Labour/Le Travailleur

Most Uncommon Common Men
Craft and Culture in Historical Perspective

Bryan D. Palmer

Volume 1, 1976

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt1art01

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (print)
1911-4842 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Palmer, B. D. (1976). Most Uncommon Common Men: Craft and Culture in Historical Perspective. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, *1*, 5–31.

MOST UNCOMMON COMMON MEN:
*Craft and Culture in Historical Perspective**

Bryan D. Palmer
State University of New York
at Binghamton

History has not been kind to Karl Ungling. We know only the barest outlines of what must have been, from all indications, a life of critical importance to an understanding of the nineteenth century past.[1] He was a printer, and like others of his craft, he wandered, but not without purpose or plan. Banished from Baden, Germany in 1848, he travelled to the United States where his republican sentiments were to cost him dearly: he volunteered to fight in the Mexican war where, at the battle of Buena Vista, he was disfigured for life. After the war Ungling's itinerary took him from Maine to Louisiana. As a journeyman typographer he established the first German newspaper in San Francisco and helped to build a theatrical company in Cincinnati. While he never remained in one location long enough to call it his home, his many friends remembered him as a man of culture and wit, warmth and talent: "He could spin a yarn, write a poem, make a speech, sing a song, bring a melody from a guitar, or tip a glass of lager bier with unequalled spirit and cosmopolitan politeness." He was indeed, in F.B. Smith's words, a most "uncommon common man."[2]

Movement was thus central to this nineteenth century craftsman's existence[3], but so too were political activism obviously cast in the mould of "radical democracy" and a penchant for social and cultural

* The author wishes to express his appreciation to Melvyn Dubofsky for his critical comments on an earlier draft of this paper. David Montgomery also provided a critical reading but his comments, unfortunately, came to the author too late for incorporation into the present article; he too is gratefully acknowledged. Finally, a debt is owed to Peter Friedlander, with whom the author has enjoyed many conversations about artisans and their historical significance.

involvement. How do we get beyond these parameters of one man's life, necessarily fragmented and lacking in substantive detail, to a more rigorous understanding of the historical presence of this skilled workingman? We can begin, I would like to suggest, by regarding Mr. Ungling as the logical culmination of centuries of artisan existence. Steeped in age-old traditions, embedded in structures and modes of thought linking the ancient and modern worlds, his death, in Detroit in 1859, could well be mourned by the artistic stonecutters of the Babylonian epoch, etching their perception of self-worth in monuments of lasting beauty, or by the Clydeside engineers of 1971, fighting to retain the remnants of a craft position in the face of overwhelming antagonistic odds; in the former lay Ungling's historical roots of pride of workmanship, and in the latter his historical destiny of strife and struggle.

We must see Ungling in this light for it is the continuity of the artisan's being which initially attracts attention; one senses a ubiquitousness rare in historical inquiry. Biblical texts strongly suggest the importance of the craftsman in the political economy of the world of the Old Testament; a vital connection among artisan, community and temple emerges from a reading of the Code of Hammurabi.[4] Moving closer to the modern era, we find the handicraftsman of medieval Europe, as town burgher or prominent guildsman, ever-present.[5] But it is with the Industrial Revolution, centred in the England of 1750-1850, that the craftsman attains his zenith of historical visibility. There, standing "at the edge of the remembered nineteenth century world," in the midst of "that rich, shadowy Dickensian understory of ...toil, high aspiration, self-education, impecuniosity, eccentricity, and subparliamentary political activity," we glimpse the artisan as a forceful historical actor.[6]

Within this basic continuity the episodic and the particular loom large. Drawn to the momentous and the eventful, historians have gravitated to the craftsman's prominence as a radical dissident: his participation in socio-political upheaval has been a convenient phenomenon upon which to focus historical study. An early epic account of the seizure of Munster by anabaptist tradesmen appropriately sets the stage for the historiographical treatment of the radical artisan. In Samuel Rowland's *Hell's Broke Loose* (1605), a simple tailor named Leyden, later to be crowned King, exhorts his fellows to

> *turne the world cleane upside down, (mad slaves)*
> *So to be talked of, when in our graves.*[7]

Similar cries would pierce the streets of Paris in the period leading up to the Year IV and Thermidor[8]; the harbours of colonial America would rock with equally vibrant exclamations in the turbulent months

of the revolutionary agitations of the eighteenth century[9]; and in English hamlets of the West Riding in E.P. Thompson's "opaque years" of 1811-12, 1816-17 and 1819, stifled whispers conveyed the same sense of urgency. [10] As *sans-culotte*, son of liberty or luddite, the artisan continued the tradition of Leyden.

Social and political radicalism, while distinctive, did not, however, encompass the totality of the artisan's historical presence. This activism was part and parcel of a larger context, a matrix of institutions, ideologies and traditions which, taken together, define the contours of a singular culture. It is this culture, and its product, the artisan as a unique historical personality, which is so often obscured by considering the craftsman only in the context of his involvement in movements of political and/or social opposition.

Culture is, to be sure, an ambiguous concept. This was not, however, always understood to be the case. Indeed, the nineteenth century, as Brian Stock has recently argued, viewing *Kultur* from the safety and confines of the 'great tradition', had fairly precise standards—those of the European nation states—against which to measure cultural activity and products.[11] The twentieth century, prodded towards a more subtle analysis of cultural reality by the anthropological writings of Melville J. Herskovits, Sidney Mintz and, more recently, Claude Levi-Strauss and his structuralist entourage, has broadened the conception of culture significantly.[12] Once regarded as highly visible and articulated, the offspring of refinement and gentility, culture has now come to be perceived more eclectically with the consequence that the culture of the *menu peuple* is now considered more sympathetically.

At the foundation of this recent sensitivity towards the culture of the lower orders stands an acute awareness of the importance of *material culture*—sustenance, clothing, furnishings, homes, neighbourhoods, environment, diet, etc.—in the unfolding of everyday life. Henri Lefebvre writes:

> *As a compendium of seemingly unimportant activities and of products and exhibits other than natural, everyday life is more than something that eludes natural, divine and human myths. Could it represent a lower sphere of meaning, a place where creative energy is stored in readiness for new creations? A place that can be reduced neither to philosophical objective definitions nor to objective representations of classified objects, such as clothing, nourishment, furnishings, etc. because it is more and other than these? It is not a chasm, a barrier or a buffer but a field and a half-way house, a halting place and a spring-board, a moment made on*

> *moments (desires, labours, pleasures—products and achievements—passivity and creativity—means and ends —etc.), the dialectical interaction that is the inevitable starting point for the realization of the possible.*[13]

Similarly, Mintz, who regards culture as "patterns of socially learned behaviour expressed in artifacts, languages, traditions, values and the like," is most emphatic in his assertion that culture transcends the lifelessness of this mere "collection of habits, superstitions and artifacts. Instead," writes Mintz, "we see that culture is *used;* and that any analysis of its use immediately brings into view the arrangements of persons in social groups, for whom cultural forms confirm, reinforce, maintain, change, or deny particular arrangements of status, power and identity."[14]

In this, then, resides the critical contribution of the widening of our conception of culture, for in viewing culture as a resource and society as the arena in which that resource is utilized, we are necessarily led to a refinement of our conception of the "levels" at which culture operates, and the "spheres" which it affects. In short, the relationships, puzzling and intricate, among class and culture, race and culture and poverty and culture—to name but three important combinations—become intelligible, as do other interconnections among institutions, behaviour and historical processes.[15] The "invisible cultures" and "limited identities" of the masses of people become, for the historian, less obscure as well as more meaningful and accessible.[16] Any attempt to grasp the artisan's historical significance and presence, demands such an approach.

Three distinct, but interrelated, strands coalesce to delineate the character of artisan culture: the rituals and traditions associated with the life and inner workings of the shop floor;[17] a cluster of ideas and attitudes that set the skilled craftsman apart from other social groups; and, finally, various institutional forms in which ritual, tradition, ideology and attitude expressed themselves concretely.

