherent contradictions and attempts to reconcile these opposing tendencies become the driving force of change in the Hutterite system.

1. The Basic Contradictions

This research identifies four basic contradictions in the Hutterite system. One is the contradiction between different value systems, which is apparent in the need for full integration in the market economy versus the sectarian beliefs in withdrawal from the world and in an other-worldly heaven. The second results from the incompatibility between social reality and ideology. This is evident in the conflict between the use of tradition to resolve disputes and to guide personnel policies, on the one hand, and the ideal of personal freedom, on the other. Contrary development in the social system is the third and is characteristic of the North-American agrarian economy generally, namely, between the reduced manpower demands of highly-mechanized agriculture and a surplus of young, relatively-unskilled colony men. Lastly, there are
several opposing tendencies in Hutterian social organization: between the need for status differentials in order to create incentives and the belief in the primacy of group interests; and between the need for a hierarchical management system and the ideal of egalitarianism.

This research does not suggest that the contradictions inherent in Hutterite society are new or novel. Some of the contradictions, such as the need to maintain group goals and individual incentives, exist in all societies. Some of the contradictions, however, pertain exclusively to those societies that maintain an oppositional component. In the Hutterite example, this tension between different value systems is conceptualized in terms of "being-on-the-colony" and "being-in-the-world."

2. Reconciliation of the Inherent Contradictions

Since it is assumed that the contradictions inherent in Hutterite society have existed for some time—if not from the conception of the movement—the basic question becomes why and under what conditions has the tension in these contradictions become untenable. Three models of Marxist theory are used to conceptualize this process.

In the technical determinist perspective, change occurs when the forces of production come in conflict with the relations of production. Since the latter serves the interest of the ruling class to preserve the status quo, the forces of production tend to be more dynamic and change at a much faster rate. At some point, the class that is associated with the new forces of production clashes with the class whose domination is
dependent on maintaining the established economic order.

Since the late 1940s, farm managers on Hutterite colonies have had to become increasingly more specialized, a specialization that cannot be reduced to routine procedural rules. The conflict that results is between the practice of exercising strict control over all aspects of individual behavior, and the need to have capable farm managers who can act relatively independently on matters pertaining to their economic specialty. This conflict is being resolved by allowing farm managers to act more autonomously. It is suggested that (in terms of exchange theory) freedom to act more autonomously is applicable not only to economic activities, but serves to create avenues for greater individual-choice behavior in non-economic spheres. This includes demands for meaningful participation in colony decision making.

One attempt to account for change in the Hutterite system that assumes that economic factors are more dynamic and develop faster than non-economic ones is Eaton's (1952:338) theory of "controlled acculturation." This suggests that the Hutterites adopt non-technological items only as pressures for change start to become unmanageable. "By bending with the wind, Hutterites have kept themselves from breaking."

The broad mode of production perspective suggests that change can occur not only from growth of productive forces, but also because systems can be "self-transforming," that is, in conflict with themselves. As Miller (1984:178-179) notes, the level of technology in England at the end of the feudal period differed little from that in Roman times, and
capitalism replaced feudalism only because the landed aristocracy
destroyed itself in a series of wars.

The advantage of the broad mode of production theory is that it
alerts the researcher to the possibility that change may occur when the
means of production remain relatively unchanged. An alternative
explanation of change among the Hutterites might thus point to the fact
that ever since Moravian times, the Brethren have been rational and
highly-specialized economic producers, and that the source of change is
due to conflict in the productive relations or in the superstructure
(i.e., ideological).

One explanation for recent changes among the Hutterites that is not
purely economic focuses on the decline of external opposition or
hostility. Under conditions where external opposition is no longer overt
and intense, there is less need or compulsion to maintain a defensive
posture. More importantly, without external opposition, it is much more
difficult to maintain such a position and thus there is a loosening of
the "structure of defensive adaptation," with a corresponding increase in
individual autonomy. This loosening of the structure of defensive
adaptation must be perceived as having some benefit, however. In the
Hutterite case, it appears that the trade-off (again, in exchange theory
terms) is reduced freedom for an increase in security and acceptance by
the outside world (Bennett 1975:130).

