JOHN ZERZAN

AXIS POINT OF AMERICAN INDUSTRIALISM

The 1820's constituted a watershed in United States life. By the end of that decade, about ten years after the last of the English Luddite risings had been suppressed, industrialism secured its decisive American victory; by the end of the 1830's all of its cardinal features were definitively present. The many overt threats to the coherence of emerging industrial capitalism, the ensemble of forms of resistance to its hegemony, were blunted at this time and forced into the current of that participation so vital to modern domination. In terms of technology, work, politics, sexuality, culture, and the whole fabric of ordinary life, the struggles of an earlier, relative autonomy, which threatened both old and new forms of authority, fell short, and a dialectic of domestication, so familiar to us today, broke through. The reactions engendered in the face of the new dynamic in this epoch of its arrival seem, by the way, to offer some implicit parallels to present trends as technological civilization likely enters its terminal crisis: the answers of progress, now anything but new or promising, encounter a renewed legitimation challenge that can be informed, even inspired, by understanding the past.

American "industrial consciousness", which Samuel Rezneck judged to have triumphed by 1830,[1] was in large measure and from the outset a virtual project of the State. In 1787, generals and government officials sponsored the first promotional effort, the Pennsylvania Society for the Encouragement of Manufactures and the Useful Arts. With Benjamin Franklin as the Society's official patron, capital was raised and a factory equipped, but arson put an end to this venture early in 1790. Another benchmark of the period was Alexander Hamilton's *Report on the Subject of Manufactures*, drafted by his tirelessly pro-factory-technology assistant secretary of the Treasury, Tench Coxe. It is noteworthy that Coxe received government appointments from both the Federalist Hamilton and his arch-rival Jeffer-

[1] Samuel Rezneck, Business Depressions and Financial Panics (New York, 1968), p. 24.

son, Republican and career celebrator of the yeoman freeholder as the basis of independent values. While Hamilton pushed industrialization, arguing, for example, that children were better off in mills than at home or in school,[2] Jefferson is remembered as a constant foe of that evil, alien import, manufacturing.

To correct the record is to glimpse the primacy of technology over ideological rhetoric as well as to remember that no Enlightenment man was not also an enthusiast of science and technology. In fact, it is fitting that Jefferson, the American most closely associated with the Enlightenment, introduced and promoted the idea of interchangeability of parts, key to the modern factory, from France as early as 1785.[3] Also to the point is Charles V. Hagnar's remark that in the 1790's "Thomas Jefferson, [. . .] a personal friend of my father, [. . .] indoctrinated him with the manufacturing fever", and induced him to start a cotton mill.[4] As early as 1805 Jefferson, at least in private, complained that his earlier insistence on independent producers as the bedrock of national virtue was misunderstood, that his condemnation of industrialism was only meant to apply to the cities of Europe.[5]

Political foliage aside, it was becoming clear that mechanization was in no way impeded by government. The role of the State is tellingly reflected by the fact that the "armory system" now rivals the older "American system of manufactures" term as the more accurate to describe the new system of production methods.[6] It is along these lines that Cochran referred to the need for the Federal authority to "keep up the pressure", around 1820, in order to soften local resistance to factories and their methods.[7] In the 'twenties, a fully developed industrial lobby in Congress and the extensive use of the technology fair and exhibit – not to mention nationalist pro-development appeals such as that to anti-British sentiment after the war of 1812, and other non-political factors to be discussed below – contributed to the assured ascendancy of industrialization, by 1830.