Perhaps the most vigorous and resilient aspects of the craft culture were the traditions and rituals associated with the work place:

> *There were traditions, customs, and usages interwoven with, and indeed in a great measure constituting, the inner and social life of workshops, a knowledge of which is as essential to the comfort of those whose lot is cast amongst them as technical proficiency is necessary to obtaining or retaining employment. To these unwritten, but perfectly understood and all-powerful laws of work-shop life, all working men—whatever may be their private opinion— must in*

> *some degree bow. The social phase of life in a workshop —the phase embodied in the customs and traditions of the 'trade'—is generally the first into which the beginner is initiated.*[18]

One need only mention Saint Monday[19], 'keeping nix'[20] and tramping[21] to point to the pervasiveness and richness of artisan culture. *The Wheelwright's Shop* was more than one man's perception of the buoyancy of craft customs and trade practices: it testified to the presence of a specific "shop culture", seemingly immune to the incursions of industrial capitalist discipline and work structures.[22] As late as 1904, after Taylorism and other managerial ideologies aimed at rationalizing the work process had made their appearance, Carroll D. Wright could write of the foundry business:

> *The customs of the trade...do not always vanish with the omission of any recognition of 'the standard day's work' in wage agreements. Nor can it be expected that the entire membership of an organization will at once respond to the removal of limitations on output by a national convention of that organization. Trade customs, shop practices, grow; they become as much a part of the man as his skill as a molder...*[23]

The shop floor was not, however, the only environment in which the traditions and rituals of the skilled craftsman thrived. In neighbourhood streets and common pastures the artisan celebrated his cultural traditions with festival and parade, ceremonial gathering and trade procession. As strong liquor liberated his inhibitions, the tradesman often broke violently from the fragile confines of deference and piety so characteristic of pre-capitalist, traditional social relations[24], or the rigid distinctions which hounded his every turn in the more impersonal world of modern capitalism. In the London of Francis Place or the Boston of Benjamin Franklin, for instance, Guy Fawkes Day became the date on which pent-up frustrations and hostility towards "social betters" manifested themselves in street brawls, bonfires and brash demands. Established authority seemed to hold little sway amidst chants to

> *Pray remember the fifth of November,*
> *Gunpowder, Treason and Plot.*
> *I Know no reason, why Gunpowder treason*
> *Should ever be forgot,*
> *A stick and a stake, for King George's sake*
> *A stick and a stump for old Oliver's rump*
> *So pray remember the bonfire.*[25]

Eastertime too, witnessed similar scenes. Samuel Bamford's recollections of the election of the "Lord Mayor of Middleton" reinforce our conception of the festive parade as a mockery of constituted authority. A drunken tradesman was hoisted upon an armchair, paraded through the streets, the crowd shrieking and gloating to the tune of "Milord wants his dues." All householders were then forcibly persuaded to contribute to a common booty, later to be divied up amongst the participants. Those resisting the mock ceremony learned to act with more diplomacy for the next morning, as tradesmen and apprentices staggered to their benches, constables could be heard to demand "who smashed such a window . . . who stole this body's can . . . who broke that body's mug?"[26] Property and authority were shorn of much of their sacredness on occasions such as these.[27]

But the craftsman did not "live" his culture only through the festive gathering or the boisterous mock ceremony. If the street were the scene of many a ludicrous procession, the tavern was an equally conducive milieu in which to express the culture of the skilled. There, on many a warm summer night or brisk winter evening, respectable workingmen would gather to enjoy conversation over a pint of ale or a leisurely pipe.[28] Often, without warning, the parlour doors would be thrown open and the tradesmen would break into song, an open expression, once again, of their contempt for the confinements of deference and class subordination. Revelling in the ribald and the risque, apprentice and master, hands clapping or rapping the table, often ended a chorus with a blustering refrain. Francis Place recalled one such distasteful phrase, regularly bellowed from his father's public house:

> *And for which I am sure she'll go to Hell*
> *For she makes me fuck her in church time.*[29]

For this was a male culture, and it was often at woman's expense that the artisan articulated his implicit contempt for a genteel aristocracy or a pious bourgeoisie.[30]

All of this is not meant to imply that drunken revels, boisterous festivities and a measure of crudeness, willingly flung in the face of "social betters", subsumed the artisan's culture. Parades could, of course, be moments of sober and serious commitment, as were the ratification processions in Philadelphia and New York in 1788. In them, the tradesmen voiced their political and social ideals, but there also they refused to bend against their own evaluation of their self-worth, as the bricklayers, with their motto "both buildings and rulers are the works of our hands" made abundantly clear.[31] And taverns, we should remember, were much more than dispersers of good brew: in them many an illicit union, many a revolutionary conspiracy, were

hatched.[32] Political and social involvement, and the sentiments and world view upon which they rested, flowed into and out of the craftsman's culture of everyday life.

The artisan's distaste for the inequities of the social order did not only surface in the obliqueness of ceremony and song. It also assumed an ideological flavour, as our earlier discussion of the political activism of the craftsman suggests. The tradition of democracy, as Gwyn Williams has argued, lay deep in the soil of pre-capitalist social and economic formations; it was the artisan who first cultivated its roots.[33] In England the continuity of the democratic heritage articulated itself in the London Corresponding Society, founded in 1792, where the "leading" of the craftsmen was "that the number of our members be unlimited" and in the Chartist upheavals of the 1830's and 1840's.[34] Across the Atlantic it was the skilled workingman's staunch republicanism that coloured labour's struggles throughout the course of the nineteenth century.[35] Yet even in America, where mobility and economic opportunity seemingly blurred distinctions between classes[36], the craft workers' republicanism was outpaced by their democratic fervour. Seth Luther announced

> *with unfeigned pleasure, that the Boston shipwrights, caulkers and gravers, never have asked or received, nor never will ask or receive mercy from aristocrats, be they merchants, manufacturers, or any other Republican TYRANTS.* [37]

"So much for equality in a republican country," Luther thundered as he chastized monopolists, aristocrats, tories and traitors: all conveniently classified under the general rubric, 'The Higher Orders'.[38] Wherever the migrations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought the skilled craftsman, this heritage of democracy continued to thrive.[39]

This struggle against "The Higher Orders" was complemented by the inner strivings of the skilled workingman for his own self-improvement. Among no social stratum were the doctrines of self-help and self-education so passionately embraced[40]; Samuel Smiles, it is clear, spoke to an audience of artisans, tradesmen and respectable workingmen.[41] But the craftsman's penchant for self-elevation was mediated by his collectivist approach to social phenomena. The emblem of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, for instance, exhorted its membership to be industrious, but the path to this end lay along the road of unity. Mutual aid, not *laissez-faire*, structured the skilled mechanic's attempts at and conception of self-advancement.[42]

A final aspect of this matrix of ideological orientations was the

craftsman's attachment to respectability, the social assessment of his worth. Cobbett noted the indignation with which working people, "the real strength, and all the resources of the country," heard themselves referred to as "the Populace, the Rabble, the Mob...."[43] For Francis Place, respectability was *the* essential defence of the labouring classes. It was "a matter of the greatest importance to every working man, for so long as he is able to keep himself up in this particular, he will have resolution to struggle with...his adverse circumstances. No workingman, journeyman tradesman is ever wholly ruined until hope has abandoned him."[44] And Thomas Carlyle insisted that in the workingman's persistent opposition to injustice lay "something infinitely respectable."[45] As Eugene Genovese has commented in another context:

> *Only those who romanticize—and therefore do not respect—the laboring classes would fail to understand their deep commitment to 'law and order'....As Machiavelli so brilliantly revealed, most people refuse to believe in anything they have not experienced. Such negativity must be understood as a challenge to demonstrate that a better, firmer, more just social order can replace the one to be torn down. But this innate conservatism, which rests on a wisdom rooted in much experience of the disasters that accompany the efforts of well-meaning fools, can be transformed into a powerful force as a demand for a responsible and constructive alternative to a tenaciously held security. And at the least, it implies a series of expectations, which when not met can produce stunning out-breaks of irrational violence.*[46]

Respectability thus reinforced the craftsman's sense of self-worth, assumed a tactical importance in the effort to avoid destitution and underlay the skilled workingman's passion for political involvement and democratic social relations.[47]

These attitudes and ideas found expression in numerous nineteenth century social and cultural institutions and movements. In the halls of friendly societies and mechanics' institutes artisans and their journeymen practiced their creeds of self-help, self-education and mutual aid. Adopting the ritual and regalia of earlier guild structures, often functioning as illicit trade bodies in the early years of the century, the fraternal order attracted skilled craftsmen in droves: in Sheffield one investigator found that in 1840 seven prominent societies embraced members of 79 trades, the largest group being, understandably enough, 276 cutlers.[48] J.M. Baernreither argued, in 1889, that friendly socities were "increasing the cohesion of the working class, and weld-

ing together elements—which, taken separately, are destitute of strength or influence—into a social power, by creating a union based upon brotherly support."[49] The Mechanics' Institute, pursuing the diffusion of useful knowledge, served a similar function and attracted a like constituency, "the superior order of the working class".[50]