Critical theory suggests that in the evolutionary sequence from
tribal to traditional to liberal-capitalist and, finally, to
advanced-capitalist states, tradition has been eroded and validity claims
have become more and more the subject of public debate. The result of this debate is that missing value has been replaced by exorbitant demands for collective services. The system has also been undermined by the development of non-monetary pursuits, such as career success, leisure activity, and consumerism.

Habermas' work is important for this research since it suggests that the Hutterite system has changed because of the conflict between "idea and reality" (Habermas 1975:23). It suggests that increasing participation in the larger society as economic producers makes it ever more difficult to maintain separation from the world as an ideal. What undermines the system based on appeals to tradition is that as the difference between the idea and the real becomes more apparent, there is a loss of validity, a loss that gives rise to public debate. Since colony authority patterns have been based on tradition and depend on people not questioning them, demands for participation by rank-and-file Hutterites can only be viewed as a serious erosion of authority.

On colonies where tradition has been replaced as the basis for legitimation, there has been a shift towards organization of group life around consumption. On some Hutterite colonies where consumerism has come to the fore, membership dissatisfaction has played a key role. It is in this sense that the Hutterite leadership has been held for ransom by the "exorbitant demands" of the rank-and-file.

With this shift to a more individualistic orientation, the nuclear family has become not only stronger, but also has taken over more and more of "the social and expressive function" (Bennett 1975:128). As
individual families have started to act more emphatically, the role of housing has changed. It is now a consumer good which through embellishment can serve an expressive function.

The consequences of the shift towards "collaboration for consumption" have been significant. With more and more colony revenues appropriated for consumer items, including housing, some colonies are having difficulties financing expansion. Since timely branching is the key to success of individual colonies because it produces new management jobs, any delay in the expansion process is a potentially serious problem. The response of the Hutterites to the problem posed by increasing intervals between branching is a lower birth rate. This decline in fertility suggests that the practice of birth control is widespread and is another indication of the eclipse of traditional values. What is particularly significant about the declining birth rate is that it appears to have been initiated solely by colony women.

**Symbolic Interactionism.** This research outlines three ways that individually-held definitions of colony housing are reconciled in the process of interaction. In the social control model, the definition is one that is largely imposed. This occurs frequently in social settings where the minister—with or without the support of a conservative Board of elders—is able to act emphatically in areas such as housing. Frequently, the minister's imposition of a definition of the situation is a negative one; that is, it is a "plan of inaction." On a great many colonies, a consensus or broad base of support for proposals by the colony leadership exists. This consensus reflects the predisposition of
individual colony members with regard to the desire for not only new housing, but the choice of a particular house type. These predispositions are primarily the result of past experience. At one of the Manitoba colonies, for example, support for the construction of detached units was unanimous because the colony members had been living quite happily in detached dwellings that had been pulled in from abandoned farms nearby. The third way individually-held definitions of housing are redeemed rhetorically is described in terms of conflict. Although examples of this model did not occur as frequently as cases illustrating consensus, where they occurred, they suggest that there is an erosion of authority, that, in effect, the rank-and-file are able to force the leadership to bend or break in the process of negotiation.

Two broad definitions of Hutterite housing are identified. One of these viewpoints is, predictably, a conservative one; the other is much less orthodox and more personal. According to the orthodox view, life on earth is only transitory, and eternal life awaits those who believe the word of God and who avoid worldly affairs. This perspective suggests that an elaborate home does not serve any useful purpose and is thus contrary to basic beliefs. For members of many colonies, however, it is no longer a matter of building housing that is "simple and cheap," but one of building housing that is "modern" and worth emulating.

In light of the conflicting nature of these two viewpoints, the basic question is how can new housing be built without these changes destroying the basis for social integration.

This research suggests that these conflicting definitions of housing
are reconciliable, to a degree, largely because the "vocabulary of motives" (Mills 1981:327) proferred to justify changes in housing does not abandon commitment to the system. The minister who lives in a new bi-level housing unit complete with an elaborate "kitchenette" and who declared that, "I can serve God just as well in a good house as I can in a poor one," provides an excellent example. This reassertion of "one's commitment to the standards of the group in the face of apparent deviation from it" (Lauer 1983:329) illustrates the nature of the negotiating process whereby so many areas of Hutterite life that represent "core values" are changing.

