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ABSTRACT

This study is based on the hypothesis that social structures of inequality are reproduced as individuals enact their daily lives. The discourse of investors is examined for the presence of an hegemonic economic ideology. The economy as represented in the print news-media is used as a model of ideology. Hegemony can be demonstrated for a number of economic representations including inflation and interest rates; increases in labour wages; the role and activities of government and its representatives; education; and the invisibility or inviolable nature of profit acquisition. Various means of control draw on these representations. The participants' discourse demonstrates that a primary means of control is accomplished through 'blaming the victims'. By deflecting accountability, critical examination of social inequality and power disparity issues is circumscribed at the everyday individual level. As well, participants' discourse demonstrates areas where the ideology has not achieved hegemony including privatization of specific government institutions and programs; government regulation; environmental issues; and the economy as a determiner or controller of society. That participants required a discursive 'space' in which to develop their opinions free from the ideology demonstrates the importance of qualitative methodologies when examining meanings that individuals give to social concepts. This study illustrates both the existence of other stocks of knowledge than an economistic ideology and processes of discourse which could be instrumental in effecting social change.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

There exists a perception that political decision-making has become increasingly focused on monetary considerations; that the social has become dominated by the economic. In policy debates, frequently, what is considered good for society seems to be dominated by what is financially feasible or economically sound. The usual vector for social-political arguments is the abstract concept "the economy"; however, what this concept actually represents is rarely addressed. In this study, the discourse of a group of relatively economically-privileged individuals was examined to determine whether a state of hegemony exists for a specific representation of the economy as expressed in the print media. In areas where hegemony was demonstrated, an attempt was made to determine how its presence facilitated the reproduction of social domination and inequality. Finally, for those areas where the ideology had not achieved hegemony, I discuss the significance to implementing social change.

My principal area of interest is the capitalist world system, in particular the inequalities which are established and perpetuated through it. The focus of this thesis is an examination of how capitalist ideology is constructed and reproduced at the individual or personal level. In particular: How does Western ideology control the general populace through the perpetuation of economistic value concepts in the everyday lives of individuals? Specifically, I examine how specific concepts are interpreted and given meaning by upper- and middle-income individuals who are not owners of large scale production or financial capital. This stratum is referred to as the relatively-privileged in this work. By examining their ideas and personal interpretations of what it means to live
in a liberal capitalist democracy, I hoped to gain some insight into the ways by which capitalist ideology, and the capitalist system, is affected and effected at the individual level (Wolf 1982: 390-1). This study is situated within the larger hypothesis that if the processes of capitalist influence and reproduction at the individual level are better understood, perhaps methods of alleviating the inequalities within capitalism can be negotiated (Slater 1993: 98, 108).

In addressing a relatively small number of individuals in a medium sized city in Southern Canada, this study may appear particularistic and relatively insignificant. However, this study is theoretically situated within a framework that recognizes that a small specific group, such as this, does not exist within a vacuum. Social reality is contextualized within the myriad networks and forces which act on—and equally are acted on by—a single individual located within the larger environment of the World System (Wolf 1982). This study addresses only a limited aspect of this infinite milieu while acknowledging that other compelling forces exist, some of which are addressed tangentially, others are not.

Due, in part, to increasing technological advances, the one-world concept is on the brink of becoming reality. Unlike previously anticipated, it is not a universal state which governs the world, but rather it is a world economic system (cf. Bauman 1992: 96). Notwithstanding attempts at defiance, the predominant cultural expression being adapted at various cultural locations is a Western version. The basic assumptions of this system of symbols are founded upon democracy, freedom, and capitalism, and have their origin in Enlightenment philosophies (Schuurman 1993: 27). As this set of ideas spreads throughout the world as a mode of governance, it is attaining a hegemony never before achieved by any previous system of thought, either in geographic space or in population numbers.

The original inception and rise of this hegemonic, Western, democratic, capitalistic form of ideation, though of interest, is not addressed in this investigation.
What is of prime concern is how this ideology is maintained in the present. How is the political/economic system reproduced and vivified each and every day? To understand, however vaguely, the processes involved requires an examination of how individuals may be instrumental to the reproduction of an ideology essential to the world capitalist system. We require an understanding of how the ideology is maintained in local stocks of knowledge as taken-for-granted meanings.

This study examines the reproduction of a macro social structure, the economy, at the micro everyday level of the self-reflective individual. It attempts to examine social life in an holistic manner, by placing social reality in the context of the constitutive components of society, singular individuals, while insisting that these 'parts' have no meaning nor reality outside the matrix within which they exist (Wolf 1982: 385). That matrix is the whole of society itself; that is, human-constructed culture, in all its macro, structural, micro, and interpretative aspects.

In Critical Theory, powerful financial interests are believed to reproduce their dominance through an hegemonic ideology (Gramsci 1971; Mannheim 1985; Marcuse 1964; Marx and Engels 1947; Mills 1959). Ideology is defined as a specific world view, a set of ideas about reality, that is supportive of current regimes of power. Hegemony is perceived of as the nurturing and legitimation of domination which facilitates regimes of power in maintaining their privileged positions within society. Drawing primarily on Critical Theory, this study views the economy, specifically as presented in the popular news media, as an ideology utilized to legitimize situations of unequal access to societal resources. My primary concern was to describe processes by which the current set of ideas regarding the economic is maintained in the present—how it is reproduced and vivified on a daily basis—and through that reproduction, how it achieves and maintains hegemony. This study examines, in small part, how a powerful minority is able to control the social majority. The ideology of the economic, as presented by news media
and held by individuals, is examined for processes that facilitate hegemony over the social perceptions of a specific segment of the population. This is accomplished by analyzing the discourse of individuals, designated as relatively privileged, who have been encouraged to discuss the concept 'the economy'.

A review of the literature produced several studies focusing on various perceptions and representations relating to the economic. Some of these studies focused on the economic perceptions of that segment of the population labeled "middle class" (Lamont 1992; Lane 1962). Many of the studies examined this group in comparison to economic perceptions held by lower strata classifications such as "the working class" (Emmison 1985; Dudley 1997; Howe 1982; Janelli 1993). The majority of these studies drew on surveys to determine the economic perceptions to be compared; rarely were the effects of an hegemonic ideology acknowledged as affecting those perceptions.

Chapter 2 describes the theoretical foundation, the purpose of the study, and the methodology used in this study. Chapters 3 and 4 operationalize the two concepts used to examine ideology, those being "the economy" and "relatively privileged" individuals. Chapter 3 examines the development of the concept "economy" within historical contexts, as a scientific concept, and as it is currently represented in the print news-media. In each case, the concept is conceived of as a product of knowledge specialists within specific social contexts. Chapter 4 explains the rationale for choosing relatively privileged members of society as participants in this study and argues the importance of this segment of society to implementing social change. The chapter ends with a description of the particular individuals who took part in this study and whose ideas and discourse were examined and are presented here.

The discourse of the participants is examined first, for evidence of the specific ideology, and second, if the ideology is present, whether it represents any state of hegemony. Not surprisingly, there existed varying levels of hegemony for different economic concepts. Chapter 5 describes those areas or concepts relating to the economy
which display significant degrees of hegemony. In each case, I discuss the significance of hegemony for these concepts to larger social inequality issues and its social ramifications. In Chapter 6, I discuss how the presence of hegemony manifests as social control. Management theories, as held and understood by participants, and horizontal conflict are examined as control mechanisms as evidenced in the participants' discourse.

In Chapter 7, topics which were not dominated by the ideology are examined. The presence of contradictions within these areas are discussed as a possible mechanism for counteracting hegemonic ideology and implementing social change. Chapter 7 ends with the presentation of a possible means for challenging hegemonic ideology drawing on the various works of Cornelius Castoriadis and as expressed in the discourse of the participants. The conclusions of the research are summarized in Chapter 8.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Foundation

People are both self-reflective and live in a world of social and cultural structure which they have inherited and continuously reconstruct. A theoretical approach which acknowledges and utilizes these two perspectives, and addresses the reality that they are inseparable, would best inform research which examines the self-reflective individual as she reproduces society through her everyday life. Since no single theory adequately addresses the unity of structure and individual, the theoretical perspective for this investigation must be, of necessity, eclectic.

The rise of the European nation state and the success of capitalism are closely tied (Arrighi 1994; Wallerstein 1974; Bowles and Gintis 1986). Specifically connected to the argument of an hegemonic ideology is the creation of state institutions. As centers of 'education', state-run welfare institutions, such as hospitals, schools, and asylums, became dissemination centers for capitalist ideas, producing a populace which would be indoctrinated to the thought processes integral to a smooth functioning social and political economy (Parenti 1978; Arrighi 1995; Wallerstein 1976). As the process of 'education' continued, other social institutions such as religion and the nuclear family came on-line (Arrighi 1994: 27-29).

The interests of an economically dominant class never stand naked. They are enshrouded in the flag, fortified by the law, protected by the police, nurtured by the media, taught by the schools, and blessed by the church (Parenti 1978: 84)

Capitalist ideation was, and is, sanctioned and ameliorated by the political system.
"The existence of the state as a thing separated from society is peculiar to capitalism" (Holloway 1994: 28). The economic and political systems coalesced into one structure, the 'political economy' which was, and is, conceived of as separate from, and exclusionary to, the society as a whole (Arrighi 1994; Wallerstein 1974; Wolf 1982: 9-11). Since the political economy is governed by capitalist ideas and values, capitalism becomes a system of governance. The political becomes handmaiden to capitalist interests. However, this is not a perfect union.

... it cannot be assumed, in functionalist fashion, either that everything that the state does will necessarily be in the best interest of capital, nor that the state can achieve what is necessary to serve the reproduction of capitalist society (Holloway 1994: 28-29).

What it does imply, is the emergence of capitalist-Enlightenment ideas and their perception in the social realm as the only yardstick for 'rational' thinking.

The artificial abstraction and narrowing of the "political" away from everyday life ... ignores the fundamental and inclusive sociological dimension of domination accomplished as a received structure of access to social goods (Adam 1978:7).

The final result is domination of the cultural social realm by capitalist ideals. Capitalism becomes a hegemon. June Nash's definition of hegemony, drawing on Antonio Gramsci, applies well to the comprehension of capitalist hegemonic ideology as applied in this study:

... an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and political principles and all social relations, particularly in their intellectual and moral connotations (Nash 1989: 11).

To remove, discredit, or ignore the influence of capitalistic ideology in either political or social relations (interaction of individuals) is to distort and decontextualize the reality
under which either of the above functions. Contemporary social theory offers little to address issues which include both "questions of political economy" and how the everyday reality constructions of individuals are embedded in or "remain fully rooted in the dynamics of advanced capitalism" (Adam 1993: 316, 317). The capitalist economic system cannot be considered separate and apart from the individual (or from any form of social relations). They are inextricably bound to each other.

A parallel can be found in an examination of water; chemically separating the oxygen atoms from the hydrogen atoms that constitute the water will result in two distinct collections of items to study: oxygen atoms and hydrogen atoms. However, the water has ceased to exist. The nature and reality of the original item of study has been dispersed and destroyed. Water is no longer the object of study. The same diversion from the original object of study occurs when any form of social relations is studied in isolation from capitalist social hegemony. To remove capitalism from the political, the economic, or any particular social interaction is to distort the reality of the mechanisms and processes involved as they exist in the everyday lived lives of social beings.

That set of knowledge taken as facts about the social reality into which individuals are socialized as they grow and mature in society is the inherited stock of knowledge. This stock of knowledge includes the capitalist ideology (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 17). The dominance of economic metaphor in moral thinking is a reflection of capitalist ideology existing in the common and individual stocks of knowledge (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 7).

Market-dependency is guaranteed and self-perpetuating once men and women, now consumers, cannot proceed with the business of life without tuning themselves to the logic of the market. Much debated 'needs' creation by the market means ultimately creation of the need of the market (Bauman 1992:98).

Ideology is securely situated in individual and common stocks of knowledge once individuals no longer have to decide between contending views and immediately draw
upon the capitalist ideology when making various decisions, whether those decisions be economic or moral in nature—assuming that there could exist a dissection of the moral from the economic. Any economic decision contains an implicit, if not explicit, morality.

The ideology of economics, in particular Neo-Liberal economics, has infiltrated all areas of life in terms of valuation. Every aspect of modern lived-life has a monetary value. Lives are given a dollar value in law judgments. Health care and education are continually reduced to cost effective parameters. Plans are implemented based not on whether they will accomplish good, but rather on whether they are cost effective or affordable. Through the oxymoronic, advertisers inform us that we "cannot afford not to purchase" the products they are promoting. Our everyday language is infiltrated with a myriad of capitalist economic metaphors imbued with an often unstated but evident morality.

The power engendered by private capital ownership is insidious, heterogeneous, and amorphous; as such it is difficult to isolate or challenge. The structures of power are "bound together in a common process of social reproduction" (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 94). Because of common or popular reproduction, the structures of power are reproduced in everyday life through the enactment of everyday activities (Bauman 1992: 98-99). If Arrighi (1994) is correct, and his analysis does seem sound, that the cycle of the world system is currently in a C > M¹ phase,¹ then the 'forces' of accumulation will place more wealth in fewer hands. Greater and greater power will be concentrated in fewer and fewer individuals, a trend which appears to be occurring currently.

Canada, like most democracies, is governed by capitalism (Bowles and Gintis 1986: xi). Capitalism is, however, not a democratic governing power. It is an oligarchy, or more correctly a plutocracy. As Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis so aptly phrase it:

To concur that wealth is indeed power risks belaboring the obvious. The statement that, say, the chief executive officers of the top hundred
multinational firms in the world exercise a significant amount of power may evoke the same degree of astonishment as the observation that dogs bark (1986: 56).

As Bowles and Gintis state above, some situations of inequality, such as great disparities of power, are obvious—are already contained in some stocks of knowledge. Using this knowledge in conjunction with a better understanding of how the individual and structures are interactive could facilitate the development of means or methods to aid in mediating or rectifying imbalances within the current system or, even, in creating an entirely new system. This study specifically examines the interrelationship between individual and ideology. Studies examining how the individual actualizes other social structures is necessary before such an attempt could be made.

The argument that the economy is a private sphere, is not defensible. It must be considered public by the very fact that actions of those with economic power affect the lives of a great number of society’s members—if not all its members. These acts are therefore socially consequential actions because they "substantively affect the lives of others and the character of which reflect the interests of the actor" (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 67), the financial elite—or more correctly the financially-powerful few. By naming the economy as a private sphere, the power relationships of the system are obscured, rendered invisible, or merely ignored.

That capitalist ideology has infiltrated the everyday life of individuals is reflected in the dominance of economic metaphor in moral thinking (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 7). What was "an originally revolutionary ideology", in the 16th and 17th centuries during capitalist governance’s nascence, has now "harden[ed] into a status quo orthodoxy" (Parenti 1978: 44) much as the prior "right of kings" had. The very capitalist ideology which infiltrates distinct spheres of social life is the means by which the capitalist financial power structures are able to reproduce themselves. This permeation of daily life by a hegemonic system, exercises control over societal "wants, sentiments.
desires, or, more generally, objectives" (Bowles and Gintis 1986: 97). Power is exercised "in part by the definition of interests" people bring to a situation. However, power is used not only to pursue interests but "is a crucial factor in defining interests or redefining the field of choice within which one must then define one's interests" (Parenti 1978: 8, 11, emphasis in original). One is then left free to choose between predefined options. The freedom garnered is much like that of the serfs when freed from feudal bondage:

... they became free to wander wherever they would in search of a means of survival: no longer tied to a particular place of exploitation, they could go and be exploited wherever they chose, providing they could find an exploiter willing to accept them. By the same token, the lord was no longer tied to exploiting the serfs he had inherited, but could convert his wealth into money and use the money as capital to benefit from the exploitation of workers in any part of the world (Holloway 1994: 30).

This power over both the 'wants and needs' and the definition of rationality held by individuals, acts as a constraining force which influences both opportunity and behavior. When power constrains freedom, choice, opportunity, and therefore, behaviour, it becomes a system of domination. This ability to control and dominate allows an hegemonic ideology to continue functioning and reproduce itself both at an individual level and on a daily basis. All social relations, including an hegemonic ideology, "require continual, day-to-day reproduction in order to survive" (Adam 1993: 324).

The reproduction of capitalist ideology at the individual level provides a weak link in the chain. To address the 'weak link' requires some understanding of how this particular link is connected to the other links in the chain—how the structure, the capitalist ideology, actualizes in the reflective individual.

A theoretical framework for social change needs an understanding of human nature, which includes appreciation of the dimensions that are denied or manipulated under capitalism... Without some appreciation of how capitalism flattens and distorts human beings it is impossible to conceive how another society might do better or how to build a movement or subculture that does anything but replicate—and exaggerate—the prevailing alienation (Epstein 1995: 115).
Of course the weakness suggested here is merely relative when one compares this option to others; such as, the feasibility of dismantling a world system, or the feasibility of depriving the powerfully privileged of their advantaged positions and power, or the feasibility, or wisdom, of overthrowing the economic system.

Cornelius Castoriadis (1980) provides a concept—germs of resistance—as a point of counteraction to the control affected by an hegemonic ideology. This concept, germinal points of contention arising out of contradictions, could prove productive in identifying specific "weak links" in the chain of domination as discussed above. Despite dominant "social imaginary significations", such as "the economy", Castoriadis argues that society "is torn by a host of internal contradictions" (1980: 241). According to Castoriadis, these contradictions do not tear society apart because, the system "succeeds in creating peoples' adherence to the way things are" (Ibid.). However, during situations of contradiction, when an individual is attempting to make two differing stocks of knowledge congruent, an aperture or a potential breach is created that can develop into resistance that can eventually lead to the reconstruction of structures of inequality into more equitable methods of resource distribution.

Arrighi (1994) addresses the world capitalist economy from a structuralist perspective. However, he does give some credit to individuals. His analysis shows how many of the actions of the ostensibly neutral economic markets are generated by the activities of real people making real decisions. His "analytical construct" focuses "on that top layer and offers a limited view of what goes on in the middle layer of market economy and the bottom layer of material life" because this upper layer is "less transparent and less explored than the intermediate layer" (Arrighi 1994: 24). However, in his work the people are alluded to, acknowledged, but not made real. We do not see how the individuals in the top tier where "the predators roam, and the law of the jungle operates" interpret their reality (Arrighi 1994: 10). We are not made privy to the ways in
which these individuals construct their reality, how they make sense of their world. They remain merely the generalized top of a three level hierarchy.

A "research agenda" which is "critical, pragmatic, cultural, and interpretive" (Denzin 1992: xv) is required to accomplish a study of how a relatively privileged group is constrained by and engaged in the reproduction of a capitalist hegemonic ideology. An "interpretive sociology which seeks to understand the meaning of the social world for the actor" is essential (Adam 1978: 4). An "examination of the 'in order to' and 'because' motives of the actors" which produced the adoption of various attitudes and behaviors is necessary to understand how individuals construct and interpret their daily lives (Adam 1978: 4). The examination of an hegemonic ideology must accommodate the fact that this dominant system of perceptions "is a product of the social activities of a real society in real time, not simply a Platonic shadow on the wall or an neo-Kantian universal form empty of content" (Blim 1996: 89). To understand how the relatively advantaged construct their life worlds requires capturing their "voices, emotions, and actions" directly (Denzin 1992: 1). To explore the presence of capitalist ideology within individual stocks of knowledge a qualitative methodology using in-depth interviews is required. This study addresses the sociology of knowledge as it pertains to everyday life.

The development of an overall hegemonic pattern of 'design for living' is not so much the victory of a collective cognitive logic or aesthetic impulse as the development of redundancy—the continuous repetition, in diverse instrumental domains, of the same basic propositions regarding the nature of constructed reality (Wolf 1982: 388).

Through repetition these propositions, these specific knowledges, become the reality of life—the yardstick of rationality. The reproduction of ideology is achieved in the repetition of daily mundane activities. This study searched for areas in which individual stocks of knowledge conflicted with and challenged the social stock of knowledge. Areas where personal ideas and perceptions were contradictory to a specific form of capitalist ideology were sought, along with those areas which reflected the ideology.
Social construction theories view reality as socially and mutually constructed (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Reality is *socially* constructed through the social interaction of individuals. It is *mutually* constructed because to achieve and to maintain social order individuals must reach a consensus, a mediated interpretation, about what reality is and is not. These theories tend to be both interpretive and interactional. Interactive sociologies observe the following three protocols. Individuals act towards things based on meanings. Meanings arise in social interaction. Meanings are modified by social interaction (Denzin 1989). These precepts are fine as far as they go. However, they do not take into account the full experience of everyday life. As Denzin warns, in research the above three statements on their own can result in merely "gazing on others". Additionally, it results in a "structural blindness" that negatively affects the research (Denzin 1992: 156).

In a strictly social constructionist theoretical framework, the structural aspects of life are missing. Without including the influences of power relationships embedded in social institutions, we garner only half of the information of a person's lived experience. The very meanings that are constructed, modified, and adapted through self-reflectivity and social interaction occur within environments (both internal and external) in which social structures such as capitalist ideology actively play a role in defining those meanings. The meanings inherited from society, whether through the family or larger institutions, have been created in a structural environment in which initially the individual has had little or no experience. It is these initial meanings, which are inherited at birth and collected throughout life, that are modified through social interaction. Therefore, it is imperative to accommodate the effects of social structure on the construction of reality by social beings.

Social structures have no essential reality beyond that which individuals give to them. According to Berger and Luckmann, an institution can only be understood in terms of the knowledge that individuals possess of it. To understand the institution it is
necessary to analyze that understanding (1966: 65). To understand knowledge of capitalist governance and its ideology, it is necessary to ask a group living within a capitalist milieu how they make sense of that reality to determine what is their stock of knowledge regarding it. This information can only be obtained through in-depth personal interviews and thick descriptions. To understand how the capitalist system works socially, one must ask individuals how their lives reflect and accommodate that reality.

The structural aspects of everyday life need to be acknowledged and accommodated in research which attempts to address the everyday experiences of any individual. However, in the structuralist theories there exists the opposite of the structural blindness evident in social construction theories. In the former the only effective participant is structure. That is, these theories only see structure (Denzin 1922: 156). Structural or macro theories tend to examine and account for only the structural aspects of social life. They disregard the individual almost completely, other than as a generalized artificially constructed entity drawn from probabilities. The reproduction at the individual daily level provides the weak link in the chain of capitalist domination and inequality. The power of reproduction lies at the individual level and the power of its deconstruction is situated in the same experiential level.

The ideals of the Enlightenment, democracy, equality, freedom, autonomy, rights, and capitalism itself, no longer have clear meanings, though they are today still held as estimable values. Modern society (or Post-modern, the difference is in degree only) presents a political democracy which is available only to the owners of very large caches of production/financial assets. Though "equality of opportunity" is claimed, it is in actuality the access to opportunity through economic resources and advantaged economic positions which allows for success. Freedom, brandished about as some equally distributed commodity, has relevance only when attached to the prepositions "from" or "to"—relating to a specific idea, thing, or situation. In a dominated society "freedom" requires explication. Autonomy is a concept which no longer has meaning when the
choices one is offered are predetermined by an unseen financially-privileged few. And capitalism has little value if its perpetuation involves unequal distribution of both wealth and power dependent on one's own wealth at the starting gates. As the world system grows, the players become larger and more powerful. Even today the chances of entering the game at square one are negligible. The inception of these "values" in the Enlightenment period was predicated on the idea that they were to be applied to a specific segment of the population only. Their inception therefore is grounded in inequality and domination (Seidman 1994: 324-325).

The debate attempting to reconcile the individual and society that was argued in Greek agorae and was reborn during the Renaissance is still with us. In all likelihood the debate has preceded the written record of humanity. It is my belief that the social individual and society are not two separate realities. They are not even two sides of the same coin. They are the same entity. It is not that neither can exist without the other, but rather that they are inseparable. Generally, structuralist theories tend to ignore or generalize the individual to a degree that she appears as an afterthought or a minor influence in the scheme of things. Likewise, social construction theories tend to ignore, discount, or not give due importance to the structures of society into which one is born, and through which one comes to know the world and then to live each and every day. To take either of these perspectives without giving both the social construction of reality and the influence and power of social structure due importance, not merely acknowledgment, is to present only half of reality—to misrepresent the actual experience of everyday lived-life.

**Purpose of the Research**

Whether the domination and inequality affecting the everyday lives of individuals in any society are reproduced by institutions of power through hegemonic views of the world or
reproduced through discourses that construct reality, it seems that the everyday lives of society's members should be a fruitful milieu in which to study the articulation of power—the articulation of institutions of domination with the dominated, and the articulation of discourses which maintain the authority of inequality. It is my belief that whether institutions or discourses are the primary vectors, relationships of unequal power, access, and rights are given validity in the actual and ordinary activities of people as they live their lives.

This study attempts to document the ability of ideological structures to attain and maintain a hegemony amongst a group of relatively economically-privileged individuals. It is grounded in the supposition that this category of individuals is instrumental in the maintenance of that hegemony which disadvantages the economically powerless in our society, while harming their own social welfare; and equally, that the engagement of the relatively privileged is essential if structures which replicate inequality are to be dismantled.