While friendly society and mechanics' institute also embraced the claim to respectability, it was another social movement which gave fuller expression to this realm of artisan self-perception. With the transition from traditional social relations, rooted in the pre-capitalist world, to the more disciplined structures of capitalist society, the drink question assumed an unprecedented importance. Throughout the nineteenth century employers and crusading zealots from the nebulous "middle classes" led an attack on the "demon rum".[51] But the skilled workingman also joined the temperance cause, albeit for different reasons: a drunkard was of little value to himself, his family or his class. The London Working Men's Association saw its aim as drawing "into one bond of UNITY the *intelligent* and *influential* portion of the working classes in town and country"; as such it excluded the "drunken and immoral" from its ranks.[52] As Chartist, Knight of Labor, Greenbacker or Socialist, the nineteenth century workingman rejected inebriation: in Lynn, Massachusetts "rebel mechanics"—vigorous critics of capitalist exploitation, degradation and moral injustice—practiced an austere temperance.[53] Yet the craftsman was seldom a prohibitionist; drink was rarely seen as *the* social problem, and the "cold water cause" was often seen as a means to a larger end.[54]

The larger end which demanded amelioration was the debasement of the craft workers' autonomy, the growing incursions upon custom and tradition which industrial capitalism fostered. Threatened by economic and social change the artisan experienced, throughout the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a profound dislocation: control over the work process, once most emphatically his, seemed about to pass to other hands as rationalization, skill dilution and task simplification eroded older conceptions of work and its practicioners.[55] In the face of such a relentless onslaught the vibrancy of the artisan's culture assumed an increasing ambivalence. Fraternal orders and mechanics' institutes, self-help and mutual-aid, movements for moral reformation and the richness of the associational life of workshop, tavern and neighbourhood—these were the institutions, ideologies and cultural forms of a world seemingly passed by. With industrial capitalism firmly in the saddle, and its disciplines and structures exercising an increasing hegemony over life on and off the shop floor, such forces and modes of thought reflected a certain obsolescence. Were the artisan and some measure of his culture to survive, a

more rigorous matrix of defence was clearly on the agenda.

It was the embattled craftsman, then, who created the labour movement in an attempt to stave off the inevitable destruction of his trade and his life. It has become a standard axiom of an emerging social history of the working class that the artisan, not the debased proletarian, fathered the labour movement. As a class for itself, the working class was born, not in the factory, but in the workshop. When Marx "consider[ed]the first outbreaks of the French proletariat", he focused attention upon the *canuts* of Lyon, highly skilled workers whose motto "Live Working or Die Fighting" foreshadowed the spectre of international class warfare.[56] In the strikes of the July monarchy, Peter Stearns found a preponderance of artisans, and Charles Tilly's and Edward Shorter's monumental compilation of data on strikes in France over the last one hundred and fifty years establishes the leading role of skilled craftsmen in the early struggles of the working class.[57]

Outside of France a similar tendency prevailed. In England, where the working class was first 'made', no stratum exerted as powerful an influence on the developing trade union movement as the skilled mechanic: historians as divergent in their views and allegiances as E.P Thompson, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, A.E. Musson and Henry Pelling are in agreement on this point.[58] Canada[59] and the United States[60] experienced the same phenomenon, although its historical treatment remains relatively undeveloped. And in a study of the formative years of the Jewish workers' movement in Tsarist Russia, Ezra Mendelsohn concluded that "by pioneering in labor organization within the Russian Empire, the Jewish workers were doing precisely what their fellow artisans had done all over Europe....it was the craftsmen who were the first to organize trade unions, leaving the factory workers behind."[61] Where industrial capitalism left its imprint, the craftsman obligingly left his: a union forged in his image, dedicated to his interests.

But what did the craftsman bring to the labour movement? Was the artisan, so dominated by concepts of thrift, sobriety, self-help and respectability, capable of building a movement of opposition to industrial capitalism? Or, rather, would he acquiesce in what already seemed the accepted and dominant ethos of his "superiors"? Could the craftsman, the privileged and pampered plebian aristocrat, take up the cudgels for his class, as a whole, or would self-protection, and its consequent exclusionary view of other, less fortunate strata of the working class, emerge as the dominant thrust of the new movement? In short, the question as to the artisans' class allegiance, petty-bourgeois or proletarian, immediately poses itself in any analytical treatment of the skilled craftsman's contribution to trade unionism.

Theoreticians of trade unionism, often engaged in an explicit de-

bate with the ghost of Karl Marx, have generally laid stress, as Frank Tannenbaum's sub-title proclaimed, on the conservative functions of trade unionism.[62] John R. Commons and his associates popularized a conception of the labour movement as an instinctively defensive and conservative response to transformations in the structure of markets.[63] And V.I. Lenin, whose credentials as an astute commentator on working-class organization need not be questioned here, saw fit to pass this often cited judgement:

> *The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation, etc. The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals.*[64]

If the artisan was indeed the architect of the early union movement, as we have argued, such views do not speak well for his potential as a radical spokesman for the class that has often been seen as the vanguard of revolutionary social change. Moreover, a deeply entrenched historiographical interpretation of the craftsman's unique social and political position regards the skilled workers of the late nineteenth century as an "aristocracy of labour."[65] Given the divisions and gradations which have characterized the working class as a whole since the early nineteenth century, such an analysis is not entirely unjustified. As early as 1858 Engels wrote Marx that "the English proletariat is becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat *as well as* a bourgeoisie."[66] By 1892 Engels had extended his argument concerning the English experience to America:

> *Your great obstacle in America, it seems to me lies in the exceptional position of the native workers. Up to 1848 one could only speak of the permanent native working class as an exception: the small beginnings of it in the cities of the East always had still the hope of becoming farmers or bourgeois. Now a working class has developed and also to a great extent organized itself on trade union lines. But it still takes up an aristocratic attitude and whenever possible leaves the badly paid occupations to the immigrants, of whom only a small section enter the aristocratic trade unions.*[67]

Lenin, ever the polemicist, utilized a language and a tone more vitriolic:

> *The industrial workers cannot fulfil their world-historical mission of liberating humanity from the yoke of capital and from wars if they isolate themselves in narrow, craft, narrow trade union interests, and self-contentedly restrict themselves to improving their sometimes tolerable petty-bourgeois position. This is exactly what occurs in many advanced countries among the 'aristocracy of labour'...which, in fact, represents the worst enemies of socialism, the betrayal of socialism, the petty-bourgeois chauvinists, the agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement.*[68]

A stronger condemnation could not have been hurled at the skilled artisan: he stood indicted as the cutting edge of the embourgeoisement of the working class that orthodox Marxists found so horrible.

Engels' and Lenin's references to a "labour aristocracy" were not figments of an historical imagination conjured up to "explain" the lack of revolutionary upheaval in the late nineteenth century. Edward Thompson has pointed to the existence and recognition of this phenomenon as early as the England of the 1830's. The old elite of the years 1800-1850—master artisans whose self-perception of their worth placed them on a par with professionals, clerks and other "blackcoated workers"[69]—gave way to a new stratum—centred in the industries of modern capitalism: iron foundries, metal trades, precision production engineering—with specialised skills, higher wages, greater job control and an acute consciousness of their differentiation from the masses of factory workers.[70] Carlyle, in 1839, Mayhew, in 1851, and Thomas Wright, in 1873, all drew attention to the distinctions between artisans and the more casual segments of the working poor.[71] Royden Harrison, reiterating Hobsbawn's earlier contention, has argued that

> *the concept of a labour aristocracy is not an invention or discovery of Marx or Engels, but almost a commonplace of mid-Victorian socio-economic literature. The distinctive institutions of mid-Victorian labour become unintelligible without reference to it, and the story of working class politics in the third quarter of the century is largely about the activities and aspirations of this stratum.*[72]

While continuities and discontinuities characterized specific aspects of the skilled craftsman's existence throughout the course of the nineteenth century, the "labour aristocracy" clearly had a long and vital history.