A redefinition of what it is to be a Hutterite in the mid-1980s is emerging on colonies across North America. This new mode of being is expressed largely in terms of increased autonomy for individual family units which is due, in no small measure, to the reduction in "observability" made possible by the introduction of more-private housing. In the older, "barracks-style" housing, where privacy was minimized and where individual Hutterites were "backstage," but never "off-stage," colony members had to act self-consciously, since they were always the audience for others. In the new and self-contained housing units being built on Hutterite colonies in the U.S. and Canada, surveillance of individual colony members is no longer pervasive, and family members are, to a great extent, capable of moving "off-stage," where they can act unconsciously. It is in this sense that the relationship between the colony and colony housing is a dialectical one. While the meaning of new housing has been defined by Hutterite society,
new housing—because the changes that it has brought about have been largely unforeseen—has acted back on the meaning so formed, "modifying it...even reshaping it" (Berger and Luckman 1984:194).

During the course of this study, a number of Hutterite spokesmen—especially on colonies in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Montana—described a world view that stresses separation or withdrawal from the larger society and belief in an other-worldly heaven. According to these informants, personal or individual possessions are only hindrances on the path to salvation. Some observers, impressed by this traditional or conservative view of the world, have gone so far as to suggest an analogy between "being-on-the-colony" and Noah's Ark in the biblical account of the Flood (Hostetler 1974:1; Thompson 1977:198).

In the last decade, however, withdrawal from the larger society as an ideal has become very difficult to maintain as legitimacy has come to rest more and more on the market economy in a period when there is very little external opposition. Under conditions that stress market integration—with "being-in-the-world"—the old value system based on traditional values can no longer provide the basis for self-identity. Under the new system of values, there is greater reliance not only on individual interpretation of what is right and wrong, but also on the need to provide outlets for self-expression and for meaningful participation in colony decision-making. This study has shown that in no area is the new social reality on Hutterite colonies more apparent than in the recent, wide-spread introduction of modern and more-private housing.
Chapter One: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTEMPORARY COLONY PATTERNS

According to the list prepared by Larry Anderson, eighteen colonies had been developed in South Dakota prior to 1918. To this tally, the writer has added "Yale," a colony that was in the process of being established. This "colony farm" was located north and east of Yale, South Dakota, and had been established in order to resolve a conflict at the Beadle (now Huron) Colony. The "Yale Colony" was operated by the Hofer Brothers, who, apparently, were promised that when the Dariusleut moved to Canada, the group at Yale would be established on a colony of their own. However, in 1918, the group at Yale moved with the members from the Beadle Colony to the West Raley Colony in Southern Alberta. Soon after, the Hofers left West Raley and founded a colony that has never been recognized by the Hutterite church.

The "emigration" to Canada was not as "total" as Peters suggests, however. In addition to Bon Homme (which was never abandoned or sold, and is the oldest Hutterite colony in North America), both the Lehrerleut and the Dariusleut maintained at least one colony in South Dakota well into the 1930s. The Lehrerleut, for example, occupied Old Elmspring.
until 1930 and Rockport until 1934. Wolf Creek, the Dariusleut's founding colony, was occupied by this branch of the Hutterite church until 1930. In a more complicated series of moves, the Spring Creek Colony in Montana was abandoned in 1921, with one faction going to Canada and the other returning to South Dakota to occupy the former site of Beadle Colony, which had been abandoned by the Dariusleut in 1918. In 1924, part of the congregation at Beadle moved to Alberta (Felgar Colony). In 1935, the second group left South Dakota and established the King Colony Ranch in Montana.

3 Although various studies (Hostetler 1974:126) suggest that the Dominion City Colony was abandoned because of flooding of the Souris River, a more likely explanation is that the colony people felt stranded and "lonely" when it became apparent that they would not be joined by other colonies from the United States (Rev. Mike Wipf, Standoff Colony, Alberta, pers. comm.).