It is hoped that in documenting the economic understandings of this segment of society a better understanding of the dynamics of legitimation and reproduction of an hegemonic ideology can be achieved. An hegemonic ideology generally maintains unequal relationships of access to resources: in a monetary culture, the access to resources translates as access to power. This study is seen as a first step in addressing the larger question of how to dismantle the existing system of unequal power and financial dominance. The present research is limited to better understanding the processes of reproduction and legitimation of the political-media constructed economy and examining how that ideology might be instrumental in maintaining existing power relationships.
Research Statement

In this study, an attempt is made to document the presence of a specific form of capitalist ideological beliefs and values within the discourse of a group of economically privileged individuals and to determine how the presence of that ideology may be instrumental in the reproduction of a capitalist ideology. The term "the economy" was used to provide a workable ideological concept to represent the larger aggregate of concepts contained within capitalist ideology. For the purposes of this investigation the model of the economy as ideology was drawn from the public news media. I had observed that the news media, particularly the print news media, was often referred to in social conversations. The ubiquitous "Did you see in the paper . . ." or "Did you read in the paper . . ." often prefaced discussions around political/social issues. The specific form of capitalist ideology chosen for this investigation was the representation of the term "the economy". The economy was chosen because discursively it "appears so frequently and in such ordinary contexts that it seems that we must all 'know' its meaning [and] yet its reality appears to be only given through complex technical indicators" (Emmison 1985:21). To determine the presence of this form of the ideology, during unstructured interviews participants were asked to talk about what the term "the economy" means to them. Using the concept "the economy" and examining the discourse of relatively privileged individuals and then comparing that discourse to the representation of the "the economy" in the news media, an attempt was made to determine how the ideological economy actualizes itself in individual stocks of knowledge.

Method

The research examined a specific period in time in the process of reproducing and maintaining a social concept at the everyday level. The construction, maintenance, and
legitimation of social reality is the sum total of a variety of dynamic processes and influences. These processes are perceived as active, vital, and in constant flux. It is not a static reality that is being examined; therefore, only a qualitative methodology could adequately capture that actuality.

In-depth interviews were used. Each participant chose the location for the interview, selecting a location with which she was most comfortable. Interviews were generally about one hour in length; the actual length was determined by each participant's willingness and ability to speak on the topic. Since qualitative methods involve creating a relationship with those being interviewed and part of that process involves the participant and the researcher 'getting to know' each other and feeling comfortable with the interview process, acquaintances and previous co-workers were used as a source of possible research participants; doing so facilitated the establishment of a relationship of mutual trust. This was especially important because the topic and the investigation probed areas that are not easily discussed. The ease with which the participants participated in the interview process and the honesty and candor of their responses, I believe, is directly attributable to the relationship of trust that had already been established by our previous acquaintance.

The interviews were dual in structure. Employing an anthropological perspective, an attempt was made to view Western culture as the 'other', as exotic and uncommon, as if viewing it for the first time (Slater 1993: 99). The initial interview attempted to apprehend the meaning that relatively advantaged individuals give to the economic and attempted to understand from where these meanings are drawn: from what stocks of knowledge, from what experiences (Appendix A). Since processes rather than causes were sought, the second interview challenged "taken-for-granted understandings" of the economic in an attempt to determine the ways in which the participants made their world appear "subjectively meaningful" and "coherent" (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 19) (Appendix B). However, it became clear early on in the interview process that the
participants often were well aware of incongruence in their viewpoints and stated these themselves, making challenges of basic assumptions and, hence, second interviews frequently unnecessary.

The statements, experiences, and interpretations offered by the participants were recorded as thick descriptions to provide "detail, context, emotion, . . . history, . . . webs of social relationships" that linked the participants to the larger social environments and "established the significance of an experience or sequence of events" (Denzin 1989: 83; Geertz 1973). The interviewee's statements were contextualized within her own biography, history, and lived-life and, as such, the statements reflect a work-in-process Contextual shifts and reflections by the respondents were encouraged (Holstein and Gubrium 1995: 55). Participants' reflexive comments were taken to be "endogenous guides" to further areas of questioning (ibid.).

Though the method used is categorized as interviewing, the process was seen rather as participant discussions and conversations. The objective was to encourage participants to discuss their interpretations of the economy with as little interference as possible. This endeavor is the participants' story of reality. As such the suggested interview questions (Appendices A and B) were merely guides and were not used as a "script". The questions and possible areas of discussion suggested were merely tools used to encourage participants to talk. It was important that respondents understood that this was not a test of their knowledge of formal economic principles, for the goal was not to study theoretical knowledge, but rather to capture Berger and Luckmann's (1966) pretheoretical knowledge, or Gramsci's (1959) common-sense.

All interviews were taped and note-taking supplemented the interview tapes. Observational notes supplied aspects of the interview which were not readily recorded by tape, such as facial expressions, posture, body language in general, or other occurrences which could not be picked-up by the audio tape (Creswell, 1994: 152). Feedback from informants was actively sought and was a constant aspect of the interview process itself.
Asking for clarification from the participant, or reframing questions or responses, ensured that what is recorded is as authentic to the participant's meaning as is possible. Additional meetings and conversations with participants provided additional information and insight for analysis of the data.

The interviews attempted to capture common understandings and meanings of the economy to determine if perceptions of the economy held by the relatively-advantaged are in fact constrained by an hegemonic ideology and how that ideology is actualized on an everyday level. An attempt was made to answer the following three questions: What is the perception of the economy? Does the perception of the economy held by participants reflect the ideology? Are there significant similarities and differences in the perceptions of the economy between individuals within the study group? On completion of the interviews, responses were dissected and analyzed for essential elements and structures which were important to the participants' interpretations of the economy and its meaning to them. Concepts were bracketed and coded. These codes were Emerson's "threads that can be woven together to tell a story about the social world" (1995: 153). The codes were compared to occurrences and situations within and across interviews. Commonalties and variation amongst and within interviews was sought and noted. After deconstructing the interviews, the key concepts and elements were reconstructed and recontextualized as elements of the economy as understood in the everyday life of relatively privileged individuals.

The individuals who took part in this investigation are not considered research objects, but rather active participants in the research. Since it is their account, I have included much of the participants' own words in the analysis of the interviews in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. Chapters 3 and 4 describe the concept the economy and the participants, respectively, in more detail.
Chapter 3: The Economy

Since this study examines knowledge and understandings of the economic held by a specific group, it is necessary to delineate what this concept the *economy* is held to represent. What is this *economy* that garners such reverence by economists, financiers, and politicians?

The Historical Economy

The term 'the economy' derives from the Greek term *oikonomia*, a compound of *oikos* "house" and *nomos* "law, custom, management, or control". In the period of Classical Greek culture the term was used to denote "the management of a household or family", or more generally the "administration" of an undertaking (Liddell and Scott 1990: 478). That is, the term signified activities and decisions involved in accomplishing a specified, desired outcome. In earliest use, it indicates those activities surrounding the living-space: acts associated with maintaining human life within the ancient Greek household.

In his Socratic discourse, *Oeconomicus*, Xenophon discusses the art of the manager of the household: that is the specific activities and decisions made by men—it was after all a man's world—for the management of a household (Strauss 1970: 87). It must be noted that the culture of Xenophon was a monied culture—coinage having been introduced in the 7th century BC—though not to the extent to which current culture is monied. Already, in Xenophon's time, the use of things had been abstracted to their monetary value: the value of an article had become grounded in increases of money.
generated, rather than on the use value of the article. In the dialogue, Xenophon (in the voice of Socrates) argues for a reverse of this trend: "that the household must be understood altogether without any regard to 'possessions' and with exclusive regard to 'usefulness' " (Strauss 1970: 95). Thus, as early as the 5th century BC, debates were being held surrounding the accumulation of resources as possessions—as wealth. In the title, Oeconomus, and in the subject matter of this work we see the roots of the study of modern economics. However, the development of economics into a 'science' would have to wait until the 18th century.

In English, economy first appears in 1530 in a work titled The Doctrynal Princelys and Proverbs Yconomie, or Housolde keeping (no author given) in which economy still maintains the sense of household management (Hendrickson 1987: 178; Simpson and Weiner 1989: 60). Proximate in time, 1580, is North's English translation of Plutarch's Lives3 which contains a definition of economy: "Oeconomia, commonly called House-rule" (Ibid.). These early English writings maintain the sense of economy as the management of, or the activities and decisions associated with, the maintenance of one's place of habitation.

By the 17th century, the sense of economy widened to include "the administration of the concerns and resources of any community or establishment with a view to orderly conduct and productiveness" (Simpson and Weiner 1989: 60). The earliest author cited as using economy in this sense is Thomas Hobbes in his Leviathan of 1651. In Chapter XXIII, "Of the Publique Ministers of Soveraign Power". Hobbes calls for the establishment of positions (public ministers) necessary for the administration of special areas of the state, one of which is "at home, for the Oeconomy of a Common-wealth". These ministers of the economy are described with the following functions.

They that have Authority concerning the Treasure, as Tributes, Impositions, Rents, Fines, or whatsoever publique revenue, to collect, receive, issue, or take the Accounts thereof, are Publique Ministers. Ministers, because they serve the Person Representative and can doe
nothing against his Command, nor without his Authority; Publique, because they serve him in his Polticall Capacity (Hobbes 1990 (1651): 167).

Here we see the sense of management of resources; however, rather than in the home it is the resources of the state that are being managed. The other areas of administration by public ministers listed by Hobbes are the militia, education, law, and what would today be termed "police services", that is the execution of judgments and laws and "maintenance of the Peace" (Ibid. 169).

It is not until the 18th century that the economy takes its modern form of objectified entity which coincides with the appearance of the term political economy. During this period the meaning of economy moves from managing the resources of a nation to the contemporary use of economy to denote "the theoretical science dealing with the laws that regulate the production and distribution of wealth" (Simpson and Weiner 1989: 60; emphasis added). The latter definition demonstrates the fetishization of the economy—ethereal and esoteric laws are now what determine how resources are distributed rather than the activities and decisions of a society's members. Economy is now securely situated within the science of wealth distribution and its meaning relating to the activities and decisions associated with the concerns of the household has been eclipsed.

John Stewart is credited as having first used the term political economy in 1767, but it is to Adam Smith that the "science" of the economy and its attendant "laws" must be credited in his An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations of 1776. Smith defines political economy as follows:

Political economy, considered as a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator, proposes two distinct objects: first, to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence of the people, or more properly to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for the public services. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign. (Smith 1902 (1776): 124).
Though in the first "object", Smith still hints at the activities of people managing the resources necessary to maintain life, the second "object" of the economy is now to support the objectified state and sovereign; the latter being the equivalent of today's privileged, financially-powerful few. The objectification of economy is evident in the use of language by Smith—in the opening sentence it is the "political economy" which "proposes" and not Adam Smith who proposes these objectives.

The context of Adam Smith's work is the period of intense debate regarding mercantilism on the threshold of the industrial revolution. The major debates centered around the importance of manufactories, or craft-industries, versus agriculture; and unregulated trade versus government protectionist policies—or mercantilism (commerce) versus landed wealth. The editor of the 1902 edition of *The Wealth of Nations* (unnamed and himself in the midst of the industrialization of social life) summarizes the importance of Smith's work:

> The more immediate result of his teaching and the one which has maintained itself until the present day was the complete overthrow, in this country [England] at least, of the doctrine of protection, and the establishment of free-trade as the basis of orthodox middle-class economics on their practical side (in Smith 1902 (1776): 31).

A statement that would seem as logical today as it must have when written at the opening of the 20th century.

The unnamed editor of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, provides an "Introductory Sketch of the History of Political Economy", part of which includes the indebtedness of Adam Smith to the early Greek philosophers. Xenophon is described as "a much less important figure" than Plato or Aristotle (ibid.: 11) and yet over two pages are devoted to the influence of Xenophon himself. At this point I would like to return to Xenophon's *Oeconomica* in relation to Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. There exist three characteristics that are relevant to the study attempted here: the importance of
Xenophon, as detailed by the editor in the introduction to Smith's work and mentioned above: the use of the term "wealth"; and the social context of knowledge.

In translations of *Oeconomica*, the word "wealth" is a translation of the Greek term *chremata* which derives from *chreomai*, "I use". In Greek lexicons, along with the translation of "wealth" for the term *chremata*, the meaning "useful things" is also given in addition to "wealth". Conceding that one choice of meaning in translation being more legitimate than another is a determination for scholars of Greek language, I suggest that an alternative to "wealth" may be justified in translating the *Oeconomica* of Xenophon.

As with the unnamed editor of Adam Smith's work, the translators of many of the Classic Greek writings were working within specific social contexts, and this included working within a knowledge of *economy* as the abstracted principle that began with Smith's work and was utilized and further abstracted in writings and discourse during and after the Industrial Revolution. Within that context, I provide a section of Xenophon's *Oeconomica* (Loeb edition 1947. E. C. Marchant, translator: 367) with the term *chremata* translated, as published, as "wealth", and then follow with a version in which the other possible meaning of *chremata* as "things that are useful" is substituted. I have italicized all words which appear in the Greek text as *chremata*, *chreomai*, or their derivatives. The published version follows:

"It seems, then, that your view is this: what is profitable is wealth, what is harmful is not wealth."
"Quite so."
"That is to say, the same things are wealth and *not* wealth, according as one understands or does not understand how to use them. A flute, for example, is wealth to one who is competent to play it, but to an incompetent person it is no better than useless stones."
"True—unless he sells it."
"We now see that to persons who don't understand its use, a flute is wealth if they sell, but *not* wealth if they keep it instead of selling."
Though the following substitute translation may seem redundant in the term "useful", this is in fact how the original of Xenophon is written. As the translator of the Loeb edition states of Xenophon's writing:

He too often irritates the reader by incessant repetition of the same pattern of sentence. of the same formula, and even of the same word. . . . But he is master of an extensive and multifarious vocabulary; so that it is strange that he constantly uses the same word over and over again in the compass of a few lines. A translator is often compelled to have recourse to synonyms. (1947: xxvii; emphasis added).

It seems probable that Xenophon used the same word over and over because that word held the exact meaning he intended. If the sense Xenophon was attempting to communicate was in fact "wealth" he would have had recourse to the more usual Greek term for "wealth", ploutos, which he choose not to use. The substitute translation follows:

"It seems, then, that your view is this. what is profitable is useful, what is harmful is not useful."
"Quite so."
"That is to say, the same things are useful and not useful, according as one understands or does not understand how to use them. A flute, for example, is useful to one who is competent to play it, but to an incompetent person it is no better than useless stones."
"True—unless he sells it."
"We now see that to persons who don't understand its use, a flute is useful if they sell, but not useful if they keep it instead of selling."

From my perspective, this substitute translation, consistent with Xenophon's actual use of words, is more meaningful than that previously given. The above example is only one of many which could be drawn from this work to demonstrate what I feel is a more reasoned understanding of Xenophon's words. This one was chosen primarily because of its ability to demonstrate my argument in a concise manner.

If Xenophon had recourse to such a varied vocabulary, including ploutos for wealth, it does not seem to me a far stretch to believe that he had an intention in the use
of specific words and even in the absence of synonyms. Is it too unreasonable to believe that his intention was very specifically about the use of possessions and not the accumulation of wealth—especially in consideration of his denunciation of the regard for possessions not based on usefulness as cited previously by Strauss? The translator of any work is a product of her time; as E.C. Marchant's translation reflects the social conditions of his time, my preference is a reflection of current social conditions and my personal experiences within those social conditions. Notwithstanding my preferences, it is acknowledged that E.C. Marchant was a scholar of the Classics, which I do not in any way purport to be, and I yield before his expertise: I merely argue my preferences because they support my thesis that knowledge in any context is socially constructed and mediated.

This semantic divergence is important, in consideration of Adam Smith's title containing the reference to "wealth" and the fact, according to the editor of the 1902 edition, that Smith's work drew from Xenophon's Oeconomicus (Smith 1902: 11). Given that Smith's work is a defense of capital accumulation, wealth accumulation, one can understand how rather than focusing on a nation's increasing "usefulness" to all the members which constitute it, Smith would come to focus on the increase in a nation's "wealth" and hence, title his work The Wealth of Nations. Through Smith's writings, the meaning of economy is transformed to encompass the accumulation of "wealth" and household management moves from an art of resource management to a science of income and expenditure—of the distribution of wealth. The significance to this current study of the economy is that the importance of Adam Smith's work to subsequent, and current economists, has been substantial and that the concepts of this work are found in general economic discourse. Since this study focuses on the concept the economy, the semantic and literary history of the term—and the social context of that history—is meaningful.
The Economy of Economics

Despite the objectification of economy in the early writings of the science of economics, the sense of activities and decisions is still held within the definition of the economy as used in the discipline; though not unexpectedly, the realm of activity is removed from the household.

An economy is loosely defined as a set of interrelated production and consumption activities. It may refer to this activity in a region of one country, in a country, or in a group of countries. In any economy, the allocation of resources is determined by the production, sales, and purchase decisions made by firms, households, and governments (Lipsey, Purvis, & Courant 1994: 48, emphasis added).

Though activities and decisions are mentioned, the specific activities and decisions have been considerably altered.

The definition above is the scientific definition in its simplest form. However, once discourse relating to the economy has been established, the economy as defined expands and develops into the political economy. At this point, one must begin to consider abstract concepts derived from arbitrary formulae such as Gross National Product, Gross Domestic Product, inflation levels, and valuations of companies for exchange of shares on specifically constructed markets. Now the processes and activities of production and consumption, of subsistence, have become so complex that specialists are required to explain, interpret, and advise. The economy of economics (that is the activities associated with the allocation of resources dependent upon the actions and decisions of corporations, governments, and households) is transformed and reversed into the reification, the economy. For the reified concept, the economy dictates the activities and decisions of corporations, governments and households—the allocation of resources have become dependent upon the economy. In the discourse of reification, the
responsibility for decisions of resource allocation is removed from policy 'decision-makers' and placed upon the severely abstracted concept, the economy.

I do not examine an economy as defined by the formal discipline of economics. Rather, the reification of the activities and decisions into "the economy" as a tool of discourse is examined. This reification is an entity which is seen to have a life of its own independent of the activities of corporations, governments, and households.

...[J]ust as Marx taunted the vulgar economists for their personification of capital, a social production relation, we now have today the totality of the economic relations and activity of a country increasingly subject to the same process of reification and even personification (Emmison 1986: 83).

This is the economy of general discourse that this particular study addresses.

The public perception of the economy originates from and is perpetuated by specialists. Pundits and media commentators counsel and deliberate, either on the television screen or in the print media (newspapers, news magazines, or popular press books), producing a particular knowledge about the economy and the economic generally. As C.W. Mills argues:

They (the media), are also among the most important of those increased means of power now at the disposal of elites of wealth and power: moreover, some of the higher agents of these media are themselves either among the elites or very important among their servants... Alongside or just below the elite there is the propagandist, the publicity expert, the public-relations man, who would control the very formation of public opinion in order to be able to include it as one more pacified item in calculations of effective power (1995: 91).

This of course does not preclude that most media experts truly believe the opinions and view-points they put forth: the Marxian concept of false consciousness applies to specialists as well as to the proletariat. Reality is a negotiated, constructed experience: even for knowledge production. As Feyerabend (1993) explains, specialists do not
function within social vacuums; they are affected by and influence vested interests. Additionally, their work is influenced by their own perceived interests.

**Media Representation of the Economy**

Emmison (1986) completed a study of the representation of the economy drawn from print media, in particular from political cartoons. This representation included the economy as a physical entity with its own set of wants, needs, and desires. As a physical entity it was demonstrated as having a "state of health" and the economy and its attendant economic constituents, such as interest rates and inflation, where shown to suffer from ill or good health or illnesses in general. Further, Emmison found that the activities of the personification were portrayed as being independent of members of society and that the economy had the ability to dictate to governments. Emmison also found a parallel negative representation of government in context with the economy. This fetishization of economic activity was demonstrated as being totally outside of the control of human beings; it had an existence beyond the very people who created it, beyond those who daily made decisions regarding the management of resources, or who daily were involved in activities associated with the management of resources.

Over a period of months, I examined the print news media for representations of the economy as described by Emmison. During that period, the representations of the economy adhered to Emmison's model consistently. This investigation was completed to ensure that the media sources likely to be accessed by participants reflected the representation of the economy as found by Emmison (1986). To provide a specific model against which to analyze the participants' discourse, one day was selected at random. Two Canadian papers were examined on October 17, 1998 for ideological representations of the economy. *The City Star* was chosen as an instrument which
informs a general readership. *The Globe and Mail*, self-styled as "Canada's business newspaper", was chosen as representing a readership with more economically skewed interests. Additionally, these two particular papers represent the print news media of two different publishers/owners. This was considered important so as to preclude the possibility of differing publisher influence on presentation of the news or the economy, specifically.

There were ample examples in both papers of fetishisms and personifications of the economy. An article in *The Globe and Mail* on the reduction of the prime interest rate by the Bank of Canada offered the following reification of the economy: "the vaunted engine of world growth—the American economy—is beginning to sputter" (B1). An article in *The City Star* addressing Paul Martin's economic policies proposed that "the economy could use lower tax and interest rates but Martin says it can't have both" and mentioned "...a growing credit squeeze, which would suck even more life out of the economy" (H3). These two statements represent the economy as a living, conscious being. "Things are volatile globally, but our economy is largely intact" (D3) stated an article in *The City Star* addressing reduced production in US factories, implying that the economy has a natural physical form. In an article on *The City Star* Opinion Page (H3), addressing the budget surplus and the reduced standard of living in Canada, the following statement was extracted: "...Canada's falling standard of living is the soft underbelly of the economy the opposition intends to rabbit punch over the next few months." Examples of economic discourse in two Canadian daily newspapers portray the economy as a living, conscious, physical being, not as the actions and decisions of people.

Examples of the use of the economy as criterion for political decision-making were evident in both papers. A *The City Star* article addressing reduced US production rates described how decisions made by a government institution, the Federal Reserve Board, were implemented "to prevent world financial turmoil from sending the American economy into a tailspin" and how decisions of the central bank could be made "without
worrying about over-stimulating the economy and causing an outbreak of inflation" (D1). The implication is that these decisions were made for the benefit of the economy and the greater good of society. Also in The City Star was an article informing readers about Microsoft’s "aid" to Canadian schools and how this "aid" will affect scholastic decisions for Canada’s youth by helping them "develop the skills they need in what (federal Industry Minister John Manley) called the 'new economy' " (D2). Here the economy is portrayed as dictating education decisions in Canada. In the Opinion article discussing Canada’s falling standard of living cited above, reference was made to a Reform Party research paper critiquing the political/economic decision-making of the Ontario Conservative Party. This Reform document chastises the Conservative Party’s faulty economic policy for the following situation:

... The Canadian economy has fallen far behind that of the US over the past 12 years. Had we kept up, one million more Canadians would be working today, average family incomes would be nearly $6,000 higher per year, the national economy would be $44 billion larger (H3).

One is left with the impression that had the economy been given more consideration Canadians would be enjoying a better standard of living. The political use of the economy is exposed in a City Star item discussing cuts to the prime interest rate. The article ends with the following statement:

For debt-burdened Canadians who now owe more than they earn, the interest rate cut was welcome news after Martin's warning that they should not bank on tax relief in his next budget because of the global financial turmoil threatening economic growth here (H3, emphasis added).

The implication for readers is that Martin cannot make a decision to provide lower taxes because his 'hands are tied' by lack of growth in the economy. However, the most illuminating article in regard to the primacy of the economy in political decision-making was an article in The City Star informing readers of potential changes to the political arrangements in Saudi Arabia. The article opens with the following statement: "With
King Fahd in failing health and the economy in a tailspin, Saudis are having to do some uncharacteristic soul searching about the future" (B8). The article discusses possible structural changes to the political power arrangements in Saudi Arabia and does not directly discuss economic issues. Placing consideration of the economy in the first line of an article which does not discuss economic activities implies an importance and emphasis on this entity that is carried clandestinely in the mind of the reader for the remainder of the article. The implication is that the health of the current leader and the health of the economy are deemed to be primary and equal issues in understanding political change in Saudi Arabia. Repeatedly, in articles in both Canadian dailies it is implied that the economy is a primary and crucial consideration when making political policy decisions. The impression given by these articles is that as members of society we are at the mercy of the economy. The political power of elected and hired government officials which created the power of the economy is obscured and the general public is encouraged to view these political power-holders as white knights doing the best they can.