Ranged against the efforts to achieve that ascendancy was an unmistakable antipathy, observed in the references to its early manifestations in classic historical works. Norman Ware found that the Industrial Revolution "was repugnant to an astonishingly large section of the earlier American

[2] Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New York, 1935), p. 98.
[3] David A. Hounshell, From the American System to Mass Production, 1800-1932 (Baltimore, 1984), pp. 25-26.
[4] Thomas C. Cochran, Frontiers of Change: Early Industrialism in America (New York, 1981), p. 53.
[5] Rezneck, Business Depressions, op. cit., p. 38.
[6] Hounshell, From the American System to Mass Production, op. cit., p. 43.
[7] Cochran, Frontiers of Change, op. cit., p. 74.

community",[8] and Victor S. Clark noted the strong popular prejudice that existed "against factory industries as detrimental to the welfare of the working-people".[9] Later, too, this aversion was still present, if declining, as a pivotal force. The July 4, 1830 oratory of pro-manufacture Whig Edward Everett contained a necessary reference to the "suffering, depravity, and brutalism"[10] of industrialism – in Europe – for the purpose of deflecting hostility from its American counterpart. Later in the 'thirties the visiting English liberal Harriet Martineau, in her efforts to defend manufacturing, indicated that her difficulties were precisely her audiences' antagonism to the subject.[11]

Yet despite the "slow and painful"[12] nature of the changeover, and especially the widespread evidence of deep-seated resistance (of which the foregoing citations are a minute sample), there lingers the notion of an enthusiastic embrace of mechanization in America by craftsmen as well as capitalists.[13] Fortunately, recent scholarship has been contributing to a better grasp of the struggles of the early to mid nineteenth century, Merritt Roe Smith's excellent *Harpers Ferry Armory and the New Technology*,[14] for example. "The Harpers Ferry story diverges sharply from oft-repeated generalizations that 'most Americans accepted and welcomed technological change with uncritical enthusiasm'",[15] Smith declares in his introduction. Suffice it to interject here that no valid separation exists between anti-technology feelings and the more commonly recognized elements of contestation of classes that proceeded from the grounding of that technology; in practice the two strands were and are obviously intertwined. This reference to the "massive and irrefutable"[16] class opposition of early industrialism or to Taft's and Ross's dictum that "The United States has had the bloodiest and most violent labor history of any industrial nation"[17] finds

[8] Norman Ware, The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860 (New York, 1964), p. x.
[9] Victor S. Clark, History of Manufactures in the United States, 1607-1860 (Washington, D.C., 1916), p. 264.
[10] Edward Everett, "Fourth of July at Lowell (1830)", in: The Philosophy of Manufactures: Early Debates over Industrialization in the United States, ed. by Michael B. Folsom and Steve D. Lubar (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. 292.
[11] Marvin Fisher, Workshops in the Wilderness: The European Response to American Industrialization, 1830-1860 (New York, 1967), p. 38.
[12] Thomas C. Cochran, Business in American Life: A History (New York, 1972), p. 38.
[13] For example, Brooke Hindle, "The Exhilaration of Early American Technology: An Essay", in Technology in Early America (Chapel Hill, 1966), p. 3.
[14] Merritt Roe Smith, Harpers Ferry Armory and the New Technology (Ithaca, 1977).
[15] Ibid., p. 2.
[16] Page Smith, The Nation Comes of Age (New York, 1981), p. 795.
[17] Philip Taft and Philip Ross, "American Labor Violence: Its Causes, Character, and

its full meaning when we appraise both levels of anti-authoritarianism, especially in the watershed period of the 1820's.

In early 1819 the English visitor William Faux declared that "Labour is quite as costly as in England, whether done by slaves, or by hired whites, and it is also much more troublesome."[18] Later that year his travel journal further testified to the "very villainous" character of American workers, who "feel too free to work in earnest, or at all, above two or three days in a week".[19] Indeed, travelers seemed invariably to remark on "the independent manners of the laboring classes",[20] in slightly softer language. More specifically, dissent by skilled workers, as has often been noted, was the sharpest and most durable. Given the "astonishing versatility of the average native laborer",[21] however, it is also true that a generalized climate of resistance confronted the impending debasement of work by the factory.

Those most clearly identified as artisans give us the clearest look at resistance, owing to the self-reliant culture that was a function of autonomous handicraft production. Bruce Laurie, on some Philadelphia textile craftsmen, illustrates the vibrant pre-industrial life in question, with its blasé attitude toward work.