Recognition of the "labour aristocracy's" historical reality is not, however, tantamount, to an uncritical acceptance of the polemics of Lenin or Engels. It is possible, indeed I would argue necessary, to recognize that however much the skilled craftsman's involvement in the labour movement stemmed from his desire to protect a past status of privilege and security, that, in and of itself, was far from the whole story. The skilled and respectable mechanics who built the labour movement did, to be sure, often form unions that excluded deprived segments of the working class;[73] true enough, the craftsman, comfortable in his staid trade union, often manifested an intense jingoism instead of proletarian internationalism;[74] and oftentimes the artisans' penchant for self-help and respectability cultivated accommodations with an oppressive order, rather than rebellion against exploitation and injustice.[75] Dan Tobin's contemptuous vision of the unorganized worker—"rubbish" at labour's door—on the eve of the emergence of the C.I.O. harkened back to many of the practices and much of the world view of the nineteenth century craftsman.[76]

But it is the other side of the historical record that renders the traditional pejorative conception of the "labour aristocracy" so inadequate. For it was the skilled workingman, the intellectual and social elite of the working class, that was most likely to manifest political militancy and radicalism, while the debauched victims of the lower classes displayed apathy or conservatism.[77]

In the United States, Ira Steward, a machinist in an age when that occupation denoted skill of the highest order, articulated a political economy of the working classes that, according to David Montgomery, rivalled Marxism in its utter repudiation of the homilies of *laissez-faire*.[78] And in 1885 the *Manchester Guardian* argued that Socialism had "never been able to touch the miserable poor, and had always been most successful in converting the well-to-do and intelligent artisan."[79] Moreover, cognizance of their own skill and elevated status within the hierarchy of the working class did not necessarily inhibit the skilled craftsman from assuming the role of spokesman for the unorganized and unskilled: Tom Mann and Peter McGuire made this all too clear in the later decades of the nineteenth century as they stood behind the drive of a forceful 'new unionism'.[80]

The rise of the Land and Labour League in England in 1870 demonstrated the "labour aristocracy's" capabilities as a vigorous defender of all proletarian interests. On Good Friday, 1870, members of the League, demonstrating against a plight somewhat removed from their own personal interests, unemployment, wore "broad scarlet-sashes, not over the shoulders, but around the waist, in the exact pattern current among the *sans-culottes* of the first French Revolution,

and, in a further imitation of that class, poles were born aloft with the emblematical caps of liberty."[81] No hint of accommodationist politics surfaced in the League's position on monarchy:

> *Men—decent, steady artisans—...speaking amid applauding circles of shop mates, wished that the whole tribe of Royalty were under the sod; while women, mothers themselves, prayed that its women might be made unfruitful, so that the race of royal paupers might not be increased.*[82]

And we should not forget that it was from the craft tradition—among the metal tradesmen of the first British shop stewards' movement and the skilled machinists of the seemingly "class collaborationist" A.F. of L.—that the contours of an Anglo-American thrust for the workers' control in the World War I years emanated.[83]

All of this should not surprise us a great deal. For the artisan, as R.Q. Gray has reminded us, was inescapably trapped in the realities and harshness of a working-class existence: despite his rhetoric of thrift, self-help and respectability, his values were always mediated by the resilient traditions of mutual aid and solidarity.[84] Antonio Gramsci's conception of the cultural domination of the "hegemonic class", so fruitfully applied to the American slave experience by Eugene Genovese,[85] proves invaluable as an explanatory construct regarding this historical phenomenon:

> *Self-deception can be an adequate explanation for a few individuals taken separately, or even for groups of a certain size, but it is not adequate when the contrast occurs in the life of the great masses. In these cases the contrast between thought and action cannot but be the expression of profounder contrasts of a social historical order. It signifies that the social group in question may indeed have its own conception of the world, even if only embryonic; a conception which manifests itself in action, but only occasionally and in flashes—when, that is, the group is acting as an organic totality. But this same group has, for reasons of submission and intellectual subordination, adopted a conception which is not its own but is borrowed from another group; and it affirms this conception verbally and believes itself to be following it, because this is the conception which it follows in "normal times"—that is, when its conduct is not independent and autonomous, but submissive and subordinate.*[86]

Thus, the artisan, as a segment of an oppressed class, inevitably internalized much of the dominant ethos of the individualistic creed of

the rising bourgeoisie. Yet class antagonisms surfaced, and indeed came to the forefront, through the emergence of a "corporate class consciousness"; the simultaneous development of specific class institutions (such as trade/craft unions) and a sense of class identity formulated under the guise of the goals, aspirations and language hegemonically appropriated from the dominant class.[87] In this context, the shibboleth petty bourgeois, so promiscuously flung at the skilled craftsman, retains little force. "Minds which thirst for [such] a tidy platonism," E.P. Thompson has aptly written, "very soon become impatient with actual history."[88]

But the "labour aristocracy's" organic relationship with the labour movement was not only noteworthy for the social, political and economic doctrines transmitted to the early unions. As we have attempted to make explicit, the artisan presence was just as much a cultural, as it was an economic or political, phenomenon. The labour movement, so influenced by the skilled craftsman, could not but reflect this: creeds of self-help, self-education and respectability gathered new strengths in the union hall; pleas for moral reformation and social change constantly flowed from the press and podiums of the emerging movement; the friendly societies' role as dispenser of working-class philanthropy was quietly usurped by the fledgling craft bodies; and nowhere did the traditions of mutuality, solidarity and egalitarianism rebound with such fervor. The *Industrial Banner*, a militant voice of Canadian labour at the turn of the century, stated what appeared to be obvious to many of the participants and observers of a growing union movement:

> *The labor movement is a new Christianity, for it is a Christianizing industry. It is a new Democracy, for it is democratizing privilege and injustice out of the world of business. It is a new philanthropy, for it is humanizing the relation of employer and employee, buyer and seller. It is a new political economy, for the greatest destroyer of wealth in the modern world is wealth, and the labor movement, by striving to put all to work and open to all the riches of nature hitherto locked up, shut down, or reserved for exclusive exploitation, is creating a true wealth beyond all the dreams of avarice.*[89]

Trade unions, too often perceived as mere institutions of economic self-interest, had inherited the rich and vibrant culture of the artisan.

So it was that the labour movement became the vehicle in which the craft culture rode into the modern epoch. It was, above all else, an eclectic culture: defined in the broadest of social terms, it delineated a particular way of life, certain values and structures of feeling, and

specific institutions.[90] Nurtured within the social structures and relationships of a traditional, pre-capitalist world, and expressive of so much of the moral economy of that historic context[91], the craft culture faced the relentless onslaught of industrial capitalism and adapted in complex and diverse ways to the new imperatives of capitalist society. Put simply, the artisan's culture had come to reflect, by the late nineteenth century, residual strains which harkened back to life and leisure in an age untramelled by the rigours of capitalist industry, as well as emergent strains, articulating a cognizance of the capitalist transformation which was both so destructive and so inevitable.[92]

This blending of residual and emergent qualities, coupled with the essential ambivalence willed to working-class culture and consciousness by an oppressed class' hegemonic relationship to the dominant class, go a long way towards discrediting the view, so common among labour historians, that the craft tradition was capable of generating only retrogressive struggles.[93] To quote Edward Thompson once more:

> *The defense of threatened rights or usages is not necessarily retrospective in any nostalgic sense. Most radical criticism of society, and especially of capitalist society with its repeated rationalizations, starts from such a sense of being threatened. The Luddites of 1811 were defending craft skills and the Clydeside engineers of 1917 or 1971 were defending established craft traditions....For we live in society just as we live in our flesh. And it is within a more precise view of society that discriminations of value must usually begin. For if capitalism is the basic economic process of four centuries of history, there has been evidence throughout of human processes that are alternatives to capitalism. We have to go on to ask: what form could a human protest take against an on-going, all-triumphant economic process unless as "retrospect?"*[94]

Thompson's argument is all the more compelling when one considers that the very defences of threatened craftsmen (use values versus money or market values, the primacy of human, as opposed to impersonal, loyalties, and of the idealized community of interests in contradistinction to a ruthless competition) are the promises of the socialist order.[95]

The artisan's culture has been the focal point of this analysis for, unlike many aspects of the craftsman's existence, it exhibited a basic continuity; much of the craft tradition lives today, although it has been severely emasculated by life in the bowels of modern capitalism.[96] Yet the very nature of this introduction, shattering basic historical unities

of national and regional context, period and chronology, will understandably upset many minds, particularly those who crave the precision of more orthodox historical inquiry. We have sought, in Levi-Strauss' words, "to enlarge a specific experience to the dimensions of a more general one, [thereby making it]...accessible *as experience* to men of another country or another epoch."[97] Our discussion has thus focused on "description", albeit of a "thick", or ethnographic nature, but for the historian this is not enough.[98]

We must, if we desire to capture a more precise measure of the craftsman's presence, turn to the local setting. As Herbert Gutman and many others have stressed, the nineteenth century workingman was an intensely local being.[99] "Popular history," argues Richard Cobb, who has written it at its best, "can be studied with profit only in very limited, regional terms."[100] (And, as Cobb, in concert with Louis Chevalier, E.P. Thompson and Eugene Genovese, would also be quick to assert, in a tone most vehement, if not vicious, it cannot be measured, counted or quantified. "I have measured out my life with coffee spoons," is Prufrock's sad refrain. Should it define the parameters of the social historian's vision and method?)[101] It is, then, in the local setting that the finer distinctions among the master artisan of the traditional or pre-capitalist world, the craftsman of the simple market society preceding industrial capitalism's entrenchment and the highly skilled mechanic of modern industry, often labelled labour's "aristocrat", can be portrayed in detail[102]; there, too, in specific communities and on specific shop and factory floors, we can glimpse the residual and the emergent, the old and the new, and assess their contributions to the day-to-day struggles of the workingman.[103] Social change and transformation, critical categories of historical analysis which may have been blurred by our treatment of the continuities of the craftsman's existence are also best examined in a local context. We should express no surprise, therefore, that the most fruitful studies of the nineteenth century skilled craftsman—and here one thinks immediately of the work of David Montgomery, William Sewell, Bruce Laurie, Eric Hopkins, Greg Kealey and John Foster[104]—have been drawn on the canvas of the community study.