4 Peters (1965:49-50) suggests that the reason the Hutterites selected Canada in 1918 was not only because Canada offered exemption from compulsory military service, but also because it was close to their old colonies in the United States, which made it possible to bring their farm equipment and household goods from South Dakota and Montana.

It appears that the separation between the remaining Lehrerleut and Dariusleut colonies in South Dakota and their counterparts in Alberta proved much more difficult to overcome than Peters states. Apparently,
the major reason the remaining Lehrerleut and Dariusleut colonies were abandoned was because the distance between Alberta and South Dakota made it difficult for women on the U.S. colonies to find husbands in Canada (Rev. Sam Wipf, Rolland Colony, South Dakota, pers. comm.).

^ In addition to two Schmiedeleut colony sites that were abandoned prior to 1918 (Trippe and Buffalo) and never repossessed, five of the colonies that were abandoned when the Brethren moved to Canada have never been reoccupied. Two of these abandoned sites were Schmiedeleut colonies (Milltown and James Valley), one was a Lehrerleut colony (Milford), and two belonged to the Dariusleut (Richards and "Yale").

The Old Elmspring Colony site was in non-Hutterite hands for many years, serving a good part of that time as a rest home run by the Lutheran church (Good Samaritan). In the last few years, the original Old Elmspring building site was purchased by the New Elmspring Colony. As of August, 1984, the former residential buildings on the Old Elmspring Colony site had not been reoccupied, however.

Of the two pre-1918 colonies established in Montana, Spring Creek is an existing colony site, while the site of the Warren Range Colony is now in private hands.

^ At the James Valley Colony in Manitoba, a separate table is provided for colony members over fifty-five years of age. At this facility, men and women eat together. Although this is apparently a traditional arrangement, it was observed only at this one colony.
Chapter Two: THEORETICAL CONCEPTS AND RESEARCH METHODS

1 Zelinsky's theory of first effective settlement is a restatement of Kniffen's (1965:551) concept of Initial Occupance.

2 Jordan (1983:81), as noted earlier, suggests that a case can be made to show that the dogtrot is "another Fenno-Scandian influence on American frontier forms, one that persisted into post-pioneer times only in the South." The likely origin of the American dogtrot is linked to what Jordan calls "the diffusional path from the lower Delaware [New Sweden]." Another possibility suggested by Jordan is that the dogtrot tradition was carried by Swedes and Finnish settlers that moved from New Sweden into the North Carolina piedmont. The latter location would introduce the dogtrot into the source area proposed by Kniffen (1965:561).

Chapter Three: ORIGIN OF THE HUTTERITE BUILDING TRADITION IN NORTH AMERICA

1 Thompson (1977:59), on the other hand, says that the "lower story served for living rooms."

Chapter Five: CHANGES IN THE MEANING OF HUTTERITE HOUSING

1 The Hutterite system is more than an "effective tyranny," however. As
Kanter (1972:221) notes, communal groups must provide opportunities "for the release or expression of tension and strong emotion" in order to survive. "All social practices swing between the two, just as commitment involves both giving up and getting. Groups whose most novel or striking characteristics are their asceticism may have ecstasy lurking close behind and vice versa" (ibid.). The celibate Shaker community, whose members labored in silence during the day only to burst forth in "ecstatic fervor" during evening rituals, is one example that Kanter (1972:221-222) cites of a group moving back and forth between asceticism and ecstasy.

2 This informant added that he used to share a central hallway with his brother, who was the hogman. He also had to share this common space with his brother's dog. Such conditions, it was suggested, require the best of one's abilities to live communally.

3 The writer's visit to this colony was made in the evening and included the minister and several of his sons. One of the sons is the colony carpenter. What was of particular interest was that despite obvious warm feelings between the father and his sons (and daughters), all of the sons successfully opposed their father on the choice of modern housing. When the mother colony was deciding the housing issue, only this informant and one other person voted against the proposal to install indoor plumbing.

4 In Montana, water that is carried from the dining hall to individual dwellings is referred to euphemistically as "walking water."
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APPENDIX A

INVENTORY AND CLASSIFICATION OF DATA SOURCES
The purpose of this Appendix is to classify the sources of information on the Hutterites. The sources are divided into literature surveyed and personal contacts.