That the presentation of the economy as a reification obscures an underlying strategy is demonstrated by the following items. In the same issue of The City Star there was a 'news' article (D1) and an 'opinion' piece (H3) about cuts to the prime interest rate. Though there was little content difference in the two items, the opinion piece was longer and attempted to explain to readers the reasons why the federal Finance Minister could not provide both low interest rates and low taxes. The constructed bad-guy in the discussion was the federal government, presented in the following terms: "... governments have scooped most of the money for themselves. The federal level is by far the worst tax hog in the wallow, having slurped up nearly $7 billion of the economic increase" (H3). The writer, Chris Vander Doelen, goes on to elaborate the wastefulness of federal government policies, in particular "the frigate saga ... launched in 1983"
(ibid.). The opinion piece explains that the government is responsible for "a classic government boondoggle" (ibid.) that consisted of the following improprieties:

a) "The MIL Davie shipyard in Quebec which built half the ships . . . declared bankruptcy. . . the money might have been misappropriated [by the owners of the shipyard]." (ibid.)

b) "The federal government had to throw $263 million at the same shipyard in 1991 to rescue it from cost over-runs on the six faulty frigates it built (they didn't float right, and had to be fitted with special ballast tanks)." (ibid.)

c) "In New Brunswick, where the other six ships were constructed, the yards of Saint John Shipbuilding Ltd. . . . is owned by the billionaire Irving family." (ibid.)

d) "The project . . . built 12 fabulously overpriced and under performing warships . . ." (ibid.)

Though the above facts are given by Vander Doelen to discredit government policy, the reader is not encouraged to ask, is in fact directed against asking, why $10 billion of taxpayer earnings were paid to private billionaire corporate interests for shoddy overpriced goods. Though the article encourages readers to view the government as the 'hog at the trough', the real wallowing appears to be located in another sector—a situation which the author ignores and encourages readers to ignore.

As with studies found during a review of the literature which demonstrated a tendency to blame the victims of economic hardship (cited above), the newspaper reports bestow this same culpability on victims. In stories discussing Mike Harris' first term as Ontario premier there is little doubt as to who is to blame for any suffering caused by Conservative Party policies. The introductory paragraph of The Globe and Mail story states: "A feisty Mike Harris blamed labour unions yesterday for the financial ills, joblessness and welfare dependency that he inherited when he came to power three years ago" and goes on to describe how his "kind-hearted" policies "set things right" (A6). The City Star story contains the following quote from Mike Harris himself:
You will find the unions... are protesting. We predicted that four years ago because quite frankly we had an $11 billion deficit, a record number of people on welfare, double digit unemployment because unions had too much power and they had too much say and the vested interests had too much power and too much say (A12, emphasis added).

Both papers, and Mike Harris himself, leave little doubt as to where the responsibility for economic woes lie. No mention is made of profit-taking which contributes to high deficits, welfare dependency, unemployment, and underemployment. Exclusion of the role and responsibility of profit accumulation for the above is flagrant deception.

The dismantling of social welfare programs in "industrialized" countries or the prevention of social welfare programs in the "un-industrialized world" can be more easily accomplished if Canadians believe that such actions are inevitable and not dependent on conscious choices. If victims of economic inequality are the cause of their own demise, little support can be garnered for them. The preservation of a consciously constructed entity presented as concerned with the best interests of Canada's and the world's people legitimates concealed social structures of inequality (Mills 1995: 91-92). The economy provides a convenient justification for disregarding social problems and hinders examination and critique of policy decisions, and their results. Certain policy decisions benefit particular financial interests as the frigate deal demonstrates and blaming unions, workers, and the power of "special interests" obscures the benefits of profit generation allowed to financial special interests. By using the economy as both a scapegoat and an ally, political policy-makers can protect their own financial interests and those of their financial associates while ignoring and demeaning the plight and rights of the less economically-advantaged: the unemployed, the poor, the under-employed and the disadvantaged generally.

Therefore, the representation of the economy as portrayed in the news media follows Emmison's model for economic ideology: a physical entity with wants, needs, and desires: independent of human beings: possessing a "state of health": a negative
representation of government. Additionally, the examples above display 'blaming the victim' as demonstrated in the studies previously cited.

**Economy, Knowledge, and Ideology**

A proclivity within the general populace to accept the economy as a physical entity with wants and needs which must take precedence in political policy decisions, to view its ill health as caused by economically deprived individuals, and to be unaware of the hidden financial benefits accruing to specific sectors of Canadian society, would be understandable in consideration of the skewed representation of economic activities in Canada's daily newspapers. It is assumed that a similar investigation of broadcast media and political information print would uncover the same construction, representation, and misuse of the term "the economy".

Specialist knowledge, in this case, of the economists, sediments through discourse into common knowledge. Partial knowledges, misused concepts, and ideas taken out of context are presented within common knowledge as 'truths'. As specialist knowledge becomes transformed through mundane use it transforms into common sense, into the rational. These truths then, through exploitation and manipulation by vested interests, become definitions of reality. The presentation and use of the economic in a particular way can be considered an ideology. Ideologies according to Gramsci must represent "a conception of the world that is implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in all manifestations of individual and collective life" (1971: 328). An ideology cannot be arbitrarily enforced on a society; it must appeal to already existing stocks of knowledge and bear an ostensible 'truthfulness' (Lane 1962:425). It must be derived from, and nurtured through, pre-existing and easily available, constantly recurring and reconstructed knowledges. A particular representation of the rational is achieved through
time, through redundancy—through "the continuous repetition, in diverse instrumental
domains, of the same basic propositions regarding the nature of constructed reality" (Wolf 1982: 388). As the news articles demonstrate, the use of the economy is
repeatedly used in a specific mode in a variety of different contexts made available daily
for the general public.

An ideology must appeal to common-sense. For Gramsci, common sense is "the
most widespread conception of life and man." (1971: 326). Common sense is that
knowledge which informs the "popular image" of the economy. This is not the "popular
knowledge" of Foucault (1980: 82ff). This popular image is composed of taken-for-
granted understandings and misunderstandings and common knowledge about the
economy (Feyerabend 1993). It is not complex, theoretical, economic knowledge. it is
habitual, redundant knowledge. It is this knowledge, propagated by media and
politicians, that informs debates about the economy and economic activities; and
ultimately social priorities.

Once the specific knowledge required by power-holders has sedimented into
common-sense, it alleviates the necessity for direct coercion (Gramsci 1971: 326; Mills
1995. 91). As Foucault states: "Far from preventing knowledge, power produces it"
(1980 59). Specific knowledge about the economic, the economy, is produced by
specific power groups. In addition, power equally prevents knowledge by restricting the
expression of contrary viewpoints, perceptions, and arguments about what is rational, and
therefore, possible. The structures of inequality are maintained through the use of trick
mirrors. Perhaps this is Marx's false consciousness—not the inability for the populace to
perceive reality correctly, but rather the ability of the power-strata to deceive, to distort
reality. Since the power-holders control knowledge, it becomes difficult for those
without power to acquire the knowledge necessary to perceive the structures of
exploitation. It is not that the populace have "scales" over their eyes, rather it is that
blindfolds have been placed over their eyes by the beneficiaries of the status quo. Not
only have these powers blindfolded the populace, but additionally, by controlling access to knowledge it is as though they hold the only scissors capable of cutting away the bindings.

This study is based on an assumption that a particular construction of the economy was and is used as a tool to maintain the general populace in ignorance or acceptance of social injustice and further to legitimate those structures of inequality. Through this mechanism more resources are assigned to fewer and fewer Canadians (Winter 1998: Appendices E and G; Canadian Business, Special Edition: July 1999; for example). This research examines whether an understanding of the economy similar to the media representation is held in the economically-active general populace and, if present, whether this ideology is hegemonic. Is it possible that the general members of society, those absorbed in accomplishing daily life, may hold a different definition of economy than that held by the political, academic, and media punditocracy (Barasamion 1994: 3); or is there a hegemony that is so secure that other definitions of the economic are not possible?
Chapter 4: The Research Participants

The ideas of relatively privileged individuals within our society were examined to determine whether an economistic ideology is maintained within individual stocks of knowledge as taken-for-granted meanings and common sense. An attempt was made to determine whether a specific ideology, the media-political representation of the economy, is legitimated and reproduced in everyday life. Legitimation in this study refers to acceptance and support of the authority of a social institution. By examining how participants made sense of contradictions and attempted to resolve conflicting interests, an effort was made to expose some mechanisms of the legitimation, and hence the reproduction, of a particular ideology.

Rationale

"Insofar as the workings of domination have been more distinctly perceived in inferiorized groups" (Adam 1978:3), this study examines a segment of the relatively privileged majority. Majority in this work denotes the greater proportion of the populace—those individuals who live in economic comfort relative to the poor as a category: the working-poor, the chronically unemployed, social assistance recipients, the homeless. Equally, the majority does not experience the extremes of wealth that bestow great power to the very privileged few within society. For the purposes of this paper, society is divided into three social strata: the economically deprived and relatively powerless, a numerically small but growing group; the relatively advantaged or relatively
privileged, numerically the largest group; and the very few who are the privileged and who maintain their privilege through economic power. There are no distinct demarcations between these three strata; the edges are fuzzy and one does not cross some line, some arbitrary measurement, to move from one category to another. Location in a strata is based upon the possession of or access to, or lack of, economic resources which translate into social power.

It is this numerically large segment of society, the majority, the relatively advantaged, which is tightly tied to capitalist ideology because of their greater economic advantage and therefore their perceived greater loss if the system ceased to function at the status quo (Dudley 1997). Challenges to capitalist inequalities often are understood as challenges to the personal well-being of these individuals of mid to upper income and wealth levels. Revealing the processes of reproduction can best be accomplished within a privileged group because it is toward the educated and economically-successful that ideology is primarily directed. According to Chomsky, these groups themselves "become the instruments of" the ideology and are necessary "to promulgate and develop the ideological principles" (in Otero 1988: 765). They are the "primary targets of the manufacture of consent" (Chomsky 1989: 47). As C.W. Mills argues, this group is consistently referred to as "the public": a phantom group of individuals who cannot readily be assigned to any particular 'special-interest' group (1995: 81). Mills more specifically defines it as

...socially composed of well-educated salaried professionals, especially college professors; of non-unionized employees, especially white-collar people, along with self-employed professionals and small businessmen (1995: 81-82).

It is the ideas of this particular social group that are addressed here.

This study is based on the hypothesis that it is the majority, the mid to high income-earners and wealth-holders, but those without direct access to significant
production capital and/or great financial power, who are most consequential in supporting, and therefore in challenging, the day-to-day reproduction of an ideology which subordinates and constrains them while causing suffering for the economically powerless (Lefebvre 1976; Parenti 1978; Bauman 1992). These are the "silent majority", the middle level of the strata discussed above, around which the disadvantaged are scattered (Adam 1978: 8). This majority may be merely a down-sizing, rationalization, or the heading-off-shore of an industry from being included in the category 'disadvantaged'. The disadvantaged minorities and the relatively-advantaged majority are both dominated albeit in differing degrees, while those of Arrighi's top tier, the smallest of minorities, the powerfully privileged, rule and dominate. The use of the term "minority" for the disadvantaged, the bottom level of the strata, is deceiving as it conceals "commonality with dominated majorities" (Adam 1978: 8-9). The disadvantaged are 'repressed', whereas the relatively advantaged are 'seduced' (Bauman 1992: 112) but both groups live under domination. The smallest minority, the financially-powerful few, benefit from the reproduction of the system. The majority suffer repression or seduction.

Those of the peripheries and margins are much more consciously aware of inequalities which exist within the system because, due to their disadvantaged position, they must deal with the overt inequalities within their everyday experiences. Social movements which have tried to address social inequalities are faced with the non-committal reactions or worse the condemnation of the relatively-privileged. It is necessary to make the relatively-privileged aware of how they are equally dominated and inferiorized, of how they have been indoctrinated to perpetuate a system which dominates them and others (Mills 1995; Chomsky 1989). The top tier of large investors utilizes the resources of the majority investors to wield its economic power in self-interest for the financially powerful (Drucker 1993; Greider 1997). Because this group of small to moderate-sized investors is a numerically large group, it represents a great deal of potential power. It is my belief that social change that is more equitable can only be
accomplished through a concordat with this group. Since an examination of current print media and a review of the literature demonstrated a tendency to blame the victims of unequal economic power, it is necessary to achieve an understanding of the processes of legitimation employed by the relatively economically privileged in accepting political-media ideology. Though a challenge through deconstruction of the privileged position accorded the very-few may "appear incomprehensible to the seduced, and alluring yet nebulous to the repressed" (Bauman 1992: 112), it is an activity that must be attempted. Not to attempt such an endeavour would be placing oneself squarely on the side of the hegemon. There is great power here, if only in potentiality. The relatively privileged constitute a powerful resource for social change. They are both numerically large and financially powerful as a group, though they may be unaware of their potential power and not yet organized as a fiscal arbiter.

I have drawn on members of a relatively prosperous segment of the population for three main reasons. First, this segment of the population is rarely presented as dominated by an unjust system, they are equally dominated by the acquisitive minority, though they may be spared the problems that the less privileged sectors of society experience. Second, they are generally excluded from the sociological literature other than as a comparative group to the "worker" or "working class". Third, and most importantly, for social change to be implemented, and then to achieve any degree of success, it is essential that this group be a conscious, willing, and involved participant in that change.

Selecting the Research Sample

Income levels were not used as criteria for participation in the study since income levels can be inaccurate as a measure of financial status. An income of $40,000 or $150,000 can be deemed economically sufficient or insufficient dependent upon variables such as
the number of individuals being supported by that income, *id est* the number of dependents; high health care expenses, particularly for chronic conditions; number of incomes within a household; level of expenses such as one or more child attending university. There are other mediating variables but the above are sufficient to render income level an inadequate determiner for this investigation. Since, in the current form of capitalism, the majority of the populace has ownership of some investment capital through stock ownership, mutual funds, and pension plans, the participants were limited to individuals with financial investments of at least $25,000 but who were not owners of investment capital valued over $750,000, while acknowledging that this range is arbitrary. For the purposes of this study, "investments" incorporates cash investments only and does not include fixed assets (homes, cottages, time-share condos, business interests, etc.) nor private-use assets (cars, boats, planes, etc.). It is assumed that an individual who owns investments at this level has sufficient income or sufficient access to financial resources to place her within the criteria of middle- to upper-income earner or among the relatively financially-privileged. Limiting investments to $750,000 more than ensured that participants were not financially powerful enough to be considered in Braudel's top tier of financial-economic controllers: the top floor of the trade-exchange hierarchy—"the real home of capitalism" and the "anti-market" (in Arrighi 1994: 24-25) This investigation of the economy addressed the "middle-tier" of individuals: the small to mid-sized investors as described above.

Health care professionals were included in the study group. Since, these individuals are daily involved in the process of mediating health care and the economy, are on the front-lines of the domination of a social domain, health care, by the economy, it was felt that their understandings and insights would prove advantageous and produce effective data. The study group represented that segment of the Canadian public who control a large resource of economic potential but who currently have very little power over that resource.
Norman Denzin addresses the need to challenge "taken for granted understandings" that influence the meanings individuals inherit and use to construct their everyday lives. He also insists that research should focus on lived experiences "which radically alter and shape the meaning persons give to themselves and their experiences" (1992: xvi). These two areas of investigation involve routine reality maintenance and crisis reality maintenance, respectively (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 149). To ensure the chance of exploring the second of these two forms of reality maintenance, the sample included "down-sized" individuals. The presence of such persons in the study provided the opportunity of interviewing individuals who were, perhaps, in economic stress and who, it was thought, might be becoming marginalized. How would they interpret this experience in the context of the economic ideology?

As a consumer society our primary identity is as consumers. Our economic system is dependent on it. Marketing strategists have advertised products in a way that, as a populace, we have come to believe that our value is merely a reflection of possessions, of purchasing a variety of 'products'. Our worth has become embedded in what we own. The group studied, the relatively-advantaged, were chosen because it was assumed that this group had the ability to purchase and consume, or had that ability prior to being down-sized for those who fit that category. How would down-sized individuals face, deal with, explain, and interpret the situation when this power was constrained? Ideally, the study attempted to examine "the personal troubles of milieu and the public issues of social structure" (Mills 1959: 8). It is the clash of the self-reflective self with inherited social constructions that creates a redefinition of both self and the world in which the self acts (Denzin 1992: 83). The study also examined the personal stocks of knowledge of individuals who had not had such an experience and had not encountered this clash of existential being but were involved in routine reality maintenance of taken for granted understandings.
Participants in the Research

Ten individuals meeting the criteria of small to moderate investor, relatively privileged as described previously, participated in the research (see Appendix C for summary). All were mature adults, ranging in age from late forties to early sixties, and therefore had long, established careers. The participant group consisted of six women and four men. Four participants were born in countries other than Canada emigrating in their young adult years (during their late teens or early twenties); all are now Canadian citizens. However, by appearance all were "white, middle-class": none of the participants could be considered a member of a visible minority. All participants had post-secondary education—either college or university; three had graduate degrees. Interestingly, all participants viewed their investments as essential to their well-being and not as a luxury nor an incidental side-interest. Investments were considered absolutely necessary to retire "comfortably"—something they considered unlikely, if not impossible, without cash investments.

The marital history of participants displayed a high degree of 'marital-status' change. Two participants had been widowed; all others but one had been divorced at one time. The length of time since divorce varied greatly from very recent (measured in months) to nearly 30 years ago. Of the seven divorced participants, three individuals have remarried; four have remained single. Second marriages were of long duration: the participant who was divorced thirty years ago has been re-married for 25 years. The significant incidence of divorce may reflect the high pressures and stresses placed upon relationships (and consequently, on families) by the need to succeed in a monetarily focused society (Bertman 1998: 83-124).

Four individuals had worked in private institutions only, while two individuals had worked in the public arena only. The remaining four individuals had worked in public institutions having moved at some time into the private realm. Two participants
were retired—a primary school teacher and an industrial engineer—having worked in the public and private realms respectively. These two individuals had spent their working lives in the same profession and with the same employer; though one, the female, did take time off to raise two children, while the other continues to work in his field on a contractual basis. Appendix D summarizes the employment histories of the participants.

Ann is married and has three grown children. She possesses a Bachelor of Arts degree and spent her adult years working as a primary school teacher, though she did take off a number of years to raise her children returning to work when her first marriage ended. Divorced, Ann is now in a long-term relationship. Two years ago Ann took advantage of an early retirement package offered by the provincial government and is now enjoying her retirement. She grew-up in a middle-class household.

Linda was divorced many years ago and has remained single. She was trained as a Registered Medical Technologist specializing in Hematology and holds a B.Sc.. Linda considers her parents working-class, her father worked in one of the local automotive plants. Though her first job after graduation was in hospital, Linda had spent the past twenty years working for the same private medical enterprise. During the research, the company was sold and shortly thereafter her employment with that enterprise ended. Linda currently works in the United States for a private clinic which she views as career degradation.

Julie was widowed many years ago and is currently in a long-term relationship. She has two grown children and possesses a college diploma. Her career started in the federal government where she worked at the Department of National Defense and with Revenue Canada, but she has worked for the past 20 years in a private company as a architectural draftsperson. Though Julie has not experienced any negative effects of rationalization, she does have an unusual working arrangement with her employer whereby she only works when there is work to be done. Her income is sufficient that this
arrangement is acceptable to her. Both of Julie's parents were university-educated professionals.

Don is divorced, has two grown children, and has remained single. He emigrated to Canada as a young man having completed his MA in his country of origin. Most of his adult life was spent working for government institutions, either in management positions or as a post-secondary teacher. Don's story is extremely interesting: after a lifetime as a professional in the public sector, he has taken a non-professional position in private industry late in his career life. Don is currently working outside of his field of expertise. Due to these unusual circumstances, going from public to private, from management to worker. Don provides excellent insight into the different perspectives associated with public-private, management-worker employment. Don's family would be considered middle-class.

Rick is recently divorced with two grown children and is in a long-term relationship. Rick possesses a college diploma and has spent his adult life working in the private sector as a skilled tradesman, though not for the same employer. He has been frequently rationalized and has had to relocate repeatedly when companies have closed and moved to the United States, "south", or "off-shore". All his working life has been spent in private enterprises. Although he has continuously found new employers after a session of down-sizing, the upheaval and uncertainty it causes has left him drained if not defeated. Not surprisingly, Rick exhibited a great deal of anger during the interviews. Rick grew up in a working-class family.

Eric is single and holds a doctorate in Chemistry. He has worked in the United States and Canada and has traveled extensively throughout the world in connection with his work. His employment has been associated with high level scientific investigation, but he also possesses extensive management experience. Though always employed by private enterprise, projects with which Eric has been involved included working in conjunction with high level government institutions such as the American military, law
enforcement agencies such as the FBI and the RCMP, and Customs Canada. Over the years, Eric has frequently changed employers due to "financial downturns" in the companies with which he was employed. Eric recently returned to the city and is currently a self-employed consultant. His father worked as a labourer in the local automotive industry.

Bonnie was divorced many years ago and has remained single. Though she had originally attended university in preparation for a career in another field, Bonnie's career of the last twenty-five years has been as a legal clerk with the same private law practice. Having remained with the same employer for twenty-five years, Bonnie does not foresee any changes and therefore has had no negative personal experience with rationalization nor does she anticipate such an occurrence. Other than long hours, she is content in her employment situation. Bonnie comes from a working-class family.

Alex is widowed with three grown children and has remained single since the death of his wife. He emigrated to Canada as a young man and completed a B.Sc. here in Canada. Before retiring, Alex worked as an industrial engineer with the same employer and had been promoted to an upper management position within the company. Though retired, he still, on occasion, does contract work for various businesses in the metropolitan area. Having spent his working career with the same private institution, Alex has had no personal experience with rationalization.

Divorced when relatively young Jenny, has two grown children from her second marriage. She came to Canada in the 1960s as a political refugee. She was attending medical school in her country of origin and subsequently completed her schooling in Canada. Over the years Jenny has worked as a post-secondary teacher but most of her working career was spent in a management position with an out-of-province government institution. Recently, because of restructuring of health care in that particular province, her job was rationalized. Jenny returned to this city where she is currently in the process of establishing a private practice. Recently her husband became ill and has been unable
to work. She is now the sole income-earner. Jenny's parents are university-educated professionals.

Elaine is recently divorced with two grown children. She emigrated to Canada as a young woman and possesses a B.Sc. from her county of origin. Elaine has worked as a bio-chemist for the same government institution for more than thirty years. Due to the restructuring of health-care in the area, there has been upheaval in her employment environment over the last several years. Recently, her job has been threatened and she feels certain that within a few months her job itself will be rationalized. Elaine's family would be considered upper-middle-class.

Julie, Bonnie, and Alex, had not been directly affected by rationalization of the workplace (down-sizing). Rick and Eric had experienced repeated employment changes due to financial changes within the companies with which they were employed: both worked in the private sector. Linda and Jenny had experienced very recent change due to rationalization within the institutions for which they worked: Linda's experience occurred during the interview process. Of these two, Linda had been privately employed and Jenny had been employed by a government institution. Elaine is employed by a public institution and her job is currently being threatened by rationalization.

Rick, Elaine, Jenny and Eric have experienced the most intense effects of restructuring: Jenny and Elaine in the public realm; Eric and Rick in the private sector. This occurrence is contrary to expectations based on every-day discourse. Jenny and Eric are the highest educated and they, along with Elaine, have professions in the 'hard' sciences which are presented by media and political rhetoric as areas of natural success. One would have expected that they would have had lives untouched by major employment concerns. Jenny and Elaine did not experience problems until very recently and those problems were directly related to government policy decisions on health care. Eric has experienced the same problems over a longer period due to what he calls "the
nature of the business", the nature of highly technical, cutting-edge technologies. Rick as a skilled tradesman is in a career deemed desirable in the current employment markets. While it is true that he always has been able to find a new employer, repeated downsizings have been the norm for him over the past several years. Since these participants followed career paths that were suppose to protect them from employment concerns, it is surprising that they were so seriously affected in the current economic/social climate of disposable workers. As expected due to their relatively-privileged positions within the social hierarchy of society, both Jenny and Eric tended to be supportive of the status-quo. However, in later conversations with Eric, cracks in the veneer of that acceptance were becoming evident. In his words: "We did what we, as young people, were told would lead to the best career path. I did all the "right" things, and now I feel betrayed."

The discussions (taped interviews and subsequent conversations) with the participants produced informative, and what I consider important, data on the state of ideology in a representative group of a segment of Canada's majority. The participants provided much unexpected information; some of it was unsettling, some of it was surprisingly encouraging.

Participants' Sources of Information on the Economy

Participants received their information on the economy primarily from the news media: in particular from a variety of television and newspaper sources. These are the very sources that present the economy in a particular perspective that serves the expectations of a tiny segment of the population as discussed in Chapter Three.

Some participants named favourite television newscasters such as Peter Jennings of ABC, the financial commentator of CBC Morning, and Paul Ross of CHW1. While some felt the 'specialist' designation gave newscasters and reporters an aura of credibility,
others were more cautious in their trust of media sources. The City Star was mentioned by all individuals though the degree of reliance varied; from reading it everyday to reading it rarely, reading it thoroughly to "just glancing at it". Other print media mentioned were The Globe and Mail, The National Post, The Economist, The Washington Post, and newsletters from professional associations. Other electronic media included radio and the internet. The degree of awareness of the identity of the sources on the internet (the owners of various webpages accessed) varied amongst the participants. Some were very circumspect about the sources they accessed on the internet whereas others were totally unaware of who was providing the information they accessed. The CBC, both radio and television, was frequently mentioned as a source.