It is hence appropriate that this paper end with an exhortation —perhaps plea is a more fitting term—rather than the customary conclusion. For what is needed in Canadian historiography is a sensitive appreciation of the social and cultural lives of men and women in the obscure and obscured settings of the past. Beginnings have been made, but they are clearly inadequate. For the historian who will probe local sources with diligence and imagination the potential and promise of a richer history slowly unfolds. Then, and only then, will the many un-

known Karl Unglings, whose social and cultural legacy to the modern world has yet to be explored or exploited, come to occupy the place in our history which they so clearly deserve.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Our fortune in knowing the following fragments of Ungling's life was, as is so often the case, his misfortune. Death, not his life itself, made this 'wandering printer' newsworthy and the *Ohio Statesman* wrote a lengthy obituary which was reproduced in the *Hamilton Evening Times*, Tuesday April 26, 1859, p. 2, the account upon which the following paragraph is based.

[2] Smith has written an important biography of one nineteenth century printer/engraver, William James Linton. The quote is from Smith, *Radical Artisan: William James Linton, 1812-1897*, (Manchester 1973), p. ix. For brief, but insightful, accounts of Canadian printers see *Hamilton Evening Times*, Saturday October 2, 1863, p. 3; Wayne Roberts, "The Last Artisans: Toronto Printers, 1896-1914," forthcoming in Gregory S. Kealey and Peter Warrian, ed., *Essays in Canadian Working Class History*, (Toronto 1976); and Gregory S. Kealey, "Workers' Control and Mechanization: The Experience of Toronto Skilled Workers, 1860-1892," (Paper presented to the Conference on Canadian Society in the Late Nineteenth Century, January 18, 1975), pp. 8-18.

[3] The classic statement in this realm remains E.J. Hobsbawn, "The Tramping Artisan," in *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour*, (New York 1964), pp. 34-63. *Cf.*, Fernand Braudel's discussion of 'transhumance' in the Mediterranean, a phenomenon in which artisans were particularly active, in *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), esp. pp. 49, 50, 201, 222, 334-338, 416-418, and 427-439; and Michael B. Katz's attempt to argue that transiency was a basic feature of nineteenth century North American society in *The People of Hamilton, 1851-1861*, (Cambridge 1975), pp. 94-175. Katz draws strength for his argument from one nineteenth century autobiography, Wilson Benson, *Life and Adventures of Wilson Benson, Written by himself*, (Toronto, 1876), *passim*.

[4] Isaiah 54:16; II Kings 24:14; I Samuel 13:19-22; David B. Weisberg, *Guild Structure and Political Allegiance in Early Achaeminid Mesopotamia*, (New Haven 1967), pp. 52,56, 77 *et passim*.

[5] Georges Renard, *Guilds in the Middle Ages*, (New York 1968, original 1918), *passim*; Edgcumbe Staley, *The Guilds of Florence*, (New York 1967, original 1906), *passim*; Sister Mary Ambrose Mulholland, *Early Guild Records of Toulouse*, (New York 1941), pp. xii-xiii; Lujo Brentano, *On the History and Development of Guilds and the Origins of Trade Unions*, (New York 1969, original 1907), *passim*; Francis Aidan Hibbert, *The Influence and Development of English Guilds; as illustrated by the craftguilds of Shrewsbury*, (New York 1970, original 1891), *passim*.

[6] Smith, *Radical Artisan*, p. ix.

[7] Samuel Rowlands, *The Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands, 1598-1628*, (Glasgow 1880), p. 17; Charles W. Camp, *The Artisan in*

Elizabethan Literature, (New York 1924), pp. 137-139. For a discussion of the historical setting conducive to such seventeenth century artisan radicalism see Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, (New York 1964), *passim;* Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*, (New York 1972), esp. pp. 32-45, 231-246; and Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study of the Origins of Radical Politics*, (Cambridge 1965), *passim*.

[8] Albert Soboul, *The Sans-Culottes*, (New York 1972), *passim;* George Rude, *The Crowd in the French Revolution*, (London 1959), *passim*., esp. pp. 1-9, 178-190; Gwyn Williams, *Artisans and Sans-Culottes: Popular Movements in France and Britain During The French Revolution*, (London 1968), ch. i-iii; Richard Cobb, *The Police and the People, French Popular Protest, 1789-1820*, (London 1970), pp. 61-70, 172-211.

[9] Charles Shaw Olton, "Philadelphia Artisans and the American Revolution," (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Berekely, 1967), *passim;* Staughton Craig Lynd, "The Revolution and the Common Man: Farm Tenants and Artisans in New York Politics, 1777-1788," (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia, 1962), pp. 148-278; Richard Walsh, *Charleston's Sons of Liberty: A Study of the Artisans, 1763-89*, (Columbia, S.C. 1959), *passim*; Pauline Maier, *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776*, (New York 1974), esp. pp. 3-50, 77-112, 161-197.

[10] My perception of Luddism follows the innovative interpretation set forth in E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, (New York 1963), Ch. xiv. Thompson also argues his case in his introduction to Frank Peel, *The Rising of the Luddites, Chartists, and Plug Drawers*, (London 1968, original 1880), an invaluable source in its own right. For different appraisals of the phenomenon of machine-breaking see J.L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Skilled Labourer, 1760-1832*, (New York 1970, original 1919), pp. 257-381; Malcolm I. Thomis, *The Luddites: Machine Breaking in Regency England*, (Hamden, Connecticut 1970), *passim;* Mark Rutherford, *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*, (London 1887), *passim*; E.J. Hobsbawm, *Labouring Men*, pp. 5-22.

[11] Brian Stock, "English Canada: The Visible and Invisible Cultures," *Canadian Forum*, LII (March 1973), pp. 30-31.

[12] Melville J. Herskovits, *Cultural Anthropology*, (New York 1955), esp. pp. 305-315; Sidney W. Mintz, "History and Anthropology: A Brief Reprise," in Stanley L. Engerman and Eugene D. Genovese, ed., *Race and Slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative Studies*, (Princeton 1975), pp. 477-494; Mintz, "Foreword," in Norman Whitten and John F. Szwed, ed., *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*, (New York 1970), pp. 1-16. On the impact of Levi-Strauss see the collection of essays in E. Nelson and Tanya Hayes, *Claude Levi-Strauss: The Anthropologist as Hero*, (Cambridge 1970), *passim;* and Zygmunt Bauman, "Marxism and the Contemporary Theory of Culture," *Co-Existence*, 5 (July 1968), pp. 161-173.

[13] Henri Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, (New York 1971), p. 14. *Cf*., Fernand Braudel, *Capitalism and Material Life, 1400-1800*, (New York 1973), *passim;* Braudel, *The Mediterranean*, pp. 757-776.

[14] Mintz, "Foreword," pp. 3, 10; Mintz, "History and Anthropology," pp. 484-485.

[15] Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in his, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, (New York 1973), pp. 3-30;

Herbert G. Gutman, "Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," *American Historical Review*, 78 (June 1973), p. 542; Herbert Gutman and Gregory S. Kealey, *Many Pasts: Readings in American Social History*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1973), Volume I, pp. 1-6; Pierre Goubert, *The Ancien Regime: French Society, 1600-1750*, (London 1973), pp. 261-285; Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*, (Middlesex 1961), pp. 258-275.

[16] Stock, "English Canada", pp. 29-33; J.M.S. Careless, "'Limited Identities' in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review*, 50 (March 1969), pp. 1-10.