> On a muggy summer day in August 1828 Kensington's hand loom weavers announced a holiday from their daily toil. News of the affair circulated throughout the district and by mid-afternoon the hard-living frame tenders and their comrades turned the neighborhood avenues into a playground. Knots of lounging workers joked and exchanged gossip [. . .]. The more athletic challenged one another to foot races and games, [and] quenched their thirst with frequent drams. The spree was a classic celebration of St. Monday.[22]

It was no accident that mass production – primarily textile factories – first appeared in New England, with its relative lack of strong craft traditions, rather than in, say, Philadelphia, the center of American artisan skills.[23] Traditions of independent creativity obviously posed an obstacle to manufacturing innovation, causing Carl Russell Fish to assay that "Such

Outcome", in: The History of Violence in America, ed. by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr (New York, 1969), p. 281.

[18] William Faux, "Memorable Days in America", in: Early Western Travels, 1748-1846, ed. by Reuben Gold Thwaites, XI (Cleveland, 1905), p. 141.

[19] Ibid., pp. 227, 215 (November 6 and 3, 1819).

[20] Jane Louise Mesick, The English Traveller in America, 1785-1835 (New York, 1922), p. 306.

[21] Ibid., p. 152.

[22] Bruce Laurie, Working People of Philadelphia, 1800-1850 (Philadelphia, 1980), p. 33.

[23] Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The National Experience (New York, 1965), p. 26.

craftsmen were the only actively dissatisfied class in the country."[24]

The orthodox explanation of industrialism's triumph stresses the much higher United States wage levels, compared to Europe, and an alleged shortage of skilled workers. These are, as a rule, considered the primary factors that produced "an environment affording every suggestion and inducement to substitute machinery for men", and which nurtured that "inventiveness and mechanical intuition which are sometimes regarded as a national trait", in the descriptive phrases of Clark.[25] But the preceding discussion should already be enough to indicate that it was the presence of work skills that challenged the new technology, not their absence. Research shows no dearth of skilled workers,[26] and there is abundant evidence that "the trend toward mechanization came more from cultural and managerial bias than from carefully calculated marginal costs."[27] Habakkuk's comparison of American and British antebellum technology and labor economics cites the "scarcity and belligerency of the available skilled labour",[28] and we must accent the latter quality, while realizing that scarcity can also mean the ability to make oneself scarce – namely, the oft-remarked high turnover rates.[29] It was industrial discipline that was missing, especially among craftsmen. At mid century Samuel Colt confided to a British engineering group that "uneducated laborers" made the best workers in his new mass-production arms factory because they had so little to unlearn;[30] skills – and the recalcitrance accompanying them – were hardly at a premium.

Strikes and unionization (though certainly not always linked) became common from 1823 forward,[31] and the modern labor movement showed particular vitality during the militant "great uprising" period of 1833-37.[32] However, especially by the 'thirties, these struggles (largely for shorter

[24] Carl Russell Fish, The Rise of the Common Man (New York, 1927), p. 91.

[25] Clark, History of Manufactures, op. cit., p. 401.

[26] For example, Robert S. Woodbury, "The 'American System' of Manufacture", in: Technology and Social Change in America, ed. by Edwin T. Layton, Jr (New York, 1973), p. 54.

[27] Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 135.

[28] H. J. Habakkuk, American and British Technology in the Nineteenth Century: The Search for Labour-Saving Inventions (Cambridge, 1962), p. 128.

[29] "The business proprietor's desire to substitute machinery was in large part dictated by the impatience of the knowledgeable artisan with working for somebody else. A lathe or drilling machine stayed put while a fine gunsmith might not." Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 55.

[30] Hugo A. Meier, "The Ideology of Technology", in: Technology and Social Change, op. cit., p. 94.

[31] Foster Rhea Dulles, Labor in America (New York, 1949), p. 32; Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States, I (New York, 1947), p. 101.