Castoriadis (1980) argues against the unquestioned acceptance of scientific proofs and attempts to demonstrate how those 'proofs' legitimate the current system. This was a common statement of participants in my study—that those who study such things as the economy had scientific knowledge to support their opinions. However, they also expressed Castoriadis' paradox that they, like everyone else, "know" that scientific knowledge is often an "illusion" (Castoriadis 1980: 240). Though claiming to depend on these experts for information, participants claimed the following: "Ask an economist that and you get a lot of waffling"; "My son is an accountant and he can't explain it"; "I don't think even the economists know". The responses tend to support Castoriadis' claim that even with the acceptance of the illusion of knowledge the system justifies itself through these specialists. He claims that the populace has been trained to believe in the validity of experts despite the paradox (1980: 242). This ambiguity of the validity of experts appeared in the interviews. For example, Ann, a teacher, summed up the paradox when asked from where she gets her information on the economy.

Well, I sort of believe the newspaper but then I shouldn't really. When it's written down I tend to believe it. But I don't really. When I see it on TV I'm more critical.
In spite of her ambiguous beliefs about the validity of the information, this was the information she used to make decisions about her investments.

Financial managers and fund managers were considered reliable sources of information on the economy by Eric, Don, and Linda. General discourse in the form of social conversations with co-workers, business associates, and friends was considered a source of information by a number of individuals. Three female participants considered fathers to be reliable sources because they were determined to be economically knowledgeable. Julie trusted her father's opinions as he was an economist for the Canadian International Development Agency. Jenny's father was a political science professor whose opinions she valued though she admitted that discussions not infrequently became friendly arguments. Linda valued her father's opinions because he was "very well-read in economics". Other family members were also mentioned as reliable sources of information. Don received clarification on economic issues from his son, an accountant, while Ann relied on her husband, a small business owner, for economic perspective. Alex's son-in-law is dean of a business school at a North American university. Though he did not mention that he valued his son-in-law's opinion on the economy, they are in frequent contact and it is possible that some of Alex's ideas are influenced by discussions with his son-in-law.

Exposure to media sources varied among the participants. Ann had little interest in economic and financial issues, relying on fund managers to look after her finances. In her words: "I really don't concern myself with that sort of thing" but accessed the news media for information on the economy. Julie was the most directly involved in her finances and checked the stock market reports in the news each day and took note of "economic current events". The majority of her investments were self-managed with twenty percent of her stocks invested in "moderately high-risk small cap technology". Julie attributes this proclivity to the influence of her mother who was "into real high-risk"
global-market investments. All participants accessed the news media in some form on a daily basis.

The primary source for economic information for the participants was the electronic and print news media. Therefore as a group, the participants represented an excellent source through which to study the effects of a specific ideology of economy as presented in the news media and whether that ideology dominated the understandings they held about their social-economic world.
Chapter 5: Hegemony

Hegemony and Ideology

Hegemony is held to be that state in which a particular system of ideas regarding social reality achieves dominance over all other interpretations of reality. An ideology achieves dominance by defining interests; thereby controlling the definition of what is socially desirable and ultimately determining what can and cannot be discussed in the public forum (Parenti 1978: 8; Bowles and Gintis 1986: 97; Stern 1990). Hegemony conveys the ability to direct knowledge in general—to control how a population thinks and what is determined acceptable and socially beneficial by the general population and by means of that control either influence the policies enacted by governments or facilitate policies preferred by government representatives. That control over public knowledge, and eventually over government policy, is exercised by a privileged few through a specific ideology which is primarily beneficial to them but is viewed by many authors as essentially deleterious to the remainder of a society's members; or at the least, to a segment of that remainder.

Hegemonic ideologies are not limited to this particular point in social time; rather they have been documented as an instrument of control by elite status-members in the written records of various and disparate cultures through time; what Barry Kemp refers to as "this vast surrender by the many and presumption by the few" (1989: 19). Even the world system, as an economic circumstance, is not unique to this point in time, rather it "should be recognized as having existed for some 5000 years, rather than the 500 years that has been conventional" (Gills and Frank 1992: 621-2, in Arrighi 1994: 8). In this
chapter 1 present those areas of discourse which reflect the economy as presented in the current political-media ideology and whether the presence of the particular ideology demonstrates control over those individuals studied.

The current study focused on common-sense knowledge (Gramsci 1971) regarding the economic as held by a group of relatively-privileged individuals within the context of an ideology made readily available through current media discourse. Since examples of that ideological discourse were drawn from daily print media and participants had accessed that media as a source of their knowledge of the economy, it meets Wolf's requirement that an hegemonic ideology achieve "continuous repetition, in diverse instrumental domains, of the same basic propositions regarding the nature of constructed reality" (1982: 388). Equally, the daily accessing of this particular medium supplies the "continual, day-to-day reproduction" that an hegemonic ideology requires (Adam 1993, 324).

However, the redundancy and easy availability of ideology does not of itself bestow hegemony. Those exposed to the ideology must hold its precepts in such a manner that other interpretations of reality are inaccessible or deemed irrational. The ideas held by participants must reflect that ideology when justifying decisions and interpretations of reality that may not be in their best interest.

Participants' Perspective of the Economy

Initially when asked directly for their meaning of the word "economy", participants provided an experiential and processual understanding that did not reflect the ideology. This divergence from the ideology is discussed in Chapter 7. However, additional questioning about the economy, and things economic, induced the subtle emergence of the political-media representation of the economy. When asked what constituted a good
or a bad economy—phrases taken from the media—the echoes of that ideology began to appear. First are some examples of a "good" economy.

Elaine: It means everybody is doing good. Business is good. Jobs are up there.

Bonnie: It means times are good. We've got low interest rates and things like that.

Don: [a good economy is] where you've got relatively high employment. My understanding is that it is necessary to have some unemployment for a healthy economy. [...] and where inflation is low, maybe less than 1%

Julie: So when the stock market is doing well—I'm making money. When it has a big drop, like it did in October, I feel poorer.

Jenny: If even the basic pay was the minimum wage [it] provides a comfortable living. For the minimum wage, for the 5 or 6 dollars an hour they're making, they can afford to buy basic housing and a basic car and decent food and that would be for me a comfortable economy.

These responses demonstrate aspects of the media ideology where the economy is linked to "good" business conditions, increased employment, low interest rates, and an active and expanding stock market. Cornelius Castoriadis argues that the discourse of the economic is contextualized within a concept of a political economy "established on the model of a physicomathematical science" that does not exist in social reality (1974: 23). The argument of Castoriadis is supported by the findings; when participants were asked about the economy in terms of the media ideology (good, bad, healthy, sick), they quickly resorted to the physicomathematical model.

Jenny's response (above) seems to differ in that though using the discourse of the ideology she shows concern for the working poor. Likewise, in contradiction to the
media ideology, for Jenny a "sick" economy occurred "when we have a lot of poverty". However, later in the conversation Jenny made the following statements about the reasons for a "sick" economy:

Because that's what's causing an unhealthy economy in the first place—the high wages! Because we need people who do basic labour. You cannot run a country just on [laughs] educated people. You need people actually doing the hard work . . . . And so I think that is a sick economy, when we see homeless people, a lot of homeless people, and . . . . I don't know. I think it's hard to judge today how much is out of laziness and how much is out of pure need.

Initially, Jenny determines that a "comfortable economy" is one in which those making the minimum wage are able to have the necessities of modern life: basic housing, a basic vehicle, and "decent" food. She seems oblivious to the impossibility of attaining those necessities at "5 or 6 dollars an hour". As a static condition, a poor economy for Jenny is one in which there is "a lot of poverty"—arising, one could argue, from families and individuals attempting to live on a minimum wage. And yet, she attributes the cause of an "unhealthy" economy to increases in wages—increases reflecting the struggle to escape poverty. There is no mention of increases in salaries, stock options in lieu of salary, or returns on investments as causing an "unhealthy" economy: it is merely the poorer segments of society attempting to gain a living wage that produces an "unhealthy" economy. Jenny's circumlocution about a "sick" economy flows from high wages being harmful to the need for labourers, to the homeless, to the debated validity of their homelessness. Jenny's ambiguity and ambivalence are not unusual. All participants suffered from varying degrees of ambiguity and/or ambivalence with regard to topics addressed in the interviews.

Other examples of a bad or sick economy were:
Ann: The banks increase their loans, increase their mortgages, and everything else, and you are suffering [if] you have been using any of those services or whatever... And then everything else goes down, and then they lay people off because they can't pay them.

Linda: A poor economy would cause prices to go up.

These responses, using the media rhetoric of bad, good, sick and healthy, more closely reflect the ideology of the political-media representations whereby a bad economy exhibits increasing interest rates, increased cost-of-living, unemployment (though, not associated with increasing efficiency and rationalization), and increasing prices. Whereas, the economy without value labels was descriptive, the valued economy of the ideology (as expressed by the participants) tends to be causal: if A then B. when A then B: A causes B.

There was, however, one response that indicated another paradigm existed in the economic stock of knowledge. After a discussion of the unrealistic demands of shareholders and the effects that that demand has on society, Alex gave the following description of a bad economy:

If they fail to realize that the bottom limit of profit should be flexible, much more flexible than it is today, to give the poor guy on a line or whatever the chance to work; if you raise that profit and you do not consider lowering it a little just to keep people working, they [the workers] are going to be without a job. Then the economy hurts.

Alex's description of an "hurt" economy is premised on ideas other than those presented in the ideology in that it assumes profit-taking has a direct influence on producing a bad economy—an economy which Alex views as not in the best interests of society generally.
It is important to note here that Alex is retired and his current income derives primarily from the earnings on his investments. Acknowledging that fact and in contradiction to rational-choice theories, Alex perceives the economy as "hurting" when shareholder demands for profit are excessive. (Alex considers 14 to 15% excessive). His interpretation does not presuppose, and in fact contradicts, the assumptions required by the media representation. This definition is unlike Jenny's bad economy described as an increase in poverty but originating in wage increases—a common concept of the ideology. What is noteworthy is that both Jenny and Alex derived their knowledge of the economy from the media and both expressed concern for those less-privileged than themselves, and yet their personal interpretations of what constitutes and causes a bad economy were considerably different. This example does not preclude the existence of the political-media ideology within Alex's stock of knowledge; in fact, just the opposite was the case.

Despite the fact that participants initially described an economy contradictory to the ideology, their concepts of a good or a bad economy were primarily in accord with the ideological perspective. Acceptance of ideological knowledge allows the controllers of the ideology to influence the general population as to the values placed on certain economic criteria—good and bad are value judgments. These definitions of values benefit the powerful-few, the top strata. As an example, I have used the ideological concept that high interest rates, inflation, and wage increases are harmful to the general populace—a concept that receives much media attention—to discuss how the aspects of the ideology, each and together, are hegemonic in that by dominating the thinking of participants, they influence the participants' decision-making against their own best interests. Due to the limits imposed by this study, I have simplified the economic 'mechanics' of economic policy as presented in the media.

The presence of a consensus within the group that high interest rates are a characteristic of a bad economy—as presented in the media ideology—provides consent
for policies which attempt to maintain low rates of interest *despite* the inherent contradiction for these relatively-privileged persons. Since the group studied have investments which they consider "essential" to their well-being (two are in fact retired and their income now is primarily derived from the return on those investments) the logical position would be to desire high interest rates, a higher rate of return on capital invested. And yet this was viewed by participants as a negative situation.

In the media ideology, interest rate increases are viewed as deleterious; they are implemented solely to control increases to a concept termed "inflation". In the current form of the ideology, this concept is a manifestation that is to be feared above all else. As the relatively recent period of double-digit inflation demonstrated, inflation diminishes the value of assets held by reducing the purchasing power of the dollar. It is acknowledged that double-digit inflation is harmful to the general populace by reducing the ability of individuals to purchase those items necessary to live on existing wages and salaries. However, very low inflation (the 1% or lower, as required by the ideology) is a critical concern only for those holding very large blocks of assets. At an inflation rate of 1%, the value loss on assets of $1,000 is only $10. On one million dollars it becomes $10,000. However, on a billion dollars an inflation rate of 1% produces an asset-value loss of *ten million dollars* ($10,000,000). Since, currently there are a significant number of financial players holding a billion or more in assets this example is not arbitrary. Zero inflation maintains the value of assets held and eliminates altogether the losses shown above. Hence, the economic discourse around eliminating inflation though presented as a concern for all society is ultimately of great concern only to those with extremely high-valued assets when one considers the relative value losses of $10 and $10 Million at an inflation rate of 1%. As this example demonstrates, keeping inflation very low benefits the extremely financially-powerful: a very small minority of the Canadian population. When inflation increases, the general public are penalized with higher interest rates. Helpful to low inflation rhetoric is the fact that most individuals
have mortgages on their homes which makes a low interest rate (and by association, very low inflation) appealing. The general public is told they must pay higher interest costs to stem inflation. We must ask "For whose benefit?" The general public pays more so that the very-privileged few can maintain the value of their huge asset holdings.

In the ideology, the major culprit blamed for increasing inflation is increasing labour costs\textsuperscript{11}—another characteristic of a bad economy identified by the participants—even though the significance of wage increases to increasing inflation is highly debated (Granovetter 1990; Greider 1997; Emmison 1986; for example). The significance and benefits of controlled and reduced wages to profit-hunters and profit-maximizers is so obvious that a discussion here seems superfluous. The majority of the populace actually would benefit if the two ideological companions of inflation (interest rates and wages) increased at low or even moderate rates. The relatively-privileged would benefit from increases to the interest rate by increasing the income on the investments that they feel are essential to their well-being on retirement without having to resort to the risks of stock-market investing; and workers would benefit from increased wage and salary rates. For the relatively-privileged to hold ideas contrary is paradoxical\textsuperscript{12} but of inestimable benefit to the privileged, financially-powerful few.

Assuring that a consensus exists about what criteria constitute a good and a bad economy allows the powerful minority to exercise sufficient control over the majority to meet their objectives of maintaining the value of their immense asset-holdings in the pursuit of ever larger blocks of financial assets and of appropriating significant profits from commercial enterprises, ultimately leading to increasing societal control through an ideology which benefits the very few but holds inherent contradictions and domination for the many.
Invisibility of Profit

In the political-media representation of the economy, profits are obscured, ignored, or transmuted into other concepts. Profits as discourse are anathema. Chomsky documents that in US president Bill Clinton's policy book, *Mandate For Change*, where he proposes "entrepreneurial economies" as the solution to societal woes, "[t]he word "profits" appears once" and Chomsky adds "I don't know how they sneaked that in, that's another dirty word, like "class"" (1994: 107). In the examples given for the Canadian media as outlined in Chapter 3, in particular the discussion of the "frigate saga", profit is not only disregarded, it is shrouded and concealed by discourse about the ineptitude and inadequacy of government. The reader is deliberately directed away from considering profit as significant to the topic of discussion. An example of transmutation of profit in economic discourse is the substitution of the word "jobs" for the term "profits". When large sums of public money are given to private interests it is associated with "jobs" or, more obscurely, with "job creation" and not as what it is—seed money for profit generation.

For the media representation of the economy, the strategy to obfuscate profit is successful. With the exception of Alex's discussion of the negative effects of shareholder expectations discussed in the previous section, profit was generally lacking in the discourse of the participants. When asked for their opinion on the large profits taken by Canadian banks, respondents related those profits to the service charges on their accounts. No concern was expressed over the profits other than that if the banks were making such high profits then they should reduce or eliminate the service charges for customers. The enigmatic nature of profit was evident when participants were asked directly about profit in relation to economic concepts. Though all participants associated inflation with increasing wage demands, when asked if profits had any effect on inflation the following responses were given:
Elaine: Profit? . . . What role does profit have to play in inflation? . . . You know, I've never thought about these things . . . I don't want to think about these things . . . Profits? . . . Well [sigh] I don't know. I'll skip that.

Don: . . . . . . No I don't [think they do]. Because profits are within the individual company. Prices and wages affect companies and they also affect you and me. Profits don't affect you and me.

Jenny: How much we charge for services, and how much . . . For example, a car costs 20 thousand dollars to sell. It costs them 5 thousand to produce it. The 15 thousand dollars goes into salaries, buildings, and the plants, and . . . the economy [laughs] . . . I don't know. I'm not an economics major. If you ask me an anatomy/physiology question, I may be better at it.

In each case, profit was inconceivable in the context asked and was quickly eliminated from the discussion.

Notice that Jenny's response includes the cost to produce the car and the excess consumer-cost goes to administrative expenses and even to the economy itself, but the concept that profit is somehow generated is unthinkable: it is completely lacking from her "example." Just when it seems she might acknowledge that profits are included in the price of the car she substitutes "the economy" and then effectively changes the subject—"profit" is removed from the discussion. The response of Elaine (above) to the direct question about the role of profit was telling. It was as if the word were foreign and not part of the general vocabulary. Elaine was not alone in her reaction to the term. All participants appeared disoriented by the term to some degree. Linda's response to a question relating to profit lead me to believe I might be in an entirely other culture than my own:
Well, I've never heard them talk about profits. No. No. Nobody. I've never heard profits—except for the company I work for.

The reaction to and lack of critical awareness of profits in the interviews forced me to return to "the media". After watching news broadcasts specifically for "profits", I found that it was indeed mentioned, albeit rarely and usually re-named "earnings" implying that profit is somehow "laboured for". Thus it appears that the word is used in such a context that we may hear or see the word but are encouraged to interpret it otherwise. The response from Don that profits are only "within companies" and that they "don't affect you and me" would tend to support this conjecture. Viewed in this way, the money assigned to profit is magically generated within the commercial institution: it does not derive from sales—from the money we pay for goods and services, or from the labour of workers producing those goods and services. Profit comes to be considered an essence that business people create out of thin air as they go about 'doing business'.

Omitted from discussion and therefore critical debate, the concept of profit is excluded from popular knowledge and discussion around the social implications of the current form of capital accumulation. Its omission allows profit maximization to take precedence over the social ramifications of job loss and quality of life issues. Rationalization of the workplace, pollution of the environment, and concentration of wealth can continue unabated because the premise on which they are founded—increasing profits—is an area that is not only excluded from discussion but equally to challenge that activity, or even to discuss it, is considered irrational (Berger and Luckmann 1966:66). Interests, objectives, and ideas not exhibited in the hegemonic ideology are deemed irrational, unrealistic, inconsequential, or even unthinkable. One is not allowed to debate profit—its levels or its morality—if the topic is not allowed to the table of discussion (Stern 1990: 40-42). One cannot critically debate those subjects of
which one is oblivious. This bias allows the philosophy of accumulation free rein to destroy the social fabric of society, including the dismantling of universal social-welfare programs such as health and education—society becomes enshrouded within a philosophy of accumulation and greed which McChesney terms "capitalism with the gloves off" (1994: 8)—and no other options are allowed consideration.

By obscuring profits from the public through general discourse, the ideology transforms the term, and its reality, into a non-issue. Profit has no meaningful existence in the stocks of knowledge associated with the economic and it cannot inform policy debates and discussions (Stern 1990). Since common-sense knowledge "is socially objectivated as knowledge, that is, as a body of generally valid truths about reality, any radical deviance from the institutional order appears as a departure from reality" (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 66). The responses relating to profit, and the lack thereof, seemed to indicate that questions relating to 'profits' were a "radical deviation" from reality. Ideological hegemony in this case is so absolute that any knowledge relating to profit is effectively obscured or invalidated, ultimately protecting the accumulative rights of the financially-powerful few.

Government

Another aspect of the media ideology as presented in Chapter 3 is the presentation of government in extremely negative terms: if not outright collusion and thievery, 'government' is guilty of, at the least, ineptitude and inefficiency. Additionally, government is chastised in the ideology for collecting far too much in taxes from "us" to fund "special interest groups"—the parallel "them". Three different characterizations of government as expressed in the media ideology appeared in the interviews: politicians as dishonest and immoral; government as inefficient or inept; and government as a
squanderer of tax dollars. For the research participants, government includes politicians, civil servants, and the abstraction "the government".

Most respondents expressed a negative opinion of government generally; however, most of that negativity was aimed at politicians.

Elaine: Some of it (tax dollars) gets stuck in somebody's pocket [laughs]. . . . and some more of the money that's made in Ottawa—well you know! [...] I think they're looking after themselves and that the country is secondary . . . . Well, I mean, I don't know, but everybody says a politician is a crook [laughs]. [...] I don't care much for the different social programs. Unless—again, see! I'm always coming back to the same thing—that the person or persons in charge of this are always thinking of themselves. So as much as they can milk-off the top, they will do so. . . . I don't trust anybody [...] And even if you have an honest person [in politics], that person is very easily corrupted by or influenced by all the others.

Alex: I have a hell of a time trusting anybody in governments and there's a lot of people saying the same thing. . . . What they do—they are manipulators. Anybody elected into a certain position, into government, they're not going to try to do what they promised you they would do. The first thing they do [they say]: "I've got to do something knowing that I'm going to be reelected". [...] That politician is just going to tell you what he wants you to know and do anything between . . . between back-room conferences. No I do not trust them—none of them!

Bonnie: I think they're all lining their pockets. [...] I don't know [where the money is going]. I think it's going into somebody's pocket.

Ann: [Politicians] are totally into the economy. Why do you think they got into office? . . . To siphon-off what they can for themselves . . . That's what I think [laughs]. Right or wrong!

The pocket metaphor was common in the participants' responses. Also, this area of discourse demonstrated defense of a view-point based on the opinions of others: "well
you know!": "everybody says a politician is a crook" and "there's a lot of people saying the same thing". "If it is common knowledge, it must be true" is the justification for holding a specific view; an indication that hegemonic ideologies do not arise from personal experience but rather are reconstructed during social interaction.

Individuals do not exclusively draw boundaries out of their own experience: they borrow from the general cultural repertoires supplied to them by the society in which they live, relying on general definitions... that take on a rule-like status (Lamont 1992: 7).

Therefore, it would appear that this concept, the culpability of government representatives, displayed a great deal of resonance within the participants' community adding to its perceived truthfulness and the concluded correctness of holding this particular view (Lane 1962: 417).

Jenny was the only participant who did not reflect this view of politicians while acknowledging that most other people did hold a negative opinion.

I'm not negative about politicians [but] a lot of people have a beef.

Though Jenny claims not to hold a negative opinion of politicians, her views expressed later in the conversation on the efficiency of government and its representatives did tend to contradict her claim.

All participants responded in some manner that politicians, the peoples' representatives in the government, were unreliable if not actually criminal, indicating a very high level of ideological hegemony on this topic. Citing the ideological "facts" regarding elected officials, all respondents displayed various levels of disillusionment with the electoral process, with a few participants indicating that the disillusionment was so severe that they no longer bothered to vote. Since government is the institution through which the citizenship is assumed to have its expectations heard and met, an
ideology which debases that institution essentially takes away its power and effectively severs the means to power and participation ostensibly held by the population generally. Disillusioned voters, failing to exercise their vote, assist the status quo by removing protesting or dissenting votes from the electoral voice. The very few, the financially-privileged, thereby ensure continued accumulation of wealth to themselves; the political voice of the many becomes smaller, quieter, and less powerful while the very few continue to enhance their power.

The inefficiency of government representatives, either politicians or civil servants, is another characteristic of the media ideology that was stated by participants. On this theme, Jenny's previous acceptance of politicians appears somewhat fragile and is in accord with the responses of other participants:

Jenny: [...] And then how much of the tax money is used for the right purposes, it's very hard for me to judge [...] But this stupidity of spending a million dollars on contracts for helicopters and then canceling them and paying millions of dollars to cancel them—I mean, we make some stupid business decisions. [...] Or look at the oil fields; how much the government put in there and never found a drop of anything. Don't blame it on poor people always! [...] And I've always said if we ran our households like some people run the government we would be in big trouble.

Rick: I feel those social assistance programs could be handled better under the auspices of the private areas—church, unrestricted governing bodies, volunteer groups. [...] Demote every director that's in the government right now. If you worked in the private sector and did the same god damn job they did, they'd be fired! They'd be out the door! Let them go on social assistance, unemployment! That's what they put in place didn't they?

Don: The first thing is that government-run institutions are, in my experience, usually relatively financially inefficient and relatively managerially inefficient.
Eric: I would say that [government debt and deficits] are probably inflated because of poor spending practices . . . So that could be mis-allocation of funds which happens a lot.

Ann: And they could have paid [the debt] off a lot more that this . . . If they didn't waste our money . . . . I mean, we give them our money in good faith that they're going to do the best thing with it. They waste it and then ask us for more of it and run up a big debt. That's exactly what happens. That's what I think.