[17] A rigorous distinction between ritual and tradition is likely to strain reality. A recent work, focussing explicitly on these phenomenon, defines ritual as "a collective observance or practice that assumes by repitition over time a distinct set of characteristics, a pattern." Tradition is regarded as "knowledge or custom that is handed down from one generation to another." See Alfred Young, "Pope's Day, Tar and Feathering, and Cornet Joyce, jun.: From Ritual to Rebellion in Boston, 1745-1775," (Unpublished draft, prepared for the Anglo-American Labor Historian's Conference, Rutgers University, April 1973), p. i. I am deeply indebted to Mr. Young for allowing me access to his work, which promises to tell us much about the lives of common people in the midst of revolutionary change.

[18] Thomas Wright, *Some Habits and Customs of the Working Classes*, (London 1867), p. 84. *Cf.*, Hobsbawm, "Custom, Wages and Work-Load in the Nineteenth Century," in *Labouring Men*, pp.344-370; Gutman, "Work, Culture and Society," pp. 531-588; E.P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism," *Past & Present*, 38 (December 1967), pp. 56-97.

[19] Saint Monday, religiously observed well into the twentieth century, is discussed in Wright, *Habits and Customs*, pp. 108-130; Gutman, "Work, Culture and Society," pp. 558-560; and Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline," pp. 72-76.

[20] Keeping nix was the task, often assigned to young apprentices, of watching for authorities to allow other men to rest. Wright, *Habits and Customs*, pp. 84-85.

[21] On tramping see Wright, *The Great Unwashed*, (London 1868, pp. 256-283; Hobsbawn, "The Tramping Artisan," in *Labouring Men*, pp. 34-63; A.E. Musson, *The Typographical Association*, (Oxford 1954), *passim*; P.H.J.H. Godsden, *The Friendly Societies in England, 1815-1875*, Manchester 1961), pp. 76-77 and Appendix A.

[22] George Sturt, *The Wheelwright's Shop*, (Cambridge 1958, original 1923), *passim*. *Cf.*, E.D. Macherness, ed., *The Journals of George Sturt, 1890-1927*, (Cambridge 1967), Volume I, pp. 134, 143-144, 165, 234-235, 281-283, 290-291, *et passim*; Edward Shorter, *Work and Community in the West*, (New York 1973), pp. 54-79.

[23] Carroll D. Wright, "Regulation and Restriction of Output," *Eleventh Special Report of the Commissioner of Labour*, (Washingtom 1904), p. 174, cited in Kealey, "Workers' Control and Mechanization," p. 28.

[24] For an insightful portrayal of the intense moralism and piety of one artisan community see Mack Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate, 1648-1871*, (Ithaca 1971), pp. 73-107.

[25] Mary Thale, ed., *The Autobiography of Francis Place, 1771-1854*, (Cambridge 1972), pp. 65-68; Young, "Pope's Day," Section I, pp. 1-15, and Section II, pp. 1-20; Samuel Bamford, *Bamford's Passages in the Life of A Radical and Early Days*, in 2 Volumes, ed., Henry Dunckley, (London 1905),

Volume I, p. 140; Wright, *Some Habits and Customs*, p. 81.

[26] Bamford, *Early Days*, Volume I, p. 126.

[27] This argument has recently been forcefully presented in Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*, (Stanford 1975), pp. 97-123; and Robert W. Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850*, (Cambridge 1973), pp. 75-88. Both sources, importantly, link the artisan involvement in such activity with that of other segments of the labouring poor.

[28] See Sam Bass Warner, *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth*, (Philadelphia 1968), pp. 3-22, for a discussion of the "unity of everyday life, from tavern, to street, to workplace, to housing ...."

[29] Thale, ed., *Autobiography of Place*, pp. 57-59; Mackerness, ed., *Journals of Sturt*, Volume I, pp. 282-283.

[30] E.P. Thompson, "Patrician Society, Plebian Culture," *Journal of Social History*, 7 (Summer 1974), pp. 382-405, provides insight into the context in which such a phenomenon arises, as does Robert Mandrou, *Introduction à la France moderne*, (Paris 1961), p. 117 cited in Davis, *Society and Culture*, p. 67, though Davis offers a contradictory assessment.

[31] *American Museum*, "Account of the grand federal procession in Philadelphia, July 4, 1788," IV (July 1788), p. 68. *Cf.*, David Montgomery, "The Working Classes of the American Pre-Industrial City, 1780-1830," *Labor History*, 9 (Winter 1968), pp. 13-14; Lynd, "The Revolution and the Common Man," pp 148, 221-223.

[32] Thale, ed., *Autobiography of Place*, pp. 112-113; Bamford, *Passages in the Life of a Radical*, II, pp. 25-26; Peel, *Rising of the Luddites*, pp. 52-53; Thompson, *Making of English Working Class*, pp. 57-58, 149, 169, 244, 317, 404 *et passim*.

[33] Williams, *Artisans and Sans-Culottes*, pp. 112-114.

[34] *Ibid*. *Cf.*, Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, ch. i; I.J. Prothero, "London Chartism and the Trades," *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XXIV, (No. 2, 1971), pp. 202-219; Prothero, "Chartism in London," *Past & Present*, 44 (August 1969), pp. 76-105; F.C. Mather, *Chartism*, (London 1966), *passim*; and the passionate ramblings of Thomas Carlyle, *Chartism; Past and Present*, (London 1839), pp. 23, 47-48, *et passim*.

[35] This is most explicit in the case of the Lynn shoemakers: Paul Faler, "Cultural Aspects of the Industrial Revolution: Lynn, Massachusetts Shoemakers and Industrial Morality, 1826-1860," *Labor History*, 15 (Summer 1974), pp. 367-394; Faler, "Workingmen, Mechanics and Social Change: Lynn, Massachusetts, 1800-1860," (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971), esp. ch. iii; Alan Dawley, "The Artisan Response to the Factory System: Lynn, Massachusetts in the Nineteenth Century," (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Harvard University, 1971), *passim*; and Dawley and Faler, "Working Class Culture and Politics in the Industrial Revolution," (Paper presented to the American Historical Association Meetings, December, 1974), *passim*. *Cf.*, Smith, *Radical Artisan*, ch. iv, v, and vii; David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1862-1872*, (New York 1967), *passim*., esp. ch. iii; and Leon Fink, "Class Consciousness and Class Conflict in the Gilded Age: The Figure and the Phantom," *Radical History Review*, 1 (Winter 1975), *passim*.

[36] See the argument in Stephan Thernstrom, "Urbanization, Migration and Social Mobility in Late Nineteenth Century America," in Barton J. Bers-

tein, ed., *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History*, (New York 1969), pp. 158-175, elaborated upon in Thernstrom, *Poverty and Progress: Social Mobility in a Nineteenth Century City*, (New York 1972), pp. 57-79, 192-224; and *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis, 1850-1970*, (Cambridge 1973), pp. 228-259.

[37] Seth Luther, "An Address to the Working Men of New England on the State of Education, and on the Condition of the Producing Classes in Europe and America," (Boston 1832), p. 26.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 26-27, 32.

[39] On the migrations of skilled workingmen see William S. Shepperson, "Industrial Migration in Early Victorian Britain," *The Journal of Economic History*, XIII (Spring 1953), pp. 179-192; R.V. Clemens, "Trade Unionism and Emigration, 1850-1880," *Population Studies*, 8-10 (November 1955), pp. 167-180; Charlotte Erickson, "The Encouragement of Emigration by British Trade Unions, 1850-1900," *Population Studies*, 3-4 (December 1949), pp. 248-273; Helen I. Cowan, *British Emigration to British North America: The First One Hundred Years*, (Toronto 1961, original 1928), *passim*; W.A. Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles*, (New York 1966, original 1929), *passim*; Stanley C. Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America*, 1763-1912, (London 1913), ch. iii; Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants: The Adoption of Scottish and English Immigrants in Nineteenth Century America*, (Coral Gables, Florida 1971), pp. 27, 229-262; Rowland Berthoff, *British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950*, (Cambridge 1953), *passim*. On the cultural diffusion accompanying this movement see Chester M. Destler, *American Radicalism, 1865-1901*, (Chicago 1966), pp. 1-31; Bryan D. Palmer, "'Give Us the Road and We Will Run It': The Social and Cultural Matrix of an Emerging Labour Movement," forthcoming in Kealey and Warrian, ed., *Essays in Canadian Working Class History*; and the seldom appreciated Frank Thistlethwaite, "Atlantic Migration of the Pottery Industry," *Economic History Review*, 11 (No. 2 1958), pp. 264-278.

[40] See J.F.C. Harrison, *Living and Learning, 1790-1960: A Study in the History of the Adult Education Movement*, (Toronto 1961), esp. ch. ii; Harrison, *The Early Victorians, 1832-1851*, (New York 1971), pp. 174-175; R.K. Webb, *The British Working Class Reader, 1790-1848*, (London 1955), *passim*; P.H.J.H. Gosden, *Self-Help: Voluntary Associations in the Nineteenth Century*, (London 1973), *passim*; Thompson, *Making of English Working Class*, pp. 711-746.