[32] Foner, History of the Labor Movement, I, p. 108; Thomas C. Cochran and Wm. Miller, The Age of Enterprise (New York, 1961), p. 26.

hours, secondarily over wages) were essentially situated within the world of a standardizing, regimenting technology, predicated on the worker as a component of it. And although this distinction is not total, it was the "unorganized" workers who mounted the most extreme forms of opposition, Luddite in many instances, contrary to the time-honored wisdom that Luddism and America were strangers. Gary Kulik's excellent scholarship on industrial Rhode Island determined that in Pawtucket alone more than five arson attempts were made against cotton-mill properties, and that the deliberate burning of textile mills was far from uncommon throughout early-nineteenth-century New England, declining by the 'thirties.[33] Jonathan Prude reached a similar conclusion: "Rumors abounded in antebellum New England that fires suffered by textile factories were often of 'incendiary origin'."[34] The same reaction was felt in Philadelphia, albeit slightly later: "Several closely spaced mill burnings triggered cries of 'incendiarism' in the 1830's, a decade of intense industrial conflict."[35] The hand-sawyers who burned Oliver Evans's new steam mill at New Orleans in 1813[36] also practiced machine-wrecking by arson, like their Northeastern cousins, and shortly later Massachusetts rope-makers attacked machine-made yarn, boasting that their handspun product was stronger.[37] Sailors in New York often inflicted damage on vessels during strikes, according to Dulles, who noted: "The seamen were not organized and were an especially obstreperous lot."[38]

Though its impact, as with resistance in general, declined after the 'twenties, Luddite-type violence continued. The unpopular superintendent of the Harpers Ferry Armory[39] was shot dead in his office in early 1830 by an angry craftsman named Ebenezer Cox. Though Cox was hung for his act, he was a folk hero among the Harpers Ferry workers, who hated Dunn's emphasis on supervision and factory-type discipline, and never tired of

[33] Gary Kulik, "Pawtucket Village and the Strike of 1824: The Origins of Class Conflict in Rhode Island", in: Radical History Review, No 17 (1978), p. 24.
[34] Jonathan Prude, "The Social System of Early New England Textile Mills: A Case Study, 1812-40", in: Working-Class America: Essays on Labor, Community, and American Society, ed. by Michael H. Frisch and Daniel J. Walkowitz (Urbana, Ill., 1983), p. 15.
[35] Philip Scranton, Proprietary Capitalism: The Textile Manufacture at Philadelphia, 1800-1885 (Cambridge, 1983), p. 79.
[36] Meier, "The Ideology of Technology", loc. cit., p. 88.
[37] Edward Pessen, Jacksonian America (Homewood, Ill., 1969), p. 119.
[38] Dulles, Labor in America, op. cit., p. 29.
[39] This primary government armory was authorized by Congress in 1798 and conveniently situated on land belonging to George Washington's Potomac Company. "For more than a generation it was impossible to impose proper industrial discipline on workers from the surrounding area." Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 74.

citing Dunn's fate as a blunt reminder to superintendents of what could
be expected if they became overzealous in executing their duties and im-
pinged on the traditional freedoms of employees.[40] Construction laborers,
especially in railroad work, frequently destroyed property; Gutman pro-
vides an example from 1831 in which about three hundred of them punished
a dishonest contractor by tearing up the track they built.[41] The destructive
fury of Irish strikers on the Baltimore and Ohio Canal in 1834 occasioned
the inaugural use of Federal troops in a labor dispute, on orders of Andrew
Jackson. And in the mid 'thirties anti-railroad teamsters, still waylaid trains
and shot at their crews from ambush.[42] In the Philadelphia handloom
weavers' strike of 1842, striking artisans used machine breaking, intimida-
tion, destruction of unwoven wool and finished cloth, house wrecking, and
threats of even worse violence. During this riotous struggle, weavers
marched on a water-powered, mass-production mill to burn it; the attack
was driven off, with two constables wounded.[43] Returning to the New
England textile mills and incendiary Luddism, Prude describes the situation
after 1840: "Managers were rarely directly challenged by their hands; and
although mills continued to burn down, contemporaries did not as quickly
assume that workers were setting the fires."[44]