There was general consensus among the participants that governments, and their representatives, are inefficient and waste a large proportion of the tax dollars they collect; this is in accord with the ideology and indicates a high level of hegemony. What is disturbing and perplexing is that Jenny, Don, and Ann were government employees—Jenny and Don both held management positions within government—and yet they chastise the waste and inefficiency of government representatives and employees. Referring to the incompetency he experienced in the public realm, Don stated the following:

Although there are competent people there . . . And they just don't survive. They go nuts! They either leave or they go nuts because the system is incompetent and most hospitals are not run very efficiently. The only . . . ah, exception I'll make to that was, I believe, Sunnyacres Hospital was run pretty efficiently . . . because they ran a pretty tight ship and everything they ran . . . You know, they tried their best. [...] But I always felt when I worked at Sunnyacres, and I put it down to the management at Sunnyacres at the time—Like I think they're very personable . . . I always felt I could go and say, "Look, this is a problem . . . is there anyway we can take care of it?". I mean, at Xerox Corp. [his current employer] they'd probably tell me to go screw myself.
In addition to the line-of-command inefficiency at Don's present employment in the private arena which he described as "impersonal", Don mentioned the "financial incompetence" of the particular corporation. In the example of discourse above, Don describes personal experience with a public institution that was efficiently run and a private institution that was not. Yet, his initial discourse reflected the media ideology that public institutions are inefficient. This example (including Jenny and Ann) may indicate that the ideology so controls thinking, has achieved such hegemony, that one's own experiences are nullified.

Hegemony of the ideological perception of government as an inefficient bureaucracy can be said to exist for the participants since all expressed this perception of government. What was interesting was that this inefficiency was nebulous: the most mentioned indication of inefficient programs was the indistinct "social programs". What was specified were projects as opposed to specific programs. For example, as presented previously, Jenny specifically referred to the helicopter fiasco and oil-field searches in Alberta. What is distinctive about these projects is that they are government funded enterprises that benefited or had potential to benefit the private sector: particularly large oil companies and large aircraft manufacturers, not small or medium-sized producers. However, as with inflation, the role of profit-generation seemed inconsequential or obscure to participants. What is important from the perspective of the media ideology is that government be viewed as inefficient which enables the sell-off of successful government enterprises and the dismantling of social programs with the consent and support of the public—and because such actions are presented as a 'tax-saving', they go with the blessing of the Canadian public even if the private holding of such enterprises and the loss of social programs are not of benefit to Canadians generally.

Though there was a generous distribution of anger throughout the interviews, it was with the discussion of taxes that participants expressed the greatest degree of anger. Taxes were a major concern and that concern reflected the political-media rhetoric
regarding taxes. For example, when Jenny was asked how the government most affects her life, though her initial response was to acknowledge that in fact it was from the government that she derives her income, she equates government thereafter only with taxes.

Government? Well, actually government affects my life a lot. Because I do billing through the government [laughs] The government? The billing, yes, and I get the GST rebate because of my medial profession, the taxation on my business, on my personal income, and . . . anything! Yes. Government affects the taxes I pay on the house. Yes!! The government is around me 24 hours a day!

Equating government with taxes in a disapproving manner was a very common occurrence in the interviews. Bonnie’s reply to the question of how the government most affects her life was simply "Taxes". When encouraged, she elaborated:

Why do we have more taxes than any other Western country? Because they decided that we have to pay more taxes. That’s why we’re paying more taxes! [...] Do you ever think: "Where does all the money go?" Lottery earnings. All these taxes. I don’t know—all kinds of taxes that you don’t hear about. You pay taxes but you don’t know where the money goes [...] Like who am I paying? Where’s the money going? It’s not benefiting me. [...] They’re always saying they don’t have enough for this, that, and the other thing. Where’s it going?! Where are all these tax dollars going?!

Don’s response to how the government most affects his life was:

By the taxes that they take and other things they take from me. [That] controls the amount of money I have available to spend or to save.
The same question to Eric generated the following statement: "Right now it's through taxes". All participants stated that the government most affects their life through the taxes they pay and which the government collects.

Alex had stated that the government's purpose was to provide an "healthy environment". When asked if it was accomplishing its purpose, he responded:

Oh, very well . . . . They do want the majority of the people to be happy. Those are the people which pay taxes. They want the money again. They get all the taxes that they can. [...] 50% of what [people] earn goes into taxes. Well, it is actually over 50%. Anything you go buy; you pay taxes. You buy yourself an item and there is PST and GST on it and then you might go: "I'm not going to buy that" because of it . . . . Taxes, I think, play a great role [in the economy] [...] The tax money, the government are misusing a lot of it. They do not provide the service they should for the tax money. We do not get good service based on the money we pay [in] taxes. Definitely not.

Julie expressed a certain degree of uncertainty about paying taxes. Initially she claims that she doesn't mind the amount of taxes she pays, but the end of her statement leaves one speculating about the candor of her acquiescence to her tax bill.

I do pay my taxes so . . . . Let's face it, if I didn't have to pay taxes I wouldn't be working [laughs] [...] Well. I don't mind paying my taxes if I feel I'm getting value for the money or if I feel the people who are unable to take care of themselves get a bit of a boost. But I certainly mind, uh, when I think they're . . . . um . . . . oh, spending it . . . . I have to admit at the end of the year when I have to pay more money, I bitch then.

In each and every case the participants viewed the government first and foremost as a collector of taxes; taxes which were judged to be excessive. The perception of government as presented by the participants, in accord with the media ideology, portrays
the government as "the hog at the wallow" much as Vander Doelen of *The City Star* had portrayed it, as discussed in Chapter 3. What is intriguing is that most participants seemed incognizant of the benefits that they received from governments—others received benefits, but participants appeared virtually unaware of any benefits accruing to themselves through government. Especially puzzling was the inability of those who were employed by public institutions, either presently or at some time in the past, to even acknowledge that their income was in fact derived from tax dollars (with the exception of Jenny's minimal acknowledgment mentioned previously). What was equally interesting, was that though social programs were mentioned as possible sources of government waste, and therefore responsible for the participants' high tax burden, participants were virtually unaware of the scope of corporate welfare and its effect on their taxes (Greider 1997).

All participants considered government a squanderer of tax funds: taxes that invariably were considered far too high. What was most impressive was that most participants viewed this activity of government (the collection of taxes) as their major relationship to their government, exhibiting little if any sense of community. Government was viewed only as a tax-collector; not understood as an institution which represents the interests of society as a whole. Any benefits accruing to participants personally through government were obscured and or unacknowledged. If an ideology is capable of instituting within the public mind the idea that tax levels are excessive and tax money is wasted through inefficiency, then government programs—but only specific ones—can be cut with public support because the public has been prepared by the discourse of high taxes and government inefficiency. The perception is that such cuts would both do away with wasteful institutions *AND* reduce taxes. However, public institutions and projects which are directly beneficial to large private interests, the privileged, are spared discourses of inefficiency and waste of tax dollars. Discourse about reducing taxes by reducing corporate welfare, or making the extremely wealthy and
corporations pay back-taxes and deferred taxes, or eliminating tax breaks for the extremely-privileged are not allowed to the table for discussion and are entirely absent from public discourse. The status quo can continue with the consent of the majority. That consent can effervesce into acclamation if the reelection rhetoric includes "tax cuts"; whether or not there is any intent to provide tax cuts for those beguiled by that rhetoric and its constructed need.

In the perspective presented above, government is viewed entirely as an economic entity. It is perceived as a collector, inefficient user, and absconder of tax dollars. The media ideology relating to government appears to be well entrenched in the minds of the participants. Tax levels are deemed excessive but the cause of high taxes are placed only within the inefficiency of government and social programs. Presenting the vague idea that tax levels should be at level other than they are, but not specifically defining what that level is, and concealing what the ramifications for the general public would be at those "reduced" levels establishes a deceitful construction for the benefit of a very specific group but of questionable benefit to the majority of Canadians. Through a fallacious media construction, financial special interests can employ control over the expenditure of government monies with the consent of the populace. Programs which benefit the public, either directly or indirectly, (usually under the rubric of "social programs" generally) are eligible for deconstruction or sale while programs benefiting the privileged few are spared even the slightest discussion or worse are not allowed into public knowledge at all.
Education

In consideration of the article in the local media relating to education as discussed in Chapter 3, it is interesting that participants expressed ideas very much in keeping with the media ideology—the concept of education as career-preparation rather than as an exercise of acquiring knowledge and the ability to think critically about any knowledge acquired (Mills 1995: 94-96).

Having had to relocate due to government cut-backs, Jenny made the following surprising comments about her educational choices when she was discussing the difficulties of setting up a private practice—a small business as a self-employed individual:

I am just sorry that when I did all this up-grading, I didn't do it in Business Administration instead of doing it in Medicine. It would have been so much more helpful to me. I wasted an awful lot of good years at school for naught. We were learning everything impractical and never learning anything practical—I would have been more prepared. But I'm learning everyday now.

Here Jenny is supporting the idea that knowledge of how to create profit supersedes the knowledge of health maintenance and disease eradication and that the latter are deemed "impractical". While acknowledging that Jenny's ideas are not an isolated situation, this perception of education seems a grievous statement about our society.

While discussing his career sojourn through the private realm, Eric made the following statement about the marketability of his profession:

So, [theoretical science] is not exactly a door to door occupation, profession. [...] That's how I got into the business program, because they had a—I forget the name of the degree, I think it's called a Special
Bachelor of Commerce. It meant that someone holding a relevant degree could get a business degree in a year. So that was one of the attractions. I figured accounting would be a portable profession. You could do it anywhere.

Like Jenny, Eric holds graduate degrees in the hard sciences; yet they both believed (and their experiences supported that belief) that the highest value in the job market, in the income-generating sphere, was business or commerce knowledge. Since their experiences supported that belief indicates that the ideology has acquired hegemony—is affecting and controlling how life is expressed in society, at least for these individuals. Rick was trained in technical skills, a job criteria believed to provide excellent employment opportunities and yet he also had returned to school to take business courses because of their perceived value in the job market. These individuals are not returning to educational institutions to upgrade their skills in their career specialties, which are located in the fields of science and technology: they are returning to the classroom to acquire knowledge on how to better procure profit for their employers or themselves.

Within the ideology and in the understanding of these participants, all other knowledges are considered secondary to the knowledge of creating and increasing profit though profit itself is not a discussible concept—it is virtually absent in public discourse. Obedient to the ideology, the activity of accumulating wealth (profit-generation) is the *sine qua non* of our society. It would seem that all other activities and knowledges are encouraged, indeed expected, to be subservient to it.

If the decision whether hegemony of the political-media ideology exists were based on the examples provided above then the inclination would be to decide in favour of hegemony. It would appear that an hegemony of certain aspects of economic reality does exist for the group studied. In consideration of the few responses at variance to the ideology, it would be unrealistic to expect that all individuals in any social group would
hold identical interpretations of reality. As Gramsci states, an ideology is hegemonic when it "holds together a social group, it influences moral conduct and the direction of will, with varying efficacy" (1971: 333, emphasis added). The varying efficacy of hegemonic ideology is supported theoretically by Stuart Hall (1988) and in the studies of Carolyn Howe (1992), Roger Janelli (1993), Michèle Lamont (1992), and Stuart Hall (1988). Therefore the few noted contrary responses to the political-media ideology are acceptable and expected, and the conclusion for hegemony is valid for the ideological perceptions of good/bad economy, disreputable government, inviolable profit, and career-prep education as held by the group participating in this study and reflective of the media representations.
Chapter 6: The Economy and Control

The preceding discussions have been primarily descriptive: what perceptions the participants held, based on their discourse; how that may benefit the top tier of the social hierarchy; and how holding specific views, while benefiting the top strata, in fact harms or constrains the participants and by extension the general populace. There has been little discussion of the actual processes involved. In this chapter, an attempt is made to examine possible processes of legitimation and reproduction of the ideology enabling it to achieve and maintain a status of hegemony. The hegemony of the ideology as presented in the participants’ discourse expresses as a mechanism of control. By controlling the definition of the rational—of what should and should not be, of what could and could not be—the ideology expresses a significant degree of social control.

Management Theories as Control

Many of the ideas regarding work and organizations expressed by participants in the interviews are echoes of the Classic Management Theories. The use of these ideas as forms of control is explained in Harry Braverman’s work (1974, 1984). According to Braverman, the Scientific Method of Frederick W. Taylor (1984) sanctioned the capitalization of labour by the owners of production capital (1974, 58). Workers (as craftsmen) not only lost control over their “instruments of production” but also over their own labour—the means and manner of their livelihood and subsistence. Labour now was
consciously considered to be owned by the owners of production capital. Only such owners would be capable of providing opportunities to convert labour power into labour.

Managers among the participants reflected this idea that workers were mistaken if they thought that they "owned" their jobs. The following example from Eric, who held management positions in the high-tech private sector, demonstrates how this manifested in the interviews.

Well, I mean, I've circulated a little bit and I've talked to production workers and listened to them. And my father was an ardent unionist all his life, and he had the opinion—he was involved in a few labour problems, not many—but he was always of the opinion that his job belonged to him. It was kind of owed to him. He never said that part but it was kind of owed to him by the company. And it was almost like an unwritten social contract that existed... And I never really subscribed to that.

Eric indicates that only owners of capital "own" the jobs and no one is "owed" a job. This is significant given that Eric has had his job rationalized over the past several years. If Eric accepts this philosophy, it becomes easier for him to deal with repeated joblessness, especially as he "did all the right things" as a young man such as gaining specialized education in the 'hard' sciences. If he is not "owed" a job, his anger arising from repeated rationalization will not be directed toward a social system where the ability to use his skills to provide an income is controlled by the owners of capital—currently the owners of large caches of financial assets and controllers of the financial markets (Greider 1997)—the privileged few.

Don, who had held management positions found himself in the job market after many years in the same job. He talked about the difficulties of finding satisfying employment when past the age of fifty and then attempted to explain why.
Don: I mean, what I was always taught in management courses was that if you can hire someone who's 50 or someone who's 30—hire the 30 year old. I don't have a problem with that. It's tough when it applies to yourself but I don't have a problem with that... CL: Doesn't that negate experience?
Don: Of course it does... But who gives... who gives a shit about experience? See experience usually demands payment. If you're going to hire you, with no experience and pay you $50,000 a year or get 20 years experience—what am I going to want? Say $100,000 a year... Well, they're going to say "Now wait a minute. We can pay him 100. We can pay her 50. We can save 50." [shrugs] I don't have a problem—I think that's—I'm not necessarily saying I agree with it, but I understand their way of thinking which I personally—I don't think is right, but...

Though Don claims to "understand" and not to "have a problem" with this philosophy, his anger indicates otherwise. Don understands the "rules" (Burawoy 1979) and insinuates that he has and would play by the same rules, accepting and reproducing the status quo. His repetition three times of "I understand" and his statements "It's tough when it applies to you", "I don't think it's right", and "I'm not necessarily saying I agree with it", indicates that another stock of knowledge conflicts with Don's management knowledge. Though Don plays by the rules, he is not comfortable with them.

The idea that only the owners of capital could provide opportunities to utilize labour was held not only by managers in the study but also by others in non-management positions demonstrating how insidious are the ideas of Scientific Management six decades after its disputed appearance in the academic and business communities. The appearance of its tenets in the participants' stocks of knowledge indicates that Scientific Management modes of thinking are not only systemic but legitimated by the general public. Not only do managers control workers through Scientific Management methods and ideas but equally the managers (and other professionals and "white-collar" workers) being aware of the tenets of this philosophy will themselves be controlled in their own positions and everyday lives by that same philosophy.
The consequences of knowledge control by the privileged few include power relations being "made invisible, submerged and embedded" in social structures; emphasis on status distinctions; an increase in monitoring and evaluation of activities; and the fostering of allegiance to the status quo (Edwards 1978: 108-109). The participants demonstrated each of these consequences. The use of "monitoring" and "control" as corrective measures for social problems was repeated by all participants for a variety of topics. The discourse of Eric, who had worked at one time as a technical recruiter for a laser development project, contains emphasis on status distinctions within work organization.

I hired twelve people for them in various technical functions: programming, a couple of mechanical engineers, design. And then in the end it got to be more mundane once the principle people were acquired—things like secretaries, shippers . . .

In Eric's value system professionals and educated technical staff are "principal" contributors, whereas secretaries and shippers are deemed "mundane": of less value to the enterprise; become objects of production ("things"). Labour is perceived as less valuable than knowledge and management skills. These value perceptions of individuals, based on the work they do, are carried into everyday life since the work environment is a major portion of an individual's daily life. Individuals become valued as people by a criteria of value constructed by proponents of Scientific Management ideas. I concur completely with Dorothy Smith (1987) that the working-world is merely a segment of the everyday world and that there can be no distinction between work and everyday life. The ideas held by participants with regard to the work environment are held in their personal stocks of knowledge and as such are carried into all social interactions—there can be no separation.
Horizontal Conflict

In the interviews, one very strongly held view which achieved total consensus within the group was to blame victims of financial power disparities for economic "problems". Since this thesis is based on the argument that the majority of the populace are victims of systems of unequal access to societal resources, it would be more correct to use the term co-victims. This idea is supported by the fact that though blame was often placed with those lower in the social hierarchy, blame was also placed with those of equal social status. The tendency to blame other victims which appeared consistently throughout each and every interview was frequently accompanied again by various degrees of ambiguity and ambivalence. The three major groups of people blamed were: workers generally (including co-workers); welfare recipients; and government workers, especially. This recurring tendency among participants may be indicative of one process whereby an ideology achieves and is able to maintain hegemony.

As we saw previously, Jenny blamed workers attempting to increase their wages for "causing an unhealthy economy in the first place". Frequently, blaming workers for economic woes occurred in conjunction with participants' perceived inability to purchase the rewards of our monetary system, as the example from Julie, when asked if workers should be able to ask for higher wages, demonstrates:

Well, they can but I think they're shooting themselves in the foot because I am sickened by the United Auto Workers labour rights. Like [a] guy [I know] is in the skilled trades in [an auto plant] and he makes 27 or 28 dollars an hour. He's there as an insurance policy. He's only there if something breaks down and [he worked through Christmas]. He was probably making 75 bucks an hour. That's ridiculous! And just the people on the line—and it's reflected in the price of cars. I know I've just had the idea recently—when I'm going out to buy a new car this spring, even though with the low interest rates that they're offering, I might look at a car that's one year old and still has some of the long-term warranty. And I mean I am not poor, but with their SPA weeks and their shutdowns, which
I suppose they fund with their own SUBS, I don't know . . . I don't think they should be able to demand whatever they want.

And there are many instances—one in Smalltown, at Double-X Corp. They worked, and they were making a darned good wage for unskilled work in Smalltown. . . They were making probably 13 or 14 dollars an hour—walked out and Double-X Corp closed down the plant and moved. That was a good job and I'm not trying to sound like a snob or anything, but they didn't have to drive into the city. It was right there in Smalltown . . . I mean you're saving a buck an hour easily.

Notice that according to Julie, Double-X Corp closed the plant because workers were asking for more money (an idea located in the ideology) rather than because the company could attained higher profit margins at another location where it is assumed labour was cheaper. Julie implies that the wages labourers and skilled-tradespeople receive ($13-14 and $27-28 per hour, respectively) are too high and are "reflected in" the price of the products we purchase. At the second interview, when asked to comment on the fact that a CEO working for Sprint earned the equivalent of $9,855.77 per hour (Wall Street Journal 4.22.98; see Appendix B), Julie's response was only to repeat "I'm sickened by that". There was no anger in her voice and no parallel discussion of how this remuneration may be "reflected in" the price of the product consumers would purchase.

According to Julie, the fault for price increases and company relocations lies entirely with the workers rather than with profit-seekers. One participant, Eric, demonstrated the logic of such a perception by asserting that such a large remuneration was not excessive since those making the decision to pay a CEO that amount must have determined that the person was capable of achieving greater sales for the company; and not only would this large remuneration be covered by the higher sales generated by this individual, but also costs to the consumer would remain unaffected or could even be reduced.

The examples of Jenny and Julie above present a knowledge that workers' demands for what were perceived of as high wages were directly responsible for harming the abstracted economy and also for the high cost of purchases they wanted to make—a
knowledge reflective of the media ideology. No consideration was given, by either Jenny or Julie, to the large profits taken by corporations or the excessively high remuneration packages given to top company administrators for increasing consumer cost. In fact, Eric argued that the extremely high remuneration paid to the top CEO's could reduce consumer cost. When asked about the high remuneration taken by top company officials generally, Ann responded:

. . . . . . . . . . . . Yeah. I think that's OK as long as it's not excessive, you know. Like you've got to have some people making a high salary because they're the ones who are going to buy the brand new cars, the big appliances, the big stereos, the big homes and that. Like you need that, you need . . . Like if everybody made minimum wage who could afford anything? So . . . then it starts spiraling downwards because all that big item stuff is sitting there. Nobody's buying it . . . well . . . How can you pay your workers? So somebody's got to buy it and if you don't make a good salary you can't . . .

Notice that Ann uses the phrase "as long as it's not excessive" but what was considered excessive was not stated. The premise of Ann's argument is that those on the higher rungs of the hierarchy have a right to purchase the big-ticket items and are benefiting those lower on the ladder by doing so: whereas, workers on the lower rungs are not necessarily entitled to such things and they are chastised for causing the costs of those items to rise. The implication is that other workers are ungrateful that the richer citizens are able to purchase these items enabling these other, abstracted, workers to toil in lower-paid positions.

The second group blamed for economic adversity was welfare recipients. With this group a great deal of ambivalence was presented. While all participants stated that there was a need for social assistance programs to aid people in times of trouble or for those who were unable to provide for themselves, all participants at some point in the interview, with the exception of Bonnie, placed blame on those who receive social
assistance payments. Frequently, the negative perceptions of welfare recipients were based on anecdotal stories that seemed to have reached mythical status. Though I did not investigate the occurrence, it seems likely that at some point similar anecdotes were perpetuated in the media, since, as they were related the discourse had a familiarity to it. Some examples follow:

Ann: I mean like we had all those parents at Regency School. All of them on welfare. And they would come about 10 o'clock and bring their kids their lunch... so that they would stay at school and not come home for lunch. They didn't want to bother with them... you know. There they are! On welfare... and they can't even get up and get the kid organized for school. You know?... And we're working our butts taking care of these kids and they're sitting on their butts doing nothing, you know... Can't even get the kid a lunch and then when they bring it it's crap. Like it's not healthy stuff?... And then they have cigarettes. You know!... [laughs] But, you know, they're on welfare!!

Note that for Ann, all parents at the particular school were "on welfare". Ann depicts all these parents with the same descriptive bias. Not only are they bad parents because they are on welfare, but also they are responsible for teachers having to work so hard. Note that Ann uses the phrase "taking care of these kids" rather than "teaching these kids" implying that the teachers are caring for the kids rather than the parents. By Ann's reckoning all welfare parents sleep late, do not want their "kids" around, and provide un-nourishing food while wasting money on cigarettes. Ann was totally unaware of her universalizing or of the illogic of her statements.

Rick, on the other hand, was able to concede that not all social assistance recipients fit his description:

... I don't believe in social welfare programs. Not the way they're governed today... I think they're inefficient, inappropriate... [it] makes
people lazy . . . unproductive . . . That's the bottom-line. They're administered inefficiently and . . . people who are on welfare—not all, I shouldn't say that—some of the individuals who accept welfare . . . are very . . . inefficient in using it to their advantage. They're addicted to the system . . . They don't want to get off it. They're addicted to it because it's so easy . . . [...] Proof of the thing is women have kids and the husband leaves, get welfare and the guy comes up once in awhile—once in a couple of weeks.

Though Rick attempted to avoid the universalizing that Ann displayed, he did revert to the ideological discourse of inefficiency when criticizing social assistance recipients. Additionally, Rick's final "proof" has a universalizing resonance for "women" in general. However, it may be his intent was that only "inefficient" welfare women are being described by this last statement.

Jenny displayed the greatest degrees of ambivalence and ambiguity throughout the interview process. As she states, Jenny lived in a socialist environment before coming to Canada and had spent a period of time living on a kibbutz in the Middle East in the 1960s—an experience that she views as essentially positive. Now that she is in the process of setting up a private practice, in essence becoming a small-business person, and because she relies quite heavily on the opinions of her husband, a business-oriented individual, she is constantly attempting to make two knowledges—two value systems—congruent. It was, at times, painful to watch her attempt to accommodate the two perspectives.

Well don't ask me, I believe in them. I grew up in socialist countries, so I think that is a basic of any democratic country—having a social welfare system. There are people who need help at certain times. And I think . . . for a country . . . an industrial country, they cannot call themselves "civilized" if they don't have some form of help for people in need. So . . . It's from health care, to education, to paying rent for somebody who is in need. I think, when there is abuse in the system, we should clamp on it because people have to have a pride in their existence . . . And sometimes giving something for free takes away pride in existence. And so it should...
be watched. But there are times when people need help and they . . . they should get it. I mean, I . . . I would not want—you know, one woman with four kids sitting at home, you know [deep sigh].