**Literature Reviewed**

A large portion of the academic literature on the Hutterites surveyed in this research is by sociologists, including Hostetler (1974; Hostetler and Huntington 1967), Boldt (1979; 1980; Boldt and Roberts 1980), and Peter (1975; Peter and Whitaker 1981). Boldt and Peter were formerly research assistants of John Hostetler and have collaborated (Peter, Boldt, Whitaker, and Roberts 1982).

Hostetler and Boldt have Amish and Mennonite backgrounds, respectively. Boldt, whose father was a colony English teacher, spent part of his childhood at the Standoff Colony in Alberta.

Several population studies by sociologists are cited. The "landmark" demographic study of the Hutterites is by Eaton (1952; 1964; Eaton and Mayer 1954). Recent analyses of Hutterite birth rates have been undertaken by Peter (1980) and Boldt (1983). Joseph Eaton has recently donated his files and field notes to the Sociology Department, University of Manitoba (Edward Boldt, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba, pers. comm.).

Anthropologists whose writings were surveyed include Serl (1964), Bennett (1967; 1975), Diener (1974), Erasmus (1981), and Whitaker (Peter and Whitaker 1981; Peter et al. 1982). Bennett, Diener, and Erasmus have
analyzed the Hutterites from a particular theoretical perspective: culture ecology, social evolution, and persistent peoples, respectively.

Geographers cited include Evans (1974; forthcoming, 1985), Ryan (1977), and Anderson (1983). The work by Evans includes an extensive review of the branching patterns of all three leuts in the last decade (forthcoming). Other disciplines represented in the literature surveyed include: urban and regional planning (Thompson 1977) and history (Peters 1965; Janzen 1984).

Some of the literature on the Hutterites has a regional emphasis. For example, most of the work by Boldt, Roberts, Ryan, and Peters has concentrated on the Schmiedeleut in Manitoba. Riley (South Dakota, State of), Anderson, and Janzen have concentrated on the Schmiedeleut in South Dakota. On the other hand, Serl, Bennett, and Hostetler have highlighted the Darius and Lehrer groups in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Montana. Hostetler's emphasis on the Alberta groups appears to reflect an interest in the more-conservative branches of the church.

Two publications by the Province of Alberta (1972; 1974) were utilized. These reports reflect public interest leading up to and following the repeal of Alberta's discriminatory legislation regulating colony expansion. The first of these two reports provides both a major review of the literature on the Hutterites and a detailed examination of colony economics. The second publication serves to allay public concern that, contrary to some reports, colony expansion is absorbing only a minute fraction of Alberta's farmland.

A considerable amount of the literature written or published by the
Hutterites was consulted. This includes material on the history and way of life of the Brethren (Horsch 1974; Gross 1965; David Hofer 1924; and John Hofer 1982) as well as the religious foundations of the Hutterite church (Rideman 1950). Some of this material is inspirational in character.

**Personal Contacts**

In addition to the spokesmen/women on the eighty-eight sample colonies, many other people were contacted during the course of the study. These contacts included Hutterites and non-Hutterites.

**Hutterite Contacts.** The bishop of each branch of the Hutterite church was interviewed as were several "senior elders:"

- Rev./Bishop Jacob Kleinsasser, Crystal Springs Colony (S), Manitoba
- Rev./Bishop John Wurz, Wilson Siding Colony (D), Alberta
- Rev./Bishop John Wipf, Rosetown Colony (L), Saskatchewan
- Rev. Jacob Waldner, Plainview Colony (L), Alberta
- Rev. Paul Gross, Spokane Colony (D), Washington

S = Schmiedeleut; D = Dariusleut; L = Lehrerleut.