Looking for social-political reasons for the culture of industrialism, one
finds that official efforts to domesticate the ruled *via* the salutory effects of
factory labor date back to the mid seventeenth century. The costs of poor
relief led Boston officials to put widows and orphans to work, beginning
in 1735, in what amounted to a major experiment to inculcate habits of
industry and routine. But even threats of denial of subsistance aid failed to
establish industrial discipline over irregular work habits and independent
attitudes.[45] Artisanal (and agricultural) work was far more casual than that
regimented by modern productionist models. Unlike that of the factory, for
example, it could almost always be interrupted in favor of an encounter,
an adventure, or simply a distraction. This easy entry to gaming, drinking,
personal projects, hunting, extended and often raucus revelry on a great

[40] Smith, Harpers Ferry Armory, op. cit., p. 256.
[41] Herbert G. Gutman, Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America (New
York, 1976), p. 58.
[42] Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, op. cit., p. 273.
[43] Michael Feldberg, "The Crowd in Philadelphia History", in: Riot, Rout, and Tumult,
ed. by Roger Lane and John J. Turner, Jr (Westwood, Conn., 1978), pp. 136-37.
[44] Jonathan Prude, The Coming of Industrial Order: Town and Factory Life in Rural
Massachusetts, 1810-1860 (Cambridge, 1983), p. 225.
[45] Gary B. Nash, "The Failure of Female Factory Labor in Colonial Boston", in: Labor
History, XX (1979).

variety of occasions, among other interruptions, was a preserve of independence from authority in general.

And, on the other hand, the regulation and monotony that adhere to the work differentiation of industrial technology combat such casual, undomesticated tendencies. Division of labor embodies, as an implicit purpose, the control and domination of the work process and those tied to it. Adam Smith saw this, and so did Tocqueville, in the 1830's: "As the principle of the division of labor is ever more completely applied, the workman becomes weaker, more limited, and more dependent. [. . .] Thus, at the same time that industrial science constantly lowers the standing of the working class, it raises that of the masters."[46]

This subordination, including its obvious benefit, social control, was widely appreciated, especially, but not exclusively, by the early industrialists. Manufacturers, with unruliness very visible to them, came quickly to identify technological progress with a more subdued populace. In 1816 Walton Felch, for instance, claimed that the "restless dispositions and insatiate prodigality" of working people were altered, by "manufacturing attendance", into patterns of regularity and calmness.[47] Another New England mill-owner, Smith Wilkinson, judged in 1835 that factory labor imposed a "restraining influence" on people who "are often very ignorant, and too often vicious".[48] The English visitor Harriet Martineau, introduced above, was of like mind in the early 'forties: "The factories are found to afford a safe and useful employment for much energy which would otherwise be wasted and misdirected." She determined that, unlike the situation that had prevailed before the introduction of manufactures, "now the same society is eminently orderly. [. . .] disorders have almost entirely disappeared."[49]

Eli Whitney provides another case in point of the social designs inhering in mechanization, namely that of his Mill Rock armory, which moved from craft shop to factory status during the period of the late 1790's to Whitney's death in 1825. Long associated with the birth of the "American System" of interchangeable-parts production, he was thoroughly unpopular with his employees for regimentation he developed *via* increasing division of labor. His penchant for order and discipline was embodied in his view of Mill Rock as a "moral gymnasium", where "correct habits"[50] of diligence and

[46] Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (2 vols; New York, 1966), II, p. 529.
[47] Walton Felch, "The Manufacturer's Pocket-Piece", in: The New England Mill Village, 1790-1860, ed. by Gary Kulik et al. (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. 326.
[48] Quoted in Introduction, ibid., pp. xxix-xxx.
[49] Harriet Martineau, Society in America (New York, 1966), II, pp. 354-55.
[50] Merritt Roe Smith, "Eli Whitney and the American System of Manufacturing", in:

industry were inculcated through systematic control of all facets of the work day.[51]