Jenny's initial response was the importance for a society to provide for its members—a strong sense of community. As another understanding enters her discourse—that helping those in need can harm them—Jenny becomes uncomfortable and stumbles for words. However, she still speaks in the plural—the social community still exists in her discourse. Nevertheless, the more recent knowledge wins out, and contrary to the preceding discourse, almost out of context, appears the negative perception of a woman on welfare. The sense of community has vanished and a singular individual, a constructed entity—the mother on welfare—is the focus of blame for "abuse in the system". However, Jenny's non-verbal response after this comment demonstrated that she was not comfortable with her condemnation.

The greatest anger and blame was directed toward government workers. This reflects the animosity displayed toward government generally; however, in this case the reasons for the animosity were very specific and indicate quite clearly an underlying process of control. Though the following examples are quite extensive, I felt reproducing them was necessary to demonstrate the substance and form of the discourse. Note the recurring themes between examples. The participants are following some template that has become a part of the general stock of knowledge. Of special interest is that both Elaine and Jenny were, or had been, government employees; a situation of which they seem totally unaware during their discussion. Alex and Eric have worked only in the private sector, while Julie worked at one time in government but has worked in the private sector for about twenty years.
Elaine: I think the people that work in the government, they think perhaps that they have . . . that they’re better off than the people who work in industry . . .

CL: When you say "They're better off", specifically—
Elaine: Well, they're better off in the way they—It's a government job. They get better pay, perhaps—maybe not that much, but they have better security . . . health care-wise, and . . . whatever-wise . . . I think perhaps, the government jobs are better . . .
CL: Is there a distinction between the people who take those jobs, between—
Elaine: Oh, of course there's a difference. Yes. I think working for the government—it's an easier job because you sort of slide by. You have an excuse for everything. But if you work for, let's say a private industry, you have to work because you want to make . . . this work. It's your life . . . It's you . . . And you know in the government, they are only working for somebody else . . . And some of those people probably don't even care what goes on . . .

Jenny: Well. I think once people work for government for a long time they get a little bit complacent because its much harder to lose a job from government than it is in a private organization. And so, when they're in the office sometime too long, sometime—but you find that in any job. Even in the hospital where I was working you need a shake-up maybe every 2 to 3 years to get people out of complacency, to pay attention again say against cleanliness or poke injuries and stuff like that and the same—if you're working for government for a long time people get complacent. Their pay-cheque comes if they produce or not . . .

Alex: I agree that they are overpaid . . . Yeah. I think . . . that . . . the ambition of a civil servant . . . is not the same as anybody who had a lot of experience working in Ford, GM, or Chrysler. It's much, much different. Because . . . the . . . output one has to do to earn the money there is important. Civil servants, you know, the money they get—they do not really worry about their output as one would working in the private sector.
CL: Why do you think that is?
Alex: Because it's . . . it's something where . . . a human mind is such that working for the government: "If I don't do it today, I can do it tomorrow" [laughs] That type of thing. "I don't have to bust my butt to be able to justify the type of work I do for the money I get" . . . Privately, it's different. Continuously, people would have to justify the thing they do. I mean they're controlled by it. There's more control in private business than in government. I think that is because a human mind probably gets more relaxed. [laughs]
Eric: . . . . Well, earlier in our conversation, I eluded to the fact that certain people when they’re in jobs for a while they kind of take it for granted. . . . And I would think that—I mean witness the government down-sizing at the federal level of a few years ago. And there was quite a bit in the press about these people complaining about the situation and the rebuttal from . . . the private sector, saying this goes on in the private sector all the time and when things are bad we suffer and when things are good we benefit, just because of the ebb and flow of economic times. And the civil service, by and large, have been protected from the vagaries of the economy like the rest of us. So that’s how I see it being different—job security . . . . . . If I were in the civil service, and I know quite a few civil servants—and they have probably enhanced job security over the general populace. They should not expect their salary levels to be reflective of comparable activities in the private sector because they have this job security aspect that those other people don’t . . . . And not only that, but you see they tend to confuse their activities with similar activities in the private sector and therefore tend to value them . . . along the same vein. Which of course they have no basis for doing. Because they’re completely different spheres. It’s like somebody being a cobbler in the Trans-Jordan as opposed to downtown Toronto. And the whole cost and . . . benefit structure is different. So, then you can’t expect comparable remuneration. You know, that kind of thing.

Julie: I’m glad I got out of government [forcefully] because I think it kills initiative. Well, I think it doesn’t encourage people to excel. It encourages mediocrity. . . . . At my level anyway—well, I was fairly fortunate. . . by not excelling I could still work my way up [laughs]. [...] . . . Well, number one, I knew I had a job for the rest of my life. And a good pension at the end. And . . . wage hikes. And most of the people I knew, especially at DLQ (a department of the government) had been at the same level for years. It’s pretty easy to move up a little bit. [...] I’m glad I left the government. And maybe at another level and maybe if I had been a little more . . . within myself had more initiative, I would have been . . . able to get ahead. So, I—now mind you all these years I could have gone and gotten an engineering degree and I haven’t, so . . . .

In the above examples of discourse, government workers are viewed as lazy, lacking initiative, unproductive or over-paid. However, what seems to be the greatest fault, according to participants, is that government workers have a level of job security that
they themselves lack. The fact that many government workers have been recently, and are continuing to be, rationalized was not significant enough to counter the hegemony of the ideology associated with government workers nor to nullify the perception of increased government job security. This is especially true for Jenny whose government job was recently rationalized and Elaine whose government job was in jeopardy at the time of the interview.

In a period of continuous rationalization in both the public and private sectors the significance of job security is paramount. It appears that participants may be attacking "others" from their own sense of insecurity. It is also possible that the unions and welfare recipients are attacked for the same reason—that they are viewed as having more security than these participants—workers through union rights and welfare recipients because they receive a cheque "automatically" each month. This argument is supported by the responses given when participants were asked what was the most important thing that money provided for them. The unanimous response was "security". However, further research would be required to investigate this relationship.

By focusing blame horizontally toward peers or downward toward labour and welfare recipients, the structures of inequality protecting the accumulative rights and positions of power of the upper strata of the hierarchy are protected. How that is accomplished is addressed in the following section.

**Horizontal Conflict as Control**

While Richard Edwards (1979) studied hierarchical control, in *Manufacturing Consent* Michael Burawoy moves the focus from production to reproduction of society through horizontal controls. According to Burawoy (1979), the ideology and rationality of social organization have become institutionalized in a form that obscures property relations.
gives normalcy to production relations, and elicits consent to the pursuit of profit. Because of the way society is organized—everyone must have a source of income—we are forced into certain choices that "generate consent to its rules, its norms . . . we are compelled to play the game, and we then proceed to defend the rules" (Burawoy 1979: 93). In this manner coercion is rarely required because individuals are then pitted against peers or attack those lower in the social hierarchy in defense of the "rules".

Defense of the rules seemed very prevalent in the interviews. Julie, a draftsperson who defended the rule that only productive time should be paid, has agreed not to work during "slowdowns" and not to be paid for these periods.

... I won't sit there and do nothing . . . That goes against my grain . . . There are people there who do that . . . I could stay and sit and do nothing and make my wage . . . but I feel it's almost dishonest.

The use of the term "dishonest" shows that for Julie breaking the rules is a moral issue. Defense of the rules, effected vertically or hierarchically, supports the privileged position of the financially-powerful few while effecting control by displacing conflict horizontally. The simple and accepting statement in the following example from Jenny when she was discussing how she believed that the working poor should not have to pay taxes on their income indicates how rules which support the status quo have achieved an aura of unquestioned normalcy.

And I think there should be no taxation for people under a certain income. And I don't mean under six thousand. I mean under, say, twenty thousand. Maybe higher taxation for people who are, you know—I know it's not right to tax the really, really rich, but . . .
Jenny seems to accept the philosophy that "the really, really, rich" must not be taxed as a rule, as a truth. Her concluding "but . . ." indicates the contention of differing knowledges within her argument; it seems to indicate that she feels the need to justify her suggestion of taxing the "rich" which would be in contradiction to the ideology. The indication here is that the hegemony of the ideology, that the top strata—the financially-powerful few—must be protected from carrying their share of the tax-burden, is extremely strong and helps to explain the lack of out-cry in the general public regarding the fact that the "really, really rich" often do not pay taxes. The peer-rule that everyone must pay their share of taxes does not get transferred upwardly toward the higher levels of the hierarchy: it only applies horizontally, or more frequently, downward. Playing by the rules only applies to those on the same or lower social level, the very top of the hierarchy plays by no rules, as Arrighi (1994) claims.

Another example of defense of the rules horizontally came from Linda who at one time worked in a public hospital but is now working in private industry. She complained how in the hospital environment workers broke the rules by taking longer than the allotted fifteen minutes for coffee breaks. According to Linda workers in private industry were much better at keeping to the rules and were therefore more valuable workers. The implication is that this is how one must behave to be considered "a good worker" and if one wishes to maintain her employment. With employees holding this particular belief, other means of coercion are less likely required—individuals will assist in keeping their peers "in line".

An instructive example of how control is accomplished at the everyday level by displacing hierarchical conflict as horizontal blame comes again from Linda. She experienced frustration when her raise was not as high as expected. Initially, when discussing how her work environment has changed with rationalization of the workplace she expressed mild disappointment.
My attitude has really changed. I don't have the . . . It's almost like I don't care . . . If I make a mistake now I go "I don't care" [shrugs her shoulders].

Linda, who was generally mild-mannered, appears to be expressing disappointment with her employer's new policies implemented to protect profits. However as she continues, her "upset" becomes displaced horizontally toward co-workers.

I was really upset with the raise I got this year . . . because I was doing so much work. I didn't even get as much as some other people. You know how they raise? They raise what [people] made an hour—if they made less to bring them up to our level. In effect, they're [the employers] paying less money because they're [co-workers] making less monies. I was really ticked off, really ticked off. I got a 1.9% raise and it went as high as 3%.

The importance of the unfairness of the raise and her perception of "deserved-ness" arise again later in the interview. This time mild-mannered Linda allowed her anger to surface. Her response demonstrates the effectiveness of horizontal control.

[spoken with firmness, assertiveness] I've always been a hard worker and I see other people I work with, what they get away with. But if I do that, I get reprimanded . . . How come they get away with it and I'm working twice as hard and . . . [voice drops in tone] You know, like I got . . . I'm happy with what I've got. I'm not complaining about what I have . . . I just think that . . . [spoken quietly] it should be more fair.

Initially, Linda seems to be angry with her employer; however, once she allowed her anger to show, the anger was focused on co-workers who were perceived of as slacking-off and not working as hard as she. The original source of her disappointment, the failure of the company to pay her what she felt she deserved, was obscured by the perceived
inadequacies of other workers. The blame has been deflected toward co-workers, whom she perceives as not working as hard and yet receiving equivalent to or higher raises than hers. After her anger has been vented, Linda was "happy with" the previously inadequate raise, and resorted to calls for "fairness" among co-workers. The "unfairness" previously claimed against the employer is now defused—the danger of questioning the profit-accumulative rights of the employer are neutralized.

Near the end of the interview Linda returned to the issue of the raise when I asked her about the term "profit". Linda's anger came through again, but this time it was centered at the cause of her original disappointment.

That really pissed me off! After this year, when I worked my butt off and didn't say a word about it. And I thought I was going to get a good raise... I just—I don't know [spoken more softly] I don't kill myself anymore. They (the employers) keep saying... [voice rises again] "Don't. You can't work overtime". [They] prevent you from working overtime and when you have overtime [they say], "Leave early when it's allowable!"... Screw you!!
CL: ... So, you end up working harder?
Linda: Yeah. Yeah. So, I've slowed down. Too bad! I don't care!...

Though Linda's anger now appears to be directed against her employer, in fact it was deflected yet again. As a form of resistance, she claims to have slowed down her work effort and isn't as careful about mistakes. Her attitude is summed up in "I don't care!" Her comments are unsettling considering that she works in medicine. Considering the ramifications of Linda's resistance, the effects of which would act horizontally to the general public as health-care-seekers, the resistance is again deflected away from the instituting cause of her anger—the failure of her employer to pay her what she considers a fair remuneration—and directed horizontally toward the general public. I would argue that this translation of hierarchical domination into lateral antagonisms goes far beyond the work environment. It is endemic within society itself and is a major contributor to
the reproduction of systems of inequality. The fact that Linda’s anger surfaced in its greatest force while calmly discussing "profit" indicates that what may be displayed here is one of Cornelius Castoriadis' (1989) "germs of resistance".

As Burawoy (1979) argues, the tendency to blame victims of domination (the relatively powerless or social peers) is an example of horizontal conflict-deflection—a form of horizontal control. Directing anger or blame horizontally or downward, protects the top levels of the hierarchy from scrutiny and question. However convincing this argument is, it is still only descriptive. Rosabeth Kanter (1977) provides some insight into the possible processes involved in horizontal conflict as a means of control. Kanter cites a study of Karen Horney which demonstrated that people will attempt to dominate others when they feel anxious, helpless, inferior, or insignificant (1977: 323).

When a person’s exercise of power is thwarted or blocked, when people are rendered powerless in the larger arena, they may tend to concentrate their power needs on those over whom they have even a modicum of authority. There is a displacement of control downward . . . In other words, people respond to the restrictiveness of their own situation by behaving restrictively toward others (Kanter 1977: 323).

In each case where participants blamed victims, they had themselves experienced frustration of personal expectations or interests; additionally participants displayed unexpected anger toward various sources "in the larger arena" (politicians and government, for example). These two situational occurrences found in the interview transcripts support Horney’s findings. Julie’s thwarted new car purchase was blamed on auto workers; Linda’s unsatisfying pay-raise blamed on co-workers; an aggressive attitude toward civil servants because of their perceived poor work ethic and job security—the are all examples of horizontal conflict as social control. The displacement of anger onto the less powerful or onto peers is attributed to the structure and organization of society.

The bureaucratic machinery of modern organizations means that there are rather few people who are really powerful. Power has become a scarce resource that most people feel they lack . . . [T]he organization places
severe limits on everyone's freedom of action. The powerful get more, but they still share some of the mentality of powerlessness (Kanter 1977: 331).

Many of the participants in the study displayed indications of powerlessness over society or over aspects of their own lives, despite the fact that generally they are considered relatively privileged and therefore in possession of some level of social power. They all at some point expressed thoughts of: "What can you do about it?"; "You can't change the system"; "There's nothing we can do". Their responses support Kanter's claim that there are few people who feel powerful and very few who feel they possess sufficient power to change the status quo.

Generally, when participants did reveal a sense of powerlessness it was not generated by their perception of the economy. Their sense of powerlessness originated from a knowledge of the extreme power certain financially-centered individuals or institutions had over their lives and their perceived inability to change the way society functions. Society now is organized in such a manner that "the net result is an atomized society of disengaged individuals who feel demoralized and socially powerless" (McChesney 1999: 11). This sense of alienation and powerlessness was associated with anger. Though I had expected some expressions of anger, the degree of anger during interviews was surprising. Most frequently, the participants' powerlessness was derived from, and their anger was directed toward, government generally, whether the institutions of government, the individuals working for those institutions, or politicians generally. Since participants blame of government workers, specifically, was grounded in issues of security, and security is associated with the possession, or lack thereof, of control and power over one's life, the anger expressed toward government generally becomes understandable and is in keeping with the arguments of horizontal conflict as control.

Unfulfilled expectations and thwarted interests combined with the powerlessness generated by the very structuring of society results in frustration and anger. Building on
Chapter 7: Incomplete Hegemony

The topics presented in Chapter 5 demonstrated a high degree of consensus within the participant group that reflected the media ideology. Using Gramsci's conception of hegemony with its varying degrees of "efficacity", it was determined that for a valued economy (good or bad), invisible profit, culpable government, and commodity education, a high level of hegemony had been achieved. However, it also was discovered that the participants' perception of economy at the everyday level was unlike the media representation suggesting that the hegemony was not absolute.

In addition to a contrary perception of the economy, there were other concepts held by the participants that were in contradiction to the ideology. The argument presented here is that specific aspects of the media ideology identified in Chapter 3 have not attained a consensus in the participant group and that these occurrences indicate that hegemony of the media ideology is at best incomplete. I discuss four topics to elaborate this position: the economy; privatization of public institutions; government regulation; environmental clean-up; and the economy as a determiner of social life.

The Economy

My expectation in beginning this project was that those who participated in the research would echo the representations of the economy and the economic as portrayed in the media, by financial institutions, and government representatives. In fact, statements
echoing the fetishization and personification that was abundantly apparent in the locally-available newspapers was almost totally absent in the discourse of these individuals.

After an intensive search of the transcripts, two examples of such statements were uncovered. These statements are from Rick and Ann respectively:

So the economy is going to keep rolling ahead but to what sacrifice?

and

It's just sort of a self-feeding monster. Just like it all just happened! Who can control it? You can't!

Here the economy is viewed as an entity separate from the activities and decisions of people. It is a being with its own agenda: a being that mere humans cannot control. This is a perception in keeping with the media representation. The two statements above also reflect a sense of powerlessness—an hegemonic ideology's "loudest message is that there is no alternative to the status quo" (McChesney 1999: 15). All participants expressed this sense of alienation from power or control over their lives and their society at some point in the interview process.

For the other participants, though they often defined the economy in terms of jobs, it was in a pragmatic and entirely different sense than the media-political discourse around 'job-creation' (Chomsky 1994: 107). It must be emphasized that participants were encouraged to give their own ideas and to avoid technical or academic definitions. Equally, they were encouraged that there were no right nor wrong answers. The following are examples of responses when participants were asked to define what the economy means to them:
Elaine: To make a living . . . Poor or rich, you have to make a living. People have to live. They have to work in order to . . . make money. In order to live, they need the money.

Eric: Making a living for people who participate . . . That's how the whole thing got started. I mean people raised sheep so they could eat mutton and get wool. Right? [...] I have to have a certain amount of money coming in to maintain myself, and I would prefer that to be through an activity with which I have some experience and in which I can make some kind of contribution.

Don: It's just a question of money flowing all over the place and the things that people do for money. The economy is just a word used to describe the movement of money from me to The Bay, to the gas station, to the grocery store, to the restaurant . . .

Julie: To me it means "exchange of money" . . . my buying products, my getting paid, my paying bills . . . and paying for services . . . receiving money from investments or other sources. It's a process.

Linda: People working and getting paid for it . . . [...] Just to be able to live, to have money to do things, pay for things.

Jenny: Everyday living. For me the economy affects my everyday paying the bills, paying the rent, sending the kids to university and . . . everything else.

Bonnie: You have to have money to buy goods and get what you want. And everybody needs money.

The participants associated the economy with jobs, with working, with making a living, with the management of everyday life and therefore associated the economy with the management of the individual household.

The economy of the participants was much closer in form to the non-specialist meaning of the original oeconomia, that is the process, activities, and decision-making
associated with the everyday management of the household—the direct activities of maintaining sedentary life in a societal form denoted as 'civilization'. In a monetary society, the prime concern is obtaining and using money "to live". Within common stocks of knowledge there existed a knowledge of the economy that was congruent with the original meaning of _oeconomia_, a meaning which predates both current media discourse and the economy of 5th century BC Greece which Xenophon had argued against. Perhaps this concept of the economic indicates a sedimentation of an early knowledge still maintained in current stocks of knowledge. In this understanding, money is viewed as a necessary tool for its "usefulness": as a means rather than as a desirable end, not as a "possession" to indicate wealth. Since this view was unanimously held by all research participants, research to determine whether it is held by the Canadian public generally would be advantageous. If further research indicates that it is a generally-held view, this finding could have value for understanding social change for it hints at a certain and specific understanding of social reality that has endured through time: an understanding of social life as other than a wealth-accumulating activity. Additionally, this finding presents a possible vector which could aid in eliciting understanding and acceptance when presenting social change to the public.

The participants' descriptions of the economy above show an experiential and processual understanding that was elicited when they were asked directly about the economy. This finding would tend to indicate a lack of hegemony since the responses differed from the political-media model.

**Privatization**

In the political-media ideology, as found by Emmison (1986) and as presented in an examination of the print news-media (Chapter 3), government is represented in such a
derogatory manner that it is assumed private enterprise would be more efficient, and therefore more effective, in accomplishing the activities usually performed by government. When participants were asked if any government institutions should be privatized, the particular responses ranged from Elaine's "No! No, no. I don't believe in that. No. I do not believe in privatization at all!" to Jenny's confident "Yes. Many." However, the responses generated by questions of privatization displayed a high degree of ambiguity and generally were dependent on what institutions were being considered.

Two participants initially responded in the affirmative for privatization: Jenny and Alex. Both Jenny and Alex felt the LCBO (Liquor Control Board of Ontario) should be privatized. Since privatization of the LCBO has received media attention in the recent past, this may account for its being named in the context of the interviews.

Along with the LCBO, Jenny included Canada Post and other government "corporations" as eligible for privatization. Her reasons for privatization closely reflect the media ideology:

Especially the LCBO. They've been privatized in Alberta and I found that it was so much better for consumers. There were so many more of the liquor outlets [after privatization]. If you want to have a discount and give a discount to your customers, go ahead and do it, if it's privatized. It was good for the economy. Except Klien sold most of the franchises to his friends. It paid to be a friend. [...] I think the Post Office should be privatized and some of the large corporations which are government run would do better if they were privatized.

Note the reference "good for the economy"—an exact echo of the discourse of the ideology. Also in this response is a reference to a government representative (Klien) being a less-than-honest government representative and a reference to government inefficiency. Also of note: the discussion of discounts to customers verges on, but shies away from, the concept of profit. Each of the above comments are hegemonic
characteristics of the ideology as found in the participants' discourse and discussed in Chapter 5.

Yet significantly, a general consensus existed among all participants that education and health care should not be privatized in disagreement with the ideology. Initially, when Jenny was asked if there were any government institutions which should not be privatized she could not think of any. Since, other participants had mentioned health care and education, I prompted her with these two. After thinking for several seconds, Jenny responded:

Well . . . . . I don't believe education should be privatized . . . I don't think health care should be privatized . . .

Though Jenny initially did not consider these two, and had to contemplate for an extended time after being prompted, her response that they should not be privatized was succinct and definite. It appears that these were ideas she held in her stock of knowledge that were so dominated by the ideology that to retrieve them required notable effort. As Jenny presented her reasons why education and health care should not be privatized, her discourse indicated that she did, in fact, have definite and strong ideas against the privatization of these two institutions.

We have that happening in the United States and it's a disaster! No. The health care and education should stay. That's what makes the country grow. OK? If we don't have healthy and educated people we cannot have progress. Even the poorest people in Canada can afford good health care. And I think that is quite important. . . . And the poorest kids should get basic education and the government grants are a big help for them.
Despite her original positive view of privatization, and her inability to consider health care and education initially, Jenny does hold strong opinions—note the use of the word "disaster"—against the privatization of health care. However, her explanation of the importance of these two programs is based fairly securely in other aspects of the ideology—based on the reproduction of labour, on the requirement of a healthy and educated labour force available for "progress".

Though Alex had initially stated that "privatization is OK", as he talked about the issue he eventually determined that the only government institution he believed should be privatized was the LCBO; a view also held by Jenny. However, Alex’s reasons for privatizing the LCBO were ambiguous—first stating prices would be reduced and then deciding that no, in fact, they would increase. Although Alex had originally claimed that privatization was "OK", his conversation relating to the privatization the LCBO, health care, and education contradicted this statement as the following example demonstrates.

If I owned a hospital, I’m going to say this: "We cannot do this. We cannot afford that". Anyway, because of not being able to afford [these things], people are going to die. So [these programs] should not be up to one private individual. That should be controlled by the government and based on providing health for the people. Other institutions which should not be privatized are schools. They would cut so many corners just to get the maximum and they would not care. That would be the number one thing they care for. Not so much "What is that young lady or that young man learning?". Privatization of schools is bad, definitely bad. They’re going to try it in Detroit [shaking his head].

What is interesting is that Alex who had discussed "profit" previously did not in this instance. His sentences often imply "profit" and yet the word remained unspoken. Alex’s comments were extremely negative of privatization, leaving one wondering from where the original idea of "privatization is OK" originated since it was not the opinion he held.
The above example indicates that Alex views the privatization of schools and hospitals as a negative situation in contradiction to the ideology.

In analyzing the responses to privatization I became aware of the importance of the geographic location of the city in which the study was completed. The proximity to the United States, unconstrained access to American news media, and direct experience with individuals from Michigan provide the opportunity to "get another view". Much of the reasoning against privatization was authenticated by the American experience with privatization, such as Jenny's "disaster" in the United States (above) or Linda's comments that follow.

I think [health care] should stay the way it is. I think it's good the way it is. I mean, I know people in the States have insurance but I don't know what or how they pay for it.

The reasoning against privatization fell into two separate, but perhaps closely related, categories: the perceived failure of American privatization; and the inability to provide social programs in a profit-generating environment—this was the one area where a few participants did use the word and concept "profit". Like Alex, Eric was confident in his statement that profit generation was harmful in certain areas, specifically education and health care. Eric's statement directly contradicts the political-media ideology.