[41] Smiles' works—*Self-Help* (1859), *Character* (1871), *Thrift* (1875) and *Duty* (1887)—articulated much of the artisans' ideological orientation. See Asa Briggs, *Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes, 1851-1867*, (Chicago 1970), ch.v.

[42] On the artisans' commitment to mutual aid, collectivism and cooperation see J.F.C. Harrison, *Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America: The Quest for a New Moral World*, (London 1969), esp. pp. 45-90, 195-260. For a somewhat different view see Sidney Pollard, "Nineteenth Century Co-operation: From Community Building to Shopkeeping," in Briggs and Saville, ed., *Essays in Labour History*, (London 1960), pp. 74-112.

[43] *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, November 2, 1816, cited in Max Morris, ed., *From Cobbett to the Chartists: Extracts from Contemporary Sources, 1815-1848*, Volume I, (London 1948), p. 36.

[44] Cited in Thale, ed., *Autobiography of Place*, p. xxii. A different approach to the problem is found in F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable*

Radical: George Howell and Victorian Working Class Politics, (Cambridge 1971), pp. 190-214. Gareth Stedman Jones contrasts the lifestyles of the casual poor and respectable working class in *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society*, (Oxford 1971), pp. 337-349.

[45] Carlyle, *Chartism*, p. 23.

[46] Eugene D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*, (New York 1974), p. 115.

[47] *Cf.*, Richard N. Price, "The Other Face of Respectability: Violence in the Manchester Brickmaking Trade, 1859-1870," *Past & Present*, 66 (February 1975), pp. 110-132.

[48] Gosden, *Self-Help*, 13, 22-23; Zygmunt Bauman, *Between Class and Elite: The Evolution of the British Labour Movement; A Sociological Study*, (Manchester 1972), pp. 38, 96-98; J.M. Baernreither, *English Associations of Working Men*, (London 1889), pp. 20-21, 142-151; Gosden, *Friendly Societies in England, passim.*

[49] Baernreither, *English Associations*, pp. 428-429.

[50] Mabel Tylecote, *The Mechanics' Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire Before 1851*, (Manchester 1957), pp. 258-269.

[51] On temperance and the drink question there is only one authoritative source, Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England, 1815-1872*, (Pittsburg 1971), *passim. Cf.*, the same author's "Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth Century England," *Past & Present*, 38 (December 1967), pp. 98-125.

[52] I.W.M.A. *Address & Rules*, (n.p., n.d.), pp. 2, 6, cited in Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians*, p. 378. *Cf.*, William Lovett, *Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom, with some short account of the different associations he belonged to*, (New York 1920), Volume I, p. 94.

[53] Faler, "Cultural Aspects of the Industrial Revolution," pp. 391-393; Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*, pp. 38, 174, 203-204 *et passim.*

[54] Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians*, ch. xvii.

[55] Innumerable sources corroborate this historical tendency: Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline," pp. 56-97; Gutman, "Work, Culture," pp. 531-588; Hobsbawm, "Custom, Wages, Work-Load" in *Labouring Men*, pp. 344-370; David Montgomery, "The 'New Unionism' and the Transformation in Workers' Consciousness, 1909-1922," *Journal of Social History*, 7 (Summer 1974), pp. 509-529; Joan Scott, *The Glassworkers of Carmaux, French Craftsmen and Political Action in a Nineteenth Century City*, (Cambridge 1974), esp. pp. 72-105; Sidney Pollard, "Factory Discipline and the Industrial Revolution," *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XVI (No. 2, 1963), pp. 254-271; Bryan D. Palmer, "Class, Conception and Conflict: The Thrust for Efficiency, The Managerial View of Labor and Working Class Rebellion, 1903-1922," forthcoming, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 7 (Summer 1975) pp. 31-49; and Gregory S. Kealey, "Artisans Respond to Industrialism: Shoemakers, Shoe Factories and the Knights of St. Crispin in Toronto," Canadian Historical Association, *Historical Papers* (1973), pp. 137-157.

[56] Karl Marx, "Critical Notes on 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform'," in Lloyd D. Easton and Kurt H. Guddat, ed., *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, (New York 1967), p. 355. On the Lyons *canuts* see Robert J. Bezucha, "The 'Preindustrial' Worker Movement: The Canuts of Lyon," in Bezucha, ed., *Modern European Social History*, (Lexington 1972), pp. 93-123.

[57] Peter N. Stearns, "Patterns of Industrial Strike Activity in France During the July Monarchy," *American Historical Review*, 70 (January 1965), pp. 371-394; Charles Tilly and Edward Shorter, *Strikes in France, 1830-1968*, (Cambridge 1974), *passim*., esp. pp. 74-75, 107, 176-178, 349-350. *Cf*., Roger Price, *The French Second Republic: A Social History*, (Ithaca 1972), ch. i; Scott, *Glassworkers of Carmaux*, *passim*.

[58] Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, esp. ch. viii and xvi; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism*, (London 1920), *passim*; A. E. Musson, *British Trade Unions, 1800-1875*, (London 1972), esp. ch. ii and vi; Henry Pelling, *A History of British Trade Unionism*, (London 1972), esp. pp. 6, 34-35,89.

[59] Our knowledge of the role of craftsmen in the development of Canadian trade unionism is scant at best, but the following are suggestive: Kealey, "Artisans Respond to Industrialism," pp. 137-157; Steven Langdon, *The Emergence of the Canadian Working Class Movement*, (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1975); Michael Cross, ed., *The Workingman in the Nineteenth Century*, (Toronto 1974), ch. v; Jack Scott, *Sweat and Struggle: Working Class Struggles in Canada, 1789-1899*, (Vancouver 1974), esp. pp. 19-24, 77-97; Charles Lipton, *The Trade Union Movement of Canada, 1829-1959*, (Montreal 1968), esp. Pts. I-II.

[60] For the United States see David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*, *passim*; Norman Ware, *The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860, (Chicago 1964, original 1924)*, *passim*; Ware, *The Labor Movement in the United States, 1860-1890: A Study in Democracy*, (New York 1964, original 1929), *passim*; John R. Commons, "American Shoemakers, 1648-1895: A Sketch of Industrial Evolution," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 24 (November 1909), pp. 39-84; Commons, et al., *History of Labor in the United States*, (New York 1966, original 1918), Volumes I-III; Commons, et al., ed., *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, (New York 1958, original 1910), Volumes III-X; Robert A. Christie, *Empire in Wood: A History of the Carpenters' Union*, (Ithaca 1956), *passim*.

[61] Ezra Mendelsohn, *Class Struggle in the Pale: The Formative Years of the Jewish Workers' Movement in Tsarist Russia*, (Cambridge 1970), p. 156.

[62] Frank Tannenbaum, *The Labor Movement: Its Conservative Functions and Social Consequences*, (New York 1921), *passim*; Selig Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement*, (New York 1928), esp. ch i and Part II.

[63] The classic articulation of this conception remains Commons, "American Shoemakers," pp. 39-84.

[64] V. I. Lenin, *What Is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, (Moscow 1969, original 1905), pp. 31-32.

[65] E. J. Hobsbawm's "The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth Century Britain," in *Labouring Men*, pp. 272-315 remains the essential statement. The literature is surveyed, unfortunately rather unimaginatively, in Michael J. Piva, "The Aristocracy of the English Working Class: Help for An Historical Debate in Difficulties," *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, VII (November 1974), pp. 270-292.

[66] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Correspondence, 1846-1895: A Selection with Commentary and Notes*, (New York 1935), pp. 115-116.

[67] *Ibid*., pp. 496-497. *Cf*., Gavin Mackenzie, *The Aristocracy of Labor: The Position of Skilled Craftsmen in the American Class Structure*, (Cambridge 1973), pp. 160-175.

[68] V. I. Lenin, *On Britain: A Compilation*, (New York 1934), Part III, quota-

tion taken from p. 67. *Cf.*, Mackenzie, *The Aristocracy of Labor*, pp. 160-175.

[69] For an insightful, if somewhat peripheral, comment on this phenomenon see David Lockwood, *The Blackcoated Worker: A Study in Class Consciousness*, (Fair Lawn, NJ. 1958), *passim*.

[70] Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, pp. 236-238.

[71] Carlyle, *Chartism*, p. 212; Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor*, III, (London 1861), p. 233; Thomas Wright, *Our New Masters*, (London 1873), pp. 5-6.

[72] Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861-1881*, (Toronto 1965), p. 5.