As skill levels were forcibly reduced, the art of living was also purposefully degraded by the sheer number of hours involved in industrial work. Emerson, usually thought of in terms of a vague philosophy of human possibilities, applauded the suppression of potential enacted by the work hours of 1830's railroad building. He observed the long, hard construction shifts as "safe vents for peccant humors; and this grim day's work of fifteen or sixteen hours, though deplored by all humanity of the neighborhood, is a better police than the sheriff and his deputies."[52] A hundred years later Simone Weil supplied a crucial part of the whole equation of industrialization: "No one would accept two daily hours of slavery. To be accepted, slavery must be of such a daily duration as to break something in a man."[53] Similar is Cochran's more recent (and more conservative) reference to the twelve-hour day, that it was "maintained in part to keep workers under control".[54] Pioneer industrialist Samuel Slater wondered, in the 1830's, whether national institutions could survive "amongst a people whose energies are not kept constantly in play by the pursuit of some incessant productive employment".[55] Indeed, technological "progress" and the modern wage-slavery accompanying it offered a new stability to representative government, owing essentially to its magnified powers for suppressing the individual. Slater's biographer recognized that "To maintain good order and sound government, [modern industry] is more efficient than the sword or bayonet."[56]

A relentless assault on the worker's historic rights to free time, self-education, craftsmanship and play was at the heart of the rise of the factory system; "increasingly, a feeling of degradation spread among factory hands", according to Rex Burns.[57] By the mid 'thirties a common

Technology in America, ed. by Carroll W. Pursell, Jr (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), pp. 51-53.
[51] Andrew Ure, English ideologue of early industrial capitalism, summed up the control intentionality behind the new technology by typifying the factory as "a creation destined to restore order", while declaring that "when capital enlists science into her service, the refractory hand of labour will always be taught docility". Andrew Ure, The Philosophy of Manufactures (London, 1835), pp. 367-68.
[52] The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, I (Boston, 1904), p. 455.
[53] "Factory Work", in: The Simone Weil Reader (New York, 1977), pp. 66.
[54] Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 136.
[55] George S. White, Memoir of Samuel Slater, the Father of American Manufactures [1836] (New York, 1967), p. 122.
[56] Ibid., p. 117, also in The New England Mill Village, op. cit., p. 351.
[57] Rex Burns, Success in America: The Yeoman Dream and the Industrial Revolution (Amherst, 1976), p. 91. Also, William A. Sullivan, The Industrial Worker in Pennsylva-

refrain in the working-class press was that the laborer had been debased "into a necessary piece of machinery".[58]

Assisted by sermons, a growing public school system, a new didactic popular literature, and other social institutions that sang the praises of industrial discipline, the factory had won its survival by 1830. From this point on, and with increasing visibility by the end of the 'thirties, conditions worsened and pay decreased.[59] No longer was there a pressing need to lure first-time operatives into industrialized life, and curry their favor with high wages and relatively light duties. Beginning before 1840, for example, the pace of work in textile mills was greatly speeded up, facilitated also by the first major immigration influx, that of impoverished Irish and French Canadians.[60]

Henry Clay asked: "Who has not been delighted with the clockwork movements of a large cotton factory?",[61] reminding us that concomitant with such regimentation was the spread of a new conception of time. Although certainly things did not always go "like clockwork" for the industrialists – "punctuality and absenteeism remained intractable problems for management" throughout the first half of the nineteenth century,[62] for example – a new, industrial time, against great resistance, made gradual headway. In the task-oriented labors of artisans and farmers, work and play were freely mixed; a constant pace of unceasing labor was the ideal not of the mechanic, but of the machine – more specifically, of the clock. The largely spontaneous games, fairs, festivals and excursions gave way, along with working at one's own pace, to enslavement to the uniform, unremitting technological time of the factory whistle, centralized power and unvarying routine. For the Harpers Ferry armorers early in the century, the workshops opened at sunrise and closed at sunset, but they were free to come and go as they pleased. They had long been accustomed to controlling the duration and scheduling of their tasks, and "the idea of a clocked day

nia 1800-1840 (Harrisburg, 1955), p. 50: "that overpowering sense of degradation which was beginning to be felt [by the 'thirties] by large masses of these working people".

[58] From The National Laborer, April 23, 1836.

[59] Arthur H. Calhoun, A Social History of the Family, II (Cleveland, 1918), p. 179; Jean V. Matthew, Rufus Choate (Philadelphia, 1980), p. 74.