Well, I mean, witness the educational system in—What state was it? Maryland, I believe—where they privatized the schools. It didn't work because they were more interested in making a profit than in providing education. There are things that can't be done for profit. Especially things with a social basis, like health care for instance.
Eric's argument was unexpected since previous to this discussion he had argued how certain social programs could be organized to be "income generating"—that is, profit generating.

Julie, who initially stated that she "may be somewhat" in favour of privatization but not for health care and education, gave some reasons against privatization that were in direct opposition to the ideology and her original response to the topic:

I would be saddened if [government social welfare programs] were privatized because . . . . . . I would hate to see some profit taken from our tax dollars [...] I would like to see the welfare programs, social assistance, stay within the government . . . . even if it makes government big. [...] I would like to see health care under one umbrella, I think . . . . Not privatized. . . but . . . I would still like to see the expenses controlled.

Julie's ideas that are in direct contradiction to the ideology include: "profit" viewed negatively, in addition to being acknowledged at all; and the acceptance of "big government" to accommodated social welfare programs. Julie's apology against privatization indicates that she, at some level, in some way, understands that privatization is not the panacea the ideology presents.

The responses given above indicate that at some level the participants understood privatization to imply profit-generation rather than the increased efficiency or effectiveness implied in the media ideology—though this understanding initially remained largely unspoken. These understandings were only realized when the participants were allowed to discuss the topics—were given 'space' to state their views.

The media ideology has not achieved hegemony in the area of privatization of government services, in particular for health care and education. That the consensus and discourse against privatization was so strong within the group indicates that for these individuals there exist, alongside the ideology, other forms of knowledge and desirable
outcomes. Frequently, participants' initial responses tend to reflect the political-media ideology; however, as they discuss the concepts, their own ideas seem to emerge and knowledges other than the ideology appear, indicating the existence of other knowledges that inform their opinions and are capable of counter-acting the hegemony of the ideology.

Government Regulation

Over-all there appeared to be a consensus in favour of government regulation of the private sector in opposition to the media ideology of free, unregulated markets. However, as with other concepts, that consensus was not always straightforward, nor without apparent deviations. Many participants originally related regulation to investment markets, a view that could be determined by self-interest since all participants had investments which they rationally would choose to have protected, especially considering the participants' stated importance of those investments to their well-being. Some examples follow:

Julie: Well, I think markets should be regulated. The fall of the Asian markets was largely due to the fact they were largely unregulated, and there were questionable transactions going on, or pay-offs. and . . . . . . . well, just questionable. And the fall of '29 was caused by loose regulations because people were buying things on margin and then when they had to pay-up they couldn't and so I definitely think that the market should be controlled and I would be in favour of tighter controls to tell you the truth.

It should be mentioned that others in the research, like Julie, had lost value on investments during the Asian Crisis in the autumn of 1998. Also of note is the fact that
Julie does most of her investing directly: she enjoys playing the high-risk and moderately high-risk markets. Conventional knowledge would suggest that she would be an unlikely candidate for market regulation, in that it could constrain her freedom to 'wheel and deal' and yet she is "in favour of tighter controls" and supports regulation with no hesitation or uncertainty. Other participants, though in favour of regulation, presented a fair degree of ambivalence in their responses.

Bonnie: I think they need to keep tabs on the stock market, things like that. Like the idea of the economy. Not too much regulation. But there has to be some kind of safeguards in place to protect peoples' investments. [...] I don't like a lot of government intervention in anything. On the other hand, I suppose there's a balance somewhere.

Ann: I think [the markets] should be somewhat regulated. . . . Stock markets and things like that because of all the fraud and things like that. And anybody can go on the stock market and say they've got whatever, and it could be a fraud. . . . I mean there has to be some kind of regulation.

Primarily, the questions of regulation elicited ambivalent responses that concluded in support for regulations. The ambivalence here may emanate from attempts to make two different knowledges congruent: the ideology wherein regulation is represented as an assault on personal freedom on the one hand, and the desirability for protection of personal investments on the other.

Other participants viewed the lack of government regulation as a threat to personal freedom, in contradiction to the ideology. However here too, a certain amount of ambivalence and ambiguity were present. Though Elaine and Jenny claim to have no opinion or not to have thought much about the topic, as they talk their opinions solidify.
Elaine: Any market should be regulated? Gee, I never thought of it. I think it should... Yes... I think it should be regulated... otherwise, it's a monopoly. You know, one person has a hold of it and it doesn't go anywhere in a way, you know. I think it should be regulated. [...] I think [the government] should be involved because otherwise you're going to have a monopoly. One group of people will be "running the show". I think there should be some checks and balances, or whatever you call those things.

Jenny: I really don't have too much opinion about it. I think in some ways it has to be regulated so we don't become totally a monopoly. Like one bank—like the mega banks; if there was no regulation by the government, we would have no choice. If you have a monopoly then you can charge anything you want. So, I think in some ways you need regulation.

When asked if the government should stay out of the economy and business and financial enterprises in general—which was merely another way to ask about government regulation—Jenny was initially in agreement with the media ideology that government should stay out of the private sector. But her support became ambiguous and then quickly dissipated as she contemplated her personal experiences with government programs, as the following excerpt demonstrates:

Yes, [the government should stay out of the business areas]. I think so. Outside of the... Well, in some ways, I think the government does give good loans at times for new starting businesses and certain aids and if they stay totally out of our economy, a lot of people wouldn't have... chances. Banks are sometimes... hard, hard on the—it depends how the—I don't know... The... Not completely, I guess. The regulations should be there and there are government programs which help. I can't complain because it was a big help [to me].
Later, when Jenny was asked if government had a purpose, regulations came back into the discussion as a positive aspect of government. (This should not be confused with Jenny’s earlier statement in Chapter 5 regarding the major effect government has on her life where she related that it was "taxes").

[The purpose of the government is] to run the country. You have to otherwise you're going to have total chaos and in each society you have to have rules and regulations otherwise there is no . . . And to implement these rules, you have to have some governing body. If you call it government or if you call it queen, you can give it any name you want to but you have to have some kind of rules and regulations.

Jenny acknowledges the need for regulation by a governing body in opposition to the ideology which presents regulation as an infringement on personal freedom.

Though Alex was confident in the need for regulations, his uncertainty centered around issues of freedom. In the latter section of the following statement, Alex appeared almost apologetic[^16] for his support of government regulations.

No. I would not want [the government] to stay out of [the private sector] but to sort of make sure that private undertakings are not getting out of hand. . . . You could have some people who would take too much advantage of [the lack of government regulations]. And again, here we go! They could move that plant to Mexico. The government should be able to say "Now look. We need this plant in here" and so on. "Because of the economy" and so on . . . Not to dictate, mind you. Not to dictate, but to have some kind of control and the private sector knowing that, they might not do it (move the plant to Mexico). . . . They should know that they are controlled.

I challenged Alex’s distinction between "dictate" and "control", noting that some people might say that regulations are a form of dictatorship. To which he responded:
No. No. It's not. Regulation and dictatorship are two different things. If I dictate something, I want something to be a particular—just the way I say. That is how it has to be done . . . I will not be open to some discussion. Now if I regulate it, there is always a high and a low, a middle way. You can regulate things too far for the best of the surrounding [society], but if you dictate, you are going to have a specific say so. And that might not be the one [that's best for the society].

What is interesting in Alex's response is that the distinction between "dictate" and "control" is based on the individual-society dichotomy. The political-media ideology supports the freedom and rights of the individual which Alex associates with "dictate". Alex, on the other hand, sides with "control" which he views as deciding what is "best" for the community, for the society as a whole.

Eric claimed to be against the regulation of "markets of any kind". However, he too experienced ambiguity and ambivalence when attempting to voice his opinions of government regulation. Initially arguing against regulation Eric made the following statement.

Well, actually I'm probably against [more regulation]. . . . . . . As long as everybody abides by what the rules are. I mean, you can have rules of conduct without having regulation, like laws. [...] I'm against legislated regulation of the market system [...] only to the extent that whatever legal caveats would continue to apply. In other words people can't do anything illegal to further their business interests—which happens a lot. And I don't think regulating the economy would affect that.

When I asked the difference between "legal" and "legislative", Eric replied:

No. Legislating behaviour, not legislating the economy . . . . In other words: I can't sell you stolen goods. I can't buy stolen goods from somebody.
At this point Eric went on to discuss corporate theft based on the marketing of clones of trademarked goods. Eric's final word on "regulation" was that people required legislative control but not "the economy"—a statement very much in accord with the ideology. It would seem, in this dialogue, that Eric is not in favour of government regulation. However, previously Eric had mentioned "monitoring" and "screening" as a means to correct problems he perceived in the social welfare system in Canada. One complaint he expressed was that students who were not university material were in essence abusing the system "much like welfare recipients" which could be corrected through "more monitoring and screening". When asked about health care Eric's response was that problems with that system could be corrected again through "monitoring and screening" through

a monitoring board that would have to be affiliated but separate. It could be composed of people that were remunerated on a similar basis. In other words, as a certain percentage of whatever fraud they uncover

I asked who would pay the salaries for the individuals on the monitoring board. to which Eric responded.

Taxpayers paying the Ombudsman . . . . But that's OK. He's sort of the general official of the province at large and not specifically related to any user group, if you like.

Eric's comment, "But that's OK", indicates that he sees the contradiction of his stance—that his solution results in the expenditure of tax dollars and the establishment of government offices for regulation in contradiction to his opinions on these issues. From this example it would seem that in fact Eric is in favour of regulation, but in certain areas
only: no regulation of private industry and business activities, but regulation of the
general populace to ensure that no one (no non-corporate citizen) is misusing the
resources of the country. This perception is very much in keeping with the political-
media ideology.

With the exception of Eric who fluctuated in his perception of the need for
government regulation and who finally decided for regulation but only within a
perception in accord with the ideology, all other participants arrived at an ultimate
conclusion that government regulations were not contraindicated in their definition of a
well-functioning society. The high level of eventual agreement on this issue indicates
that in the area of government regulation the media ideology has far from attained an
hegemonic status.

Environment

It was with discussions around the environment that there existed the greatest consensus
against the media ideology and the greatest contradiction between the ideology and other
knowledges. All participants agreed that ultimately it is private industry that is
responsible for cleaning-up and carrying the cost of environmental hazards and accidents,
or more generally, pollution. In many cases holding such ideas was in direct
contradiction to the initial ideas held by some participants with regard to government
regulation. In contrast to the previous discussion of government regulation, for
government regulation of the environment there was no hesitancy nor ambiguity.
Following are some examples:

Elaine: Well, I think that people who pollute should be responsible for the cleanup. But because they will probably not, it should be government
that is controlling them in a way... If the industry does, let's say, pollute the river, they should pay to do the clean-up.

Jenny: It is the responsibility of the government to govern the environmental cleanup and to penalize the companies that caused the damages. You cannot leave it up to the welfare of the companies because the money will be number one. But the government has to step in and do as much as they can, otherwise we will have no planet left.

Alex: The one who should be responsible to clean up is the one who does it. But the government would have to make them do it. The government should have control. It's not their responsibility to clean up but to make them clean it up, those who are doing it... who are polluting. The polluters should clean up their businesses.

Bonnie: I think they should be the responsibility of the polluter themselves but... if they don't police themselves—There again, it's another thing where some kind of balance has to come in. Like maybe government could... or maybe they should do more than they're doing...

Rick: Environmental spills are related to companies that do it... The point is the government must have known. It's not the government's responsibility to do that—fault, yes, for not monitoring more.

Julie: ...I think that the government has to do some monitoring there. I think that [cleanups] are the responsibility of industry. But! if... an industrial company is following the guidelines that were in place at the time the environmental polluting took place, I think then the government is definitely co-responsible and should pay

Don: Yes, [the government is responsible for environmental cleanups], unless they can prove that the contamination was caused by a private company. Then the company should pay.

In each case, private industry should clean the pollution it causes under the control and monitoring of government institutions—in essence government regulation of the environment. The ideas presented above display a perception of government at odds with
the media representation of government and contrary to the ambiguity of the regulation
discourse described previously; this form of government regulation is acceptable without
any hesitancy or vestiges of doubt—even for Eric who had expressed strong views
against government regulation. This was the one area where not only was a complete
consensus achieved, but also, it was achieved with little to no ambiguity.

The fact that stories on the environment and pollution are frequently presented in
the media may have a influence on this result. Equally and related, is the fact that the
participant group is located in an area with high air and water pollution levels which
likely exerts a significant influence on their perceptions of environmental issues. It
appears that the participants' perceptions of pollution and environmental clean-up have
not been dominated by the media ideology because the participants have access to other
knowledges about, and personal experiences with, pollution. Rather than the ideology
resonating with participants' other stocks of knowledge and their direct experiences about
pollution and the environment (Lane 1962: 417), the ideology clashed with their day-to-
day repetitive experiences of living in a polluted environment (Adam 1993: 324; Wolf
1982: 388) and hence complete hegemony was unrealizable.

The Economy as Determiner

One of the precepts of the political-media representation is that we are at the mercy of
the economy and have no other options than those presented due to the economy. The
impression cultivated is that the economy functions without the decisions of mere
humans and any attempts to control the economy are futile.

When asked if anyone or any institution controlled the economy there was a
general agreement that in fact the economy could be controlled with only Ann dissenting.
Ann, as we saw earlier, felt very strongly that the economy was uncontrollable. Julie
believed that the economy couldn't be controlled but it could be influenced, but then only by major economic players—people and institutions such as Alan Greenspan and the American Federal Reserve Board. The responses of other participants were fairly uniform when asked if the economy could be controlled and if so, who controlled it:

Elaine: I think the rich people run the economy. The government runs the economy . . .

Jenny: Oh, absolutely! Banks!!

Bonnie: A bunch of people—corporations, the government.

Rick: Government . . . via big business.

Don: I think banks and financial institutions control it.

Linda: I would say the companies, the banks, and oil.

Eric: [It is] controlled by either individuals or corporate entities, but not overwhelmingly so.

Eric's response indicates that he believes control was located with the same general group as the other participants but he was unwilling to give that group the total control that the others had bestowed. On the other hand, his response lacks the negativity expressed by Linda who felt there existed no control. These comments fairly well reflect the responses given when participants were also asked who controlled the government as the following two examples demonstrate.

Elaine: It's the people with money. They rule . . . And money talks—unfortunately, but it's so.

Alex: I think the almighty dollar runs it . . . . Who has got the most money has the most say-so . . . . Money runs the government.
These comments about control of government by monied-interests are significant considering the responses that suggested the government controlled the economy. Since participants had indicated an understanding of the economy that was intimately involved with their daily lives, the responses indicate that the participants are aware that their lives are dominated and by whom—at least in a nebulous form. Therefore, the upper levels of the privileged-few may remain opaque (Arrighi 1994; Janelli 1993), but some of the activities and realms of power are discernible by the dominated strata. The fact that the domination is apparent is important. When specific signifiers are identifiable, change is more likely to occur (Castoriadis 1980). Under such circumstances there exists an object toward which change, and the discourse of change, can be focused.

Germs of Resistance

In discussing germs of resistance, Castoriadis describes the role of "needs creation" in maintaining the functioning of the system and its regime of domination (1980: 244). The system works because it can satisfy those needs. We are taught to emulate our superiors in the prestige hierarchy and to lust after—or at the very least attempt to imitate—their elite life-styles. These prestige needs are embedded within the ideology of our social system. However, though I agree that the satisfaction of created needs does impart a certain amount of support for the system, the participants' discourse seems rather to indicate that whether or not topics are open for discussion is far more important to creating adherence to the status quo and in presenting germs of resistance (germinal points of contention arising out of contradictions). Topics that tended to be discussed in the public forum, such as environmental issues, demonstrated the least agreement with the basic tenets of the ideology; whereas, topics which were not open for discussion, such as profit, expressed a virtually unquestioned acceptance. Therefore, it seems that the
greatest threat to the specific ideology examined here is the opportunity for people to discuss an issue and become aware, through their own understanding, of the contradictions existing in their acceptance of that ideology. This conclusion is supported by C.W. Mills who claims that the greatest harm inflicted by mass media is that they "often encroach upon the small-scale discussion, and destroy the chance for the reasonable and leisurely and human interchange of opinion" (1995: 90). This activity, contemplation or discussion and interchange of opinion, however, must be repetitive to be effective. Although in later conversations with participants many indicated that their participation in the research had initiated a questioning of certain assumed aspects of the current ideology—ideas that they had not previously considered questioning—the maintenance of ideological hegemony and equally, its deconstruction, requires repetitiveness and redundancy. This study suggests that the obfuscation of the hierarchy of domination and the lack of opportunity to discuss and debate ideological contradictions are far more important than the opportunity to satisfy created needs and are possibly foundational to the quest for prestige goods. Though the satisfaction of created needs is a significant factor, it is associated with consumer ideology and therefore beyond the scope of this study.

Though the second interviews with participants were to address the contradictions as discussed by Castoriadis, they were so prevalent in the first interviews that frequently second interviews were unnecessary. The contradictions were accompanied by a large amount of ambivalence in the participants' discourse indicating that, as Castoriadis has argued, the adherence to the status quo is not passive. Individuals are constantly and actively attempting to make contradictory knowledges and value systems congruent. The attempts to make them acceptable and fit an individual's knowledge about reality can lead to what Castoriadis terms "germs of resistance":

This or that theme of 'everyday' concerns can contain, and generally do potentially contain, much more than at first glance appears there: they
contain, in germinal form, an implicit . . . contestation of the established order in general . . . even though it almost always remains obscure for the participants themselves. This signification, these germs, are repressed by the entire contemporary social structure, by the reigning ideology . . . and by individuals' psychical internalization of this structure: the self-repression of the significations they create without completely knowing it." (1974: 9).

Linda's presumably out-of-context anger about her raise that surfaced when she was asked about the term "profit" is an example of a germ of resistance. There were many examples of seeds of resistance in the interviews. However, I have chosen to focus on the following example because it presents recurring germs of contestation with the current social order and because it demonstrates Eric's attempts to come to terms with those conflicts. I also chose Eric's example because his discourse, as a whole, appeared to be the most supportive of the status quo.

As mentioned previously, Eric had to change employers frequently due to what he refers to as "economic difficulties" or "business difficulties" of the companies for which he worked. These are his terms for down-sizing. While describing his career history, he made the following statement.

I didn't want to go into pure research because I learned very quickly that people in research, especially when they're developing the project, after the product's developed . . . they're expendable—which they were—expended. And so given that kind of background, when I initially started in my career, it wouldn't be too surprising that I would gravitate to small companies that had any technical product to offer.

Note that Eric makes the statement that workers "are expendable" as a matter of course within his description of his work history, suggesting the acceptability of such a view. Having worked as a technical recruiter for a project and in management positions, Eric would know the employment policies and practices of his field. After a discussion of the
benefits of small versus large companies, I returned to the idea of the expendability of researchers.

CL: Your comment about researchers being expendable—do you have any thoughts on that?
Eric: Well, that was probably a little bit harsh. And there again, that comes from being in a small company environment . . .
CL: You don't think that's the case in large companies?
Eric: . . . Uh . . . . . . . Well . . . There's always the age factor. [...] There were some older individuals working there who tended to be a little bit more, um, a little bit more, um . . . . restive than the rest of us. Part of that was because they were concerned about when they got older. What would they do? And especially in a technical area, it's not uncommon for companies either overtly or covertly to kind of recycle technical staff occasionally. Get in new blood—probably at less money, although that's not always the reason . . . .

Here, having had the opportunity to discuss the situation, Eric now finds his statement about the expendability of workers "A bit harsh". After mentioning that employers "recycle" staff to "get in new blood", Eric went on to discuss the characteristics of good and bad workers—Eric had deflected the issue of expendability again. After his discussion of employee characteristics, I wanted to return again to the expendability of workers, to which Eric responded:

Yeah. Perhaps I was a little bit too harsh. What I should have said was . . . . . . If they, if they agree [a contract of ownership over creative work with the company] before they start the project—but they're seldom—The only kind of which I am aware [that] fall into that category, i.e. where a person has an original idea and develops it are owner-operated. The people I'm thinking about were people who were hired on after the inception and initial development of the product was already begun. So, they were more like developmental engineers and not really researchers. [...] I don't think I've ever been in a situation where it's been all that cut and dry, where they have someone in, other than on a specific project, to do something and then essentially just, uh, terminate the individual.
Though initially Eric had felt that the expendability of researchers was significant enough to influence his career choices, and after several attempts to avoid discussing the idea, eventually he decides that perhaps the individuals were not "really" researchers and that, in any case, the situations are not "all that cut and dry". The issue here is not whether Eric remembers correctly, or what the 'reality' may be. The important aspect is that Eric's behaviour was significantly influenced (career choices he made) by a "fact" generated in his profession (or within greater society) which had been taken as a given. When this given was examined more closely either it was not such a substantial "fact" or if it was then Eric was trying very hard to justify it without succeeding very well. On some level Eric became aware that this "fact" is "too harsh"—that it is challenged by the values of other knowledges that he holds.

Eric's cognitive dissonance is evident in the following part of the interview. Shortly after the above conversation, Eric was describing how his father had been "a union man" and how he was unable to understand some of his father's viewpoints. During this discussion again a germ of value conflict arose.

Eric: I always saw it as a . . . . much more business-like situation, where people hire other people to do things for themselves. So that the people that are hiring then can take advantage of the labour leverage business . . . In other words, if I make 10 dollars an hour doing something and I can hire somebody at 5 dollars an hour to do the same thing, then I end up with a net of 5 dollars. And I can spend my time doing something else . . . . Maybe at 20 dollars an hour . . .

CL: What if that person hired for 5 dollars got the full 10 dollars?

Eric: Why should he?! If I didn't provide the employment and the opportunity at 5 dollars an hour, nobody else would.

CL: So it's providing the opportunity?

Eric: Yeah. I don't think that . . . I mean, I hate to use biblical references, but you remember the numerous stories in the bible about the grower going out hiring pickers for the vineyard and that type of thing? And he hired them at one dinarius, the first guys at one dinarius a day and the rest that came in only worked half a day, and a third of a day. They
all got the same money. Well I mean, that sounded like a buyer's market in labour for the owner of the vineyard. And I never really subscribed to that. And I don't think that anybody should be parasitic about it, and yet... If the opportunity presents itself, and I decided to avail myself of it because my options are limited, that's not really the fault of the person that's offering me the opportunity... Although, I mean, there's a certain...

CL: Whose fault is it? You used the word "fault"?

Eric: Well I mean, it could be a number of reasons. Like I moved out of [this city] because I didn't find what I needed here for a job. So, now if I, at that point, I decided that I wasn't going to leave here and I was going to stay here that would certainly limit my options. Now whose uh... fault, again if that's the word. I mean that's the result of circumstances...

CL: So it's the fault of circumstance?

Eric: Well, I don't know if, ah... I want to retract that word. It's—it's the circumstances that prevail at, at the given time in a given place... I mean, that's one reason I went back and did accounting... I mean, I thought at one point—I mean, I could do accounting and I could certainly do that in [this city].....

While arguing for the 'rightness' of what he refers to as "the labour leverage business", Eric himself acknowledges a certain unfairness exists in such a system when he uses the word "fault". His use of the word "parasitic" is itself telling. In the latter part of this conversation, Eric tries to justify the inequality by first retracting the word "fault" and then is at a loss for words to support his argument of the 'rightness' of such a system. "Rather than that internal discussion we call reflection, he is accompanied through his life-experience with a sort of unconscious, echoing monologue... He is not truly aware of his own daily experience and of its actual standards" (Mills 1995: 99-98). Only by having the opportunity to elaborate the "monologue" did Eric become aware of the standards implied by the monologue—standards that seemed to conflict with other stocks of knowledge. Expressing cognitive dissonance that may indicate germs of resistance. Eric is faced with a clash of values. It is at the point of the articulation of these contestations of different knowledges that Castoriadis argues for an opportunity to deconstruct the current systems of inequality.
Castoriadis claims that to be liberated from domination society's members must be engaged in the deconstruction of the economic as the central value (1989: 416). This view is also presented by David Slater (1993). Slater challenges the usual focus of studies that are grounded in taken-for-granted assumptions based on 'the economic'. He specifically calls for a critique of the private sector and the politics of accumulation on which economic arguments are based. From a post-Marxist perspective he calls for a deconstruction of the "imaginary edifice called the Western world" and the assumptions which give it validity and power (Slater 1993: 99). However, his deconstructionism is not a destructive activity. Rather, he calls for a 'recasting' of societal imperatives towards an emancipation from the control of power elites. Slater and Castoriadis are similar in their views on the 'reality' of this edifice and the necessity of dismantling it. The edifice of Western society is the ideology that has become embedded in everyday life and as such is the source of the means of control. Castoriadis questions whether "... a negation of the needs being nourished at present by the system and the appearance of other aims, beginning to dawn, to appear to be important to people living today" (1980: 250) might not be indicative of change. He specifically discusses the rise of ecology movements as an indicator of a nascent change in focus (1980). Additionally, Castoriadis notes that some people are beginning to observe the "incompetency" of the system as well as the incompetency of the managers of the system, the political personnel (1982: 252).