[73] On this point one need only consider the relationship of the American labour movement to the black workingman. See Julius Jacobson, ed., *The Negro and the American Labor Movement*, (New York 1968), esp. pp. 155-187; Sterling D. Spiro and Abram L. Harris, *The Black Worker: The Negro and the Labor Movement*, (New York 1968, original 1931), Part II; and Arthur Mann, "Gompers and the Irony of Racism," *Antioch Review*, XIII (Spring 1953), pp. 203-214.

[74] Historians have generally stressed the jingoism of the British craftsmen during the Boer War, but see Richard Price, *An Imperial War and the British Working Class*, (Toronto 1972), esp. ch i, for a revisionist interpretation stressing the fundamental ambivalence of working class attitudes. For an argument on A. F. of L. accommodations to U.S. foreign policy see Ronald Radosh, *American Labor and United States Foreign Policy*, (New York 1969), esp. ch. iv-vi.

[75] Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, *passim*.

[76] Art Preis, *Labor's Giant Step: Twenty Years of the C.I.O.*, (New York 1964), p. 41.

[77] My dichotomization of the respectable and casual poor is likely somewhat strained, as David Montgomery has reminded me, and a reading of Cobb or Louis Chevalier would suggest. Nevertheless, I am struck by the distinctions between casual and respectable poor drawn by Gareth Stedman Jones. See his *Outcast London*, esp. pp. 337-349 and, more persuasive still, his article "Working Class Culture and Working Class Politics in London, 1870-1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working Class," *Journal of Social History*, 7 (Summer 1974), pp. 460-508.

[78] Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*, pp. 249-260.

[79] Cited in Henry Pelling, *Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain*, (London 1968), p. 58.

[80] Harrison, *Before the Socialists*, p. 32; Musson, *The Typographical Association*, p. 76; Musson, *British Trade Unions*, 1800-1875, p. 19; Christie, *Empire in Wood*, *passim*; Dona Torr, *Tom Mann and His Times*, Volume I, (London 1956), *passim*., esp. pp. 34, 39, 63-64, 71, 101, and 180.

[81] *Times*, 16 April 1870, cited in Harrison, *Before the Socialists*, p. 227.

[82] "English-Republicanism," *Fraser's Magazine*, 3 (January-June 1871), p. 754, cited in Harrison, *Before the Socialists*, p. 227.

[83] James Hinton, *The First Shop Stewards' Movement*, (London 1973), *passim*., esp. pp. 56-100; Carter Goodrich, *The Frontier of Control: A Study of British Workshop Practices*, (New York 1920), *passim*; Branko Pribicevic, *The Shop Stewards' Movement and Workers' Control, 1910-1922*, (Oxford 1959), *passim*; Montgomery, " 'New Unionism'," pp. 509-529.

[84] R. Q. Gray, "Styles of Life, the 'Labour Aristocracy' and Class Rela-

tions in Later Nineteenth Century Edinburgh," *International Review of Social History*, 18 (1973), p. 447. *Cf.*, Price, *An Imperial War*, p. 10; Bruce Laurie, "'Nothing on Compulsion': Life Styles of Philadelphia Artisans," *Labor History*, 15 (Summer 1974), p. 366.

[85] Genovese, *Roll Jordan, Roll*, esp. pp. 25-49.

[86] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, ed., Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, (New York 1971), p. 327.

[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 181-182. *Cf.*, Gray, "Styles of Life and Class Relations," pp. 429-430.

[88] E.P. Thompson, "The Peculiarities of the English," in John Saville and Ralph Miliband, ed., *The Socialist Register, 1965*, (New York 1965), p. 321. *Cf.*, Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, pp. 711-832.

[89] *Industrial Banner*, September 1910, p. 2.

[90] See, in particular, Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution*, (Middlesex 1965), ch. ii, esp. p. 57.

[91] On the moral economy of the pre-capitalist world, remnants of which 'slipped' into more modern times, see Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, esp. 203-204, 341-343 and 543-544; Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past & Present*, 50 (Spring 1971), pp. 76-136; and the critical debate flowing from Thompson's argument in A.W. Coats, "Contrary Moralities: Plebs, Paternalists and Political Economists," *ibid.*, 54 (February 1972), pp. 130-133; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "The Many Faces of Moral Economy: A Contribution to a Debate," *ibid.*, 58 (February 1973), pp. 161-168.

[92] On the residual/emergent synthesis, adopted from Raymond Williams, see Fink, "Class Conflict and Class Consciousness in the Gilded Age," p. 7.

[93] See, for example, Gerald Grob, *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement, 1865-1900*, (Chicago: 1969, original 1961), *passim*; Martin Robin, "The Working Class and the Transition to Capitalist Democracy in Canada," *Dalhousie Review*, 47 (1967-68), pp. 326-343, esp. pp. 335-336; H. Clare Pentland, "The Development of a Capitalistic Labour Market in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XXV (November 1959), p. 461.

[94] E.P. Thompson, "A Nice Place to Visit," *New York Review of Books*, XXII (February 6, 1975), pp. 35-36, a commentary on Raymond Williams' recent work, *The Country and the City*, (New York 1975).

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 36. *Cf.*, Gramsci's conceptualization of "passive revolution" in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, esp. p. 106.

[96] See the discussions in Alaine Touraine, *L'Evolution du travail ouvrier aux usines Renault*, (Paris 1955), pp. 57-74; E.P. Thompson, "A Special Case," *New Society*, 24 (February 1972), pp. 402-404.

[97] Claude Levi-Strauss, "History and Anthropology," in *Structural Anthropology*, (New York 1963), p.17.

[98] Geertz, "Thick Description" in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 3-30; and Louis Althusser's comments on "descriptive theory" in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, (London 1971), pp. 132-133.

[99] Perhaps the most cogent presentation of Gutman's views remains his "Class, Status, and Community Power in Nineteenth Century American Industrial Cities: Paterson, New Jersey, A Case Study," in Frederic C. Jaher, ed., *Age of Industrialism: Essays in Social Structure and Cultural Values*, (New York 1968), pp. 263-287.

[100] Cobb, *Police and the People*, p. xvii.

[101] T.S. Eliot, "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," in *Selected Poems*, p. 13; Cobb, *Police and the People*, p. xv, fn. 1; Louis Chevalier, *Laboring Classes and Dangerous Classes in Paris During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, (New York 1973), *passim*; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, p. 210; Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, pp. 7-14.

[102] Throughout the course of this discussion I have employed the term 'pre-capitalist' with considerable hesitancy. While it has gained widespread acceptance, it is my opinion that it blurs historical development into categories which are somewhat artificial. I would like to suggest that C.B. Macpherson's periodization, employed artfully and non-mechanistically, offers a more precise and less ambiguous chronology; the customary or status society, corresponding roughly to what is often referred to as the "traditional" or the "pre-capitalist" world, in which society and production revolve around mutual obligations cast in a setting of hierarchical social relations and production for use, as opposed to production for exchange; the simple market society in which markets have emerged in terms of the production and distribution of goods, thereby upsetting the previous dominance of use values, but in which labour has not yet become a commodity; and, finally, the possessive market society, signalling the full-blown arrival of industrial capitalism, with labour simply one of many commodities governed by the cash-nexus. It is Macpherson's recognition of the transitional moment from the traditional to the fully modern world (the simple market society), which distinguishes his analysis; this is of critical importance in any discussion of the nineteenth century craftsman, I would suggest, for many such skilled workingmen spent their everyday lives in commercial environments which, while hardly "traditional", were not yet industrial. See C.B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*, (New York 1962), pp. 49-61.

[103] The above discussion has perhaps erred in not stressing the new inputs into the craft culture flowing from advanced industrial capitalist relations. In this regard David Montgomery, "Workers' Control of Machine Production in the Nineteenth Century," forthcoming, *Labor History*, 1976, is an appropriate comment.

[104] David Montgomery, "The Shuttle and the Cross: Weavers and Artisans in the Kensington Riots of 1844," and William H. Sewell, Jr., "The Working-Class of Marseille Under the Second Republic: Social Structure and Political Behavior," in Peter N. Stearns and Daniel J Walkowitz, ed., *Workers in the Industrial Revolution: Recent Studies of Labor in the United States and Europe*, (New Brunswick, N.J. 1974), pp. 44-116; Laurie, " 'Nothing on Compulsion'," pp. 337-366; Eric Hopkins, "Small Town Aristocrats of Labour and their Standard of Living, 1840-1914," *The Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XXVIII (May 1975), pp. 222-242; Kealey, "Artisans Respond to Industrialism," pp. 137-157; and John Foster, *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution: Early Industrial Capitalism in Three English Towns*, (London 1974), *passim*.