Interviews were also conducted with Hutterites who had visited the old Bruderhofs in Hungary:

- Rev. Jacob Kleinsasser, Crystal Springs Colony, Manitoba
- Rev. John Hofer, James Valley Colony, Manitoba
- Mr. Paul Kleinsasser, Blumengard Colony, South Dakota
A special effort was made to locate photographs of early colony housing in North America. Photographs were supplied by and discussed with:

Mr. Albert Waldner, Rosedale Colony, Manitoba
Mr. Josh Hofer, Lakeside Colony, Manitoba
Rev. John Hofer, James Valley Colony, Manitoba
Mr. David Waldner, Milltown Colony, Manitoba
Rev. Jacob Waldner, Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota
Rev. David Waldner, Jamesville Colony, South Dakota

Mrs. Susie Kleinsasser, Blumengard Colony, South Dakota, was particularly helpful in sorting-out the building sequence at Milltown, a Schmiedeleut colony that was abandoned and never repossessed. When she was a young girl living at the Milltown Colony in South Dakota, Mrs. Kleinsasser was assigned to assist Bertha Clark (1924), a sociologist who wrote extensively about the Hutterites in the early 1920s (Because the Canadian border "closed" temporarily to Hutterite immigration, the second contingent from Milltown did not move to Manitoba until 1922.).

Other Contacts. Several university researchers who have written about the Hutterites were consulted during the course of the study:

Edward Boldt, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba
Lance Roberts, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba
Marvin Riley, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University
Simon Evans, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Memorial University of Newfoundland (on sabbatical to Department of Geography, University of Calgary, 1983-84)

All of the pre-1918 colonies in South Dakota, Manitoba, and Montana that were abandoned and never repossessed were visited. These visits resulted in contacts with the following owners/occupants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Colony</th>
<th>Owners/Occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trippe (S)</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Bradley, Trippe, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milltown (S)</td>
<td>Dr. &amp; Mrs. J.T. Dilger, Mitchell, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo (S)</td>
<td>Mrs. Donald Knippling, Wessington Springs, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Valley (S)</td>
<td>Mr. Howard Arbeiter, Huron, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford (L)</td>
<td>Mr. Palmer Wedel, Huron, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion City (D)</td>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Lance Barham, Dominion City, Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards (D)</td>
<td>Mr. Radford Byerly, Forestburg, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Range (D)</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Wilson, Utica, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Yale&quot; (D)</td>
<td>Mr. Clifford Gascoigne, Yale, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Schmiedeleut; L = Lehrerleut; D = Dariusleut.

Mrs. Ellen Nelson, Woonsocket, South Dakota, lived in the Richards' Mansion before it was purchased by the Hutterites and has a photograph of the building when it was still considered a showpiece. The structure was destroyed by fire in 1959.
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Is this the same housing that was built originally on this colony? If yes, why did the colony build this type of housing?

Was the housing built from plans?

2. If this is not the same housing that was built on this colony originally, how has it been changed or altered?

Why was it changed?

Why did the colony pick this type of housing when you rebuilt/renovated?

Was the rebuilding/renovating done with plans?

3. Is the housing on this colony anything like the housing on your parent colony (i.e., _____________ Colony)? If yes, how is it the same?

If no, how does it differ?

Why is it different?

4. When your most recent daughter colony (i.e., _____________ Colony) branched out, what kind of housing did they build?

How did they decide what kind of housing to build?

5. Is the housing on your most recent daughter colony like the housing on this colony? If yes, how is it the same?

If no, how is it different?

Why is it different?

6. Are you planning on building/rebuilding/renovating any of the housing on this colony? If yes, what type of housing will you build/etc.?

Why will you pick this type?

How will it differ from the housing presently on this colony?
7. When this colony branches again, what type of housing will you build?

How will you decide?

How will it be different from the housing presently on this colony?

Why will it be different?

Will it be built from plans?

Will it be pre-cut?

8. When you branch again, will the new housing be built by the members of this colony? If not, by whom?

9. Are there examples of housing on other colonies that you think are good examples to copy or follow? If yes, on which colonies?

What are some of the characteristics of these examples?

How are the colonies mentioned above related to this colony?

10. Where do ideas for new types of housing come from?

11. Do you think Hutterite housing will change very much in the future? If yes, why?

How?

If not, why not?

12. Is housing on more prosperous colonies different from housing on poorer colonies? If yes, how?

13. Is the housing on Lehrerleut colonies any different from the housing on Dariusleut colonies (or vice versa)? Between colonies in Canada and the United States? If yes, how does it differ?
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