The discourse of the participants tends to support Castoriadis' argument regarding these two issues. I would argue that the incompetency of government can be situated within the ideology as presented by the participants. However, the negativity expressed toward private institutions in the discussion of environment and the negativity expressed toward monied interests in the discourse addressing control of the economy support Castoriadis' argument that individuals are becoming aware of incompetency of the capitalist economic system. Germs of resistance exist within common stocks of knowledge; what is required is an understanding of how these germs can be used to
deconstruct the economic edifice and emancipate society's majority (that majority which includes the financially powerless and dispossessed) from domination by the powerful-few and thereby establish a new society constructed so as to allow equitable access to societal resources for all society's members—a society where access is not predetermined by the degree of financial-ownership and power one possesses.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

In this study, an attempt was made to talk to people who would be representative of a segment of the population which, by conventional knowledge, is considered to have vested interests in fiscal policy decisions. Mid-level investors were identified as a desirable study group through which to gain an understanding of how the ideology of the economy is manifested within the general population. That is, in order to study the expression of the ideology within the population, it was considered necessary to examine the discourse of a group that would tend to be amicable to the ideology and to avoid, at the outset of the research, any segment of the population which might be antagonistic to the ideology or already be querying its tenets.

The representation of the economy used in this study was primarily based upon the work of Michael Emmison (1985; 1986). That model was compared to and elaborated from representations in two locally available newspapers. In these papers we saw that the economy was fetishized as an independent entity with a physical form and endowed with wants, desires, and needs; capable of making unilateral decisions; and sovereign over the humans which created it. Government policy decisions were considered to be dependent on the wants and needs of the economy. Utilizing the above representation of economic processes—processes which are constitutive of the decisions of specific people—policy-makers could make decisions without needing to take responsibility for those decisions; the economy, as constructed, becomes both an ally and a scapegoat. Decisions which are socially deleterious for the majority of the population or are unpopular can be implemented while resorting to "the dictates of the economy" or "the dictates of the market". Since decision-making activities and knowledge of the
constructed economy on which decision-making is purported to be founded are presented as the realm of specialists, the general public is disinclined to resist, or even to question, the resultant policies.

Through examination of the discourse of the study's participants, it was found that the ideology had achieved hegemony in a number of areas. The concept of the economy itself as held by participants was not that of the ideology; however, when the term economy had a value label attached to it—such as good or bad—participants echoed the ideology as given in media sources. Those situations or concepts which could affect the economy, as given in the ideology, were then valued as good or bad, without question by participants. Therefore policies could be presented as palatable, or not, by their effect on the economy. Some areas where the political-media ideology had achieved dominance were: inflation and interest rates; increases in labour wages; the role and activities of government and its representatives; education; and the invisibility or inviolable nature of profit acquisition.

Various means of control draw on the economic ideology; the most prevalent and pernicious is blaming the victims of social inequalities. Since in the perspective of this work the majority of the world's population suffer domination by a very powerful few, the victims frequently take the form of cohorts and peers in addition to those lower on any social hierarchy. This form of control, because it is insidious, is extremely effective not only in deflecting blame, but equally in deflecting any critical examination of social problems and the economistic assumptions under which we live—and the underlying and unexamined morality of those assumptions. As blame is deflected toward co-victims, the hierarchy of domination is protected from public scrutiny and any possible challenge to its dominance.

The discourse of the participants also demonstrated areas where the ideology had not achieved hegemony or where it was at least incomplete. Topics demonstrating incomplete hegemony included privatization of specific government institutions and
programs; government regulation; environmental issues; and the economy as a
determiner or controller of society. It was in this area, incomplete hegemony, that one
process of ideological maintenance was uncovered. In the areas where incomplete
hegemony was demonstrated, participants' discourse, initially, reflected the ideology.
After speaking for a time about these issues, participants became aware of contradictions
in their arguments. As they discussed further, they eventually determined that they did
not hold the opinion they first stated. Only after being given the opportunity to elaborate
were participants able to vocalize opinions contrary to the ideology. This could only
occur if people were allowed 'to think it through' for themselves. A more direct approach
of pointing out inconsistencies, contradictions, and paradox only entrenched ideological
ideas or left participants repeating innocuous phrases. Significant conversation or
discussion was hampered. People must be allowed the opportunity to discover and
ruminate over contradictions themselves for the ideological opinions to dissipate. This
finding is significant to social change. If social issues and arguments for social change
are presented too harshly, too directly, then ideological resistance is the result. What is
required is an unstructured forum whereby people can discuss and contemplate the issues
and eventually come to see the contradictions which the ideology presents.

This finding that individuals require a 'space' in which to discuss and ruminated
before they are decisive about their opinions also has significance for social science
methods. If a quantitative methodology had been used in this study, the conclusions
would have been entirely different and would not have reflected social reality, would not
have recorded the perceptions of the economy as held by the participants. It would
merely have quantified aspects of the ideology as first presented by the participants and
then concluded that that was the reality of the everyday perceptions of these individuals.
This weakness of quantitative methodology, and the ability of qualitative methodology to
overcome that weakness, was also demonstrated in the work of Michael Emmison
(1985). As argued in the theory section of this work, before accomplishing research in
the social sciences it is absolutely necessary to account for the effects of ideology, particularly capitalist ideologies associated with the economic and consumerism. Otherwise the research may merely lead us in ideological circles. Such a situation can only be remedied through qualitative methods.

The finding that the participants' perception of economy—without value labels of 'good', 'bad', 'healthy' or 'unhealthy'—was entirely different than the ideological representation indicates that there exists a foundational stock of knowledge on which to draw and which lies just behind or under a veneer of ideological knowledge. Since this perception of the economy was an unanimous response, it could demonstrate that knowledges contradicting the ideology already exist within the relatively privileged general population. (Further research would be required to support that supposition.) Often contradictions to the ideology were accompanied by a large amount of ambivalence in the participants' discourse indicating that, as Castoriadis has argued, the adherence to the status quo is not passive. Individuals are constantly and actively attempting to make contradictory knowledges and value systems congruent. The attempts to make them acceptable and fit an individuals' knowledge about reality can lead to what Castoriadis terms "germs of resistance". The ability to drawn on other knowledges when given a 'space' to do so provides a means with which to address the weak link in the chain of ideological reproduction as discussed in Chapter 2. It can provide a vector through which the domination of the many by the few can be challenged. However, these other knowledges are not always readily available to the individual's awareness: they require that 'space' in the discourse in which to be brought into awareness. Drawing on the perception of the economy that was in contradiction to the ideology and on other partially concealed knowledges—assisting the accessibility of those knowledges within informal and small groups—appears to be a possible paradigm for implementing social change. However, further research is required to determine how that model could be successfully accomplished.
While a critical and public deconstruction of the hierarchy of power, and the accompanying privilege it provides for the very few, is desirable, first a deconstruction of the ideology which supports that hierarchy is required. Though it is a complex problem, the research here has indicated that there do exist possibilities for deconstruction with the support and involvement of the public—not the mass public encouraged by the ideology but rather a conscious participatory public.

**Areas for Further Research**

This investigation has provoked further questions with regard to the reproduction and maintenance of structures of inequality and has increased my interest in the processes and effects of an hegemonic ideology.

A closer examination is needed of those processes whereby other knowledges surface as people discuss issues and become aware of inherent value contradictions. Such research would be necessary in order to facilitate those processes, both within the individual and across society generally. The direct approach used in the second interviews generally proved counter-productive. It seems that an indirect approach, as used in the first interviews, is necessary, allowing the participants to apprehend the contradictions for themselves. Connected to the research suggested above, we require investigations of how best to implement informal, unstructured, and un-associated gatherings where informal discussion could provide sufficient ‘space’ in which contradictions are allowed to surface and then be addressed.

Additionally, research would be required to more closely examine the relationship between ideological attacks on labour, social assistance recipients, and government workers and the issue of security. A better understanding of that relationship could assist
in counter-acting the ideology of such attacks and perhaps provide a clearer understanding of issues of social security.

Also required is further investigation of the ways in which society would be constituted drawing on the other knowledges held by individuals and based on non-economic value systems, as indicated by the perception of the economy as "those things we do everyday in order to live". Though some participants did discuss or describe some characteristics that an "ideal" society would manifest, this was not an area that was sufficiently addressed in this current investigation. This information would be necessary in order to build a counter-hegemony platform or program which would resonate with knowledges already held by the general public and challenge the current structures and ideology of unequal access to societal resources.
End Notes:

1 C > M^1 denotes the movement of capital invested in production facilities, such as factories, into cash investments. C represents "commodity capital"; that is capital invested in long-term assets where there is a degree of loss in the flexibility of (or control over) those assets. Such assets have reduced liquidity; they are not easily converted into currency. M represents "money capital" which affords the owner more liquidity and therefore flexibility than C, and M^1 represents "money capital" with increased liquidity. Generally, M^1 is financial capital, such as is invested in currency markets and stock market speculation, or short term speculation of any kind. The degree of liquidity afforded by internet trading in stocks and currencies has made liquidity virtually instantaneous. During a C > M^1 phase, capital is taken out of those areas where production is enacted and labour is used and put into cash investments not employing labour, or employing very little labour. C > M^1 phases are periods of financial expansion rather than production expansion and "the capitalist world-economy 'shifts' through radical restructurings and reorganizations onto another path" (Arrighi 1994: 9). Equally, during such a period, industries also shift through radical restructurings and reorganizations as they move toward accumulating every greater levels of M^1, usually in the form of ever greater levels of profit-generation.

2 In Constitution of Society (1984) Anthony Giddens attempts to provide a synthesis of "micro" and "macro" theories. According to Giddens in his theory of structuration, the study of social life should focus on "neither the experience of the individual actor nor the existence of any form of societal totality, but social practices ordered across space and time"(2). Therefore, Giddens theory still replicates the duality of social existence. The argument presented here is the contrary: that the individual is context within society; that the individual and structure are not separable. By focusing primarily on social structures, social practices through space and time, Giddens recreates a duality, the "duality of structure", which this study argues against. Further, Giddens argues that in everyday life the individual draws only on those knowledges which are available to "discursive consciousness", whereas this study indicates that in fact the individual has access to a number of "knowledges", at least one of which is an ideology that may not represent the "best interests" of the individual, and that the individual is continuously and actively attempting to make contradictory knowledges compatible. In this work social structure, that is the ideology, is viewed as existing within individual stocks of knowledge and is able to affect social life because it is authenticated and justified within the knowledges of a large proportion of the population. In Giddens discussion of "knowledges" the structures still remain outside of the individual; social structures appear to have an existence independent of the individuals who are actively replicating them.
Plutarch's *Lives* was written in the first century of the current era.

Of note in the context of this discussion: The Greek word translated as "profitable" derives from ἀφελέω, "to help, aid, or benefit".

Whether Adam Smith's personal translations of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* or the translations to which he had access were translated as the Loeb edition are questions worthy of further investigation. However, the limitations of this study preclude a fuller investigation of this matter.

False consciousness is used to indicate that state of being whereby an individual holds to a set of ideas that may not be conducive to, nor representative of, or is actually deleterious to his social well-being and that the individual is initially or continuously unaware of such a situation. False consciousness is viewed as an instrument, as a social structure or arising from specific social structures, that affects power for a privileged minority. Perhaps a more correct term would be incomplete knowledge due to social structures of unequal access to knowledge.

The number of authors are far too numerous to list here. A great number of authors listed in the bibliography support this perception of the current ideology, such as (Altman 1990; Barasamion 1994; Block 1986; Castoriadis 1989, 1980, etc.; Caufield 1996; Chomsky 1999, 1994, 1989, for example; Emmison 1986, 1985; Foucault 1980; Greider 1997; Greisman 1977; Jackall 1995; Jannelli 1993; Mannheim 1985; Marcus 1990; Marcuse 1964; McChesney 1999; Miller and Rose 1997; Mills 1995, 1959; Parenti 1995, 1993, 1978; Sederberg 1984; Seidman 1994; Slater 1993; Smith 1987; Stern 1990; Winter 1997; for example).

For examples of the interviews: ........ denotes pauses in the participants' discourse: [...] denotes editing of the transcript.

This discussion does not address additional problems with how inflation is itself arbitrarily measured—what measurements are included and what are excluded, and how those measurements are themselves valued.

A recent survey published in the July 1999 Special Issue of *Canadian Business* lists 23 billionaires in Canada with publisher Kenneth Thomson having the greatest wealth at $20.97 billion. The article lists the 100 wealthiest Canadians who together hold $106.5 billion, equivalent to 12 per cent of the economic output of Canada last year. However, since this was a voluntary poll, it is not unrealistic to assume that there are other billionaires in Canada who did not consider it beneficial to participate in the survey. Therefore, the conclusion is that there are more than 23 billionaires in Canada and the wealthiest could conceivably hold more than $20.97 billion and that the 100 wealthiest control much more than 12 per cent of Canada's 'economic wealth'. Though they may be of a significant number for the argument presented, they
represent an extremely small percentage of the Canadian population who hold a very
great amount of financial power over the balance of the Canadian public.

The October 17, 1998 edition of *The City Star*, carried an article regarding the
financial problems then being experienced by CIBC. At the end of the article the
financial problems were attributable to weaker capital markets and the "purchase
costs" of acquiring a New York brokerage, Oppenheimer, the previous year.
However, the remainder of the article describes the rationalization of CIBC's work-
force worldwide. The article opens with: "CIBC's troubled investment banking arm
is cutting almost 500 jobs or five per cent of its work-force as it struggles to bring its
expenses under control". Here the inflation in costs is attributed to, and remedied
through, the cost of labour rather than the cause of the financial "troubles"—
acquisition costs.

This is a general statement and a personal Financial Statement would have to be
prepared in each individual case to determine the actual benefits. The increases to
investment income and employment income in some cases would negate or overcome
increases in interest on personal debt. Therefore, the "correctness" of the statement is
dependent on the degree of personal debt. High levels of personal debt within the
relatively advantaged strata have more to do with consumer ideology (not addressed
here due to the limitations of the study) than does the debt experienced by the
financially deprived. (see Altman 1990).

Another example of transmutation is the use of the word "efficiency" in place of, and
to denote, "reduction in labour costs".

Rick was unable to define what an "unrestricted governing body" was or explain how
it differed from a government institution. I remain unclear as to what he meant by
the use of this term.

This sense of community was assigned to government when participants discussed
what government *should* be and would be in an ideal world.

"Apologetic" was determined by non-verbal clues which are not apparent in the
example from the transcript. These clues included body language and changes in
voice tone, tempo, and volume.

The term "becoming" is not used in any evolutionary sense. Castoriadis (1980) is
merely noting his observation that at this point in time certain people seem to be
'becoming' aware (that is coming out of a state of unawareness) with regard to the
situation discussed. This does not imply that it is a singular occurrence—that it has
not occurred before in human social life, in either space or time. Nor is the
implication that this is a "progressive" change. He suggests, and I concur, that there
would be identifiable circumstances relating to the occurrence that have nothing to do
with a progressional development of man or society, but that the occurrence and any related circumstances require further investigation.
Question Guide for Interviews*

Interviews were conducted as open-ended discussions. The following questions were merely a guide to be used if a participant found it difficult to begin, or continue, discussing the economy. Participants were advised that there were neither right nor wrong answers to any of the questions nor of their concepts about the economy.

I Participant History:
   1. Age, gender, ethnicity, occupation, relationship status, number of dependents
   2. Approximately, how much do you have invested?

II The Economy:
A: What the economy is/does
   1. Could you give me a concise description of the economy?
   2. Who runs the economy? Who should? Who would best run the economy?
   3. What would you say is the purpose of the economy? Has it been successful in fulfilling its purpose?
   4. Recently the stock market has become very volatile, do you think this is connected to the economy? In what ways?
   5. Do you worry if the economy is deemed weak or strong? Why?
   6. Where does the money in the economy come from? Who controls it? Who or what determines how money is used in the economy?
   7. Should markets be unregulated? Should the economy be unregulated? Does it function better unregulated? How so?
   8. Do social welfare programs harm the functioning of the Canadian economy? What do you consider to be social welfare programs?
   9. Does it benefit/harm the economy to give private business enterprises large sums of government money? Does the average taxpayer benefit? How?
   10. Tax levels are determined by the economy. Agree/disagree. If not, what does?
   11. Politicians are separate from the economy. They have no interest in the economy other than as Member of Parliament (Federal or Provincial).
   12. In a healthy economy business executives and managers can claim as high remuneration levels as the market will bear. Agree/disagree. In a healthy economy labor can demand as high wages as the market will bear. Agree/disagree. [If responses differ, why the difference?]
   13. What is a healthy economy? When is the economy sick?
   14. Speculation on the stock market helps/hinders the economy/ the average person.

B: The Role of Government:
   1. How does the government most affect your life? Who would you say runs the government?

*Some information for this questionnaire was drawn from Lane (1962)
2. What is the purpose of government? What services does it provide? Do you feel you are getting a good return on your tax dollars?
3. Do you think there is any difference in the kind of people who work for the government compared to those who work for a large business organization? How is that?
4. Should the government 'stay-out' of the economy and business/financial enterprises in general? How would this be done? Would all government services be privatized? Implementation of user-fees? Do you believe that user-fees would adequately cover the cost of the services the government now provides?
5. Could and would business and industry do a better job than the government has done? Why? Why not?
6. Both the deficit and government debt are caused by overly generous social programs, and overpaid and superfluous government workers. Do you agree or disagree? There are no overly generous remuneration packages or superfluous people in business enterprises. Agree/disagree.
7. Environmental clean-ups are the responsibility of the government. Agree/disagree? Why?
8. Inflation is caused by increased prices due to increased wage demands. Agree or disagree? What role do profits play in price increases?

III Personal Experiences
A: With Money:
1. Do you have any early memories of economic discussions in the home? What were they? Tell me about your early memories of experiences with money or economic issues.
2. What was your first job? [age, type of work] How did you get the job?
3. What do you like about your job/occupation? What do you not like about it? Taking this all together, how do you feel about it? What does the future look like in your work? Do you feel you are cut out for this type of work? Have you ever thought seriously about changing to some other line of work? Under what conditions might you change?
4. Is your income better or worse or about the same as last year? Five years ago? Five years from now? - just your best guess.
5. Is your income sufficient to meet your needs? [if not enough] How much more would you need? Want? What would you like most that your present income cannot provide? How important are these things to you?
6. What is the most important thing that money can give a person? Is there anything that money can't buy? What? Why?
7. Has the recent volatility of the stock market had much, if any, effect on you or your family?
8. Have you ever had to go without food, heating, or medicine due to lack of money? Have you ever had to 'do without'? What did you 'do without'?

B: With the Economy:
1. Has the economy had a major impact on your life recently? How? Is this usual or unusual?
2. Does the economy have much influence on your life? In what ways?
3. Do you often think about the economy? During the day? week? how often?
4. What sources are most reliable for information on the economy? Do you find any particular medium, person, columnist, program more reliable than others? Which ones?
5. Do you feel that a "free press" is important to or hinders the smooth operation of the economy? Democracy?
6. Do you sometimes feel that listening to all the different points of view on the economy is too confusing and that you would like to hear just one point of view from somebody who knows? Who would this be?
Possible Areas of Economic Conflict or Contradiction

Recently in the news, it was reported that banks have been recording billion dollar quarterly profits. Do you feel that these profits are justified? Do you have bank stocks in your mutual fund accounts? If you feel that the bank profits are too high, how do you justify that with wanting the highest possible returns on your mutual fund investments?

The World Bank, located in Washington DC, decided in 1989 to build a new headquarters. The budget was set at, and authorized for, $186 million. By 1990 the cost rose to $206.5 million and by May 1993 the figure was $250 million. By July 1993 the projected cost to completion was $314 million. An extra $5 million was required to install a special air-conditioning system so that directors, who considered the no smoking ban an infringement of their civil rights, could continue to smoke. *The Economist* noted that this additional sum was equivalent to the cost of 200,000 child immunizations in the third world. (Caufield 1996: 261)

The media and politicians often state that a healthy economy brings prosperity to the average citizen. Comment on the following statement:
"Since the early 1970s the world's 500 largest multinational corporations' sales grew from $721 billion in 1971 to $5.2 trillion in 1991, yet the worldwide employment of the same firms has remained flat" (Greider 1997: 41).

The media and politicians often state that government run industries cannot effectively supply goods and services to citizens. They argue the privatization of industries provides a better situation for a nation's people. Comment on the following:
In Mexico 80 percent of state industries were privatized. Results: wages plummeted by 52 percent (80 percent of Mexicans earn less than $7 per day), and some 30 billionaires were created. (Saul 1995: 12).

If you believe that governments cannot afford the social welfare safety-nets which have been progressively dismantled because they are deemed harmful to the economy and the well-being of working citizens through increased tax levels, comment on the following examples of corporate welfare.
Alabama 1993: Daimler-Benz (Mercedes) receives more than $300 million in tax breaks and subsidies for 1,5000 jobs. ($200,000 per job) Additionally: the National Guard cleared the site, the government promised to buy 2,500 vehicles at $30,000 each. $60 million covered travel and hotel costs to send workers to Germany to be trained.
Britain paid Ford $150 million in state aid
South Carolina paid BMW $79,000 per job
1988 Kentucky paid $125 million to Toyota
Toledo paid Owens-Corning $90 million
Connecticut paid Pratt & Whitney $32 million
Virginia paid IBM $165 million
1980 Tennessee paid Nissan $11,000 per job
1982 Ohio paid $16 million to Honda
1992 Kentucky paid a Canadian steel company $350,000 per job
Minnesota paid Northwest Airlines $828 million—the deal included expansion which never was accomplished
Illinois paid Sears $240 million, yet Sears laid off a large portion of its labour force (Greider 1997: 43 ff.)

In 1994 the top American Chrysler executives received bonuses of 75 to 100% of their salaries while CAW workers were allowed bonuses of 1.5%. The top 200 American executives received 100% bonuses (Winter 1989: 90). If you believe that union workers are greedy or over-paid, comment.

Gord Henderson wrote an article in the March 1, 1994 edition of the City Star raising reasonable questions about the above action by the Chrysler Corporation. Just prior to this action, Chrysler had paid the City Star $300,000.00 for an advertising spread. Henderson’s article was pulled from the second (home delivery) edition by the new editor, André Préfontaine (Winter 1997: 89-90). Does this situation express what you believe to be freedom of the press? Comment.

Quaker Oats lured away Sprint’s CEO by offering him $2.5 million in cash and 11.7 million in stock options. However, Sprint countered with an offer of $20.5 million. (Wall Street Journal 4/22/98) Assuming a 40 hour week that works out to $394,230.70 per week or $9,855.77 per hour. Do you believe that an individual managing an enterprise providing phone service or breakfast cereal ($253,846.70 weekly and $6,346.77 hourly) is worth such a large share of resources? Do you think anyone is? Who? Why?

In 1991 Revenue Canada was approached by an extremely wealthy Canadian family to forgo tax owing on funds ($2.2 billion dollars) leaving a Canadian trust account and entering a US bank. The amount of capital gains tax owed to the Canadian people was $700 million. Revenue Canada obliged and the $2.2 billion left Canada without paying the taxes due. In 1991, a lawyer for Canadian Dimensions magazine questioned the government about the transaction and was told it was none of his business. In 1996 he took the case to court. After a lengthy fight, a federal judge overturned the Revenue Canada ruling. Comment.
Appendix C:

Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>*divorced/long-term rel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>middle class</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>divorced/single</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>working class</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>widowed/long-term rel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>middle-class, educated**</td>
<td>college diploma</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>divorced/ single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>middle-class</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>divorced/long-term rel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>working class</td>
<td>college diploma</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>working class</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>divorced/single</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>working class</td>
<td>some university</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>widowed/single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>middle class</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>divorced/long-term rel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>middle-class, educated</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>divorced/ single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>middle-class</td>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age is given as a range. 55+ denotes an age between 55 and 59 years.
* Long term rel denotes a committed long-term relationship including, but not exclusive to, legal marriage.
** Educated refers to university education
### Appendix D:

**Research Participants**

#### Employment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Currently work</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
<th>Employment Hist</th>
<th>Rationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>primary school teacher</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>same profession/employer</td>
<td>early retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>medical technologist</td>
<td>medical technologist</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>long-term with last employer</td>
<td>recently rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>draftsperson</td>
<td>draftsperson</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>primarily, same profession/employer</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>outside his field</td>
<td>management, p.s. educator*</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>long-term with previous employer</td>
<td>recent change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>skilled trade</td>
<td>skilled trade</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>frequent change</td>
<td>frequently rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>self-emp; consultant</td>
<td>laser research, management</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>frequent change</td>
<td>frequently rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>legal clerk</td>
<td>legal clerk</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>same profession/employer</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>engineer, management</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>same profession/employer</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>self-emp, medical practice</td>
<td>p.s. educator, management</td>
<td>public/private</td>
<td>long-term with previous employer</td>
<td>recently rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>bio-chemist</td>
<td>chemist</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>same profession/employer</td>
<td>currently threatened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p.s. educator = post-secondary educator
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