[60] Habakkuk, American and British Technology, op. cit., pp. 54-55; Carolyn Ware, The Early New England Cotton Manufacture (Boston, 1931), p. 8; Barbara M. Tucker, "The Merchant, the Manufacturer, and the Factory Manager: The Case of Samuel Slater", in: Business History Review, LV (1981), pp. 310-11; John F. Kasson, Civilizing the Machine (New York, 1976), p. 102.

[61] Quoted in Peter N. Carroll and David W. Noble, The Free and the Unfree (New York, 1977), p. 153.

[62] The New England Mill Village, p. 463.

seemed not only repugnant but an outrageous insult to their self-respect and freedom."[63] Hence, the opposition to 1827 regulations that installed a clock and announced a ten-hour day was bitter and protracted.

For those already under the regimen of factory production, struggles against the alien time were necessarily of a lingering, rear-guard character by the late 'twenties. An interesting illustration is that of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, a mill village whose denizens built a town clock by public subscription in 1828.[64] In their efforts to counter the monopoly of recording time which had been the mill-owner's factory bell, one can see that by this time the whole level of contestation had degenerated: the issue was not industrial time itself, but merely the democratization of its measurement.

The clock, favorite machine of the Enlightenment, is a master device in the depiction of American political economy by Thoreau and others. Its function is decisive because it links the industrial apparatus with consciousness.[65] It is fitting that clockmaking, along with gun manufacture, was a model of the new technology; the United States led the world in the production of inexpensive time-pieces by the 1820's, a testimony to the encroaching industrial value system – and the marked anxiety about the passage of time that was part of it.[66]

Though even in the first decades of the Republic there was a permanent operative class in at least three urban centers of the Mid Atlantic seaboard,[67] industrialization began in earnest with New England cloth production twenty years after the Constitution was adopted. For example, forty-one new woolen mills were built in the United States, chiefly along New England streams, between 1807 and 1813.[68] The textile industry selected the most economically deprived areas, and with cheery propaganda and, initially, relatively good working conditions, enticed women and children (who had no other options) into the mills. That they "came from families which could no longer support them at home"[69] means that theirs was essentially forced labor. In 1797 Obadiah Brown, in a letter to a

---

[63] Smith, Harpers Ferry Armory, pp. 65, 271.
[64] The New England Mill Village, p. 265.
[65] Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden (New York, 1964), p. 248.
[66] Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, p. 821. See Tamara K. Hareven, Family Time and Industrial Time (Cambridge, 1982), for a New England case-study of the "timing" of all aspects of life in the new framework. Paralleling the heightened time-consciousness was "a pre-occupation with punctuality, measurement, and calculation", according to an English traveller of the early 'thirties, Thomas Hamilton. Patricia Cline Cohen, A Calculating People: The Spread of Numeracy in Early America (Chicago, 1982), p. 175.
[67] Clark, History of Manufactures, p. 540.
[68] Prude, The Coming of Industrial Order, op. cit., p. 47.
[69] Cochran and Miller, The Age of Enterprise, op. cit., p. 19.

partner regarding the selection of a mill site, determined that "the inhabitants appear to be poor, their homes very much on the decline. I apprehend it might be a very good place for a Cotton Manufactory, Children appearing very plenty."[70] "In collecting our help", a Connecticut mill-owner said thirty years later, "we are obliged to employ poor families and generally those having the greatest number of children."[71]

New England factory-cloth output increased from about 2.4 million yards in 1815 to approximately 13.9 million yards in 1820, and the shift of weaving from home to factory was virtually completed by 1824.[72] Despite arson, absenteeism, stealing and sabotage persisting with particular emphasis into the 'thirties,[73] the march of industrialization proceeded in textiles as elsewhere. If, as Inkeles and Smith[74] (among others) have contended, a prime element of modernity is the amount of time spent in factories, the 1820's was indeed a watershed.

"Certainly by 1825 the first stage of the industrialization of the United States was over",[75] in Cochran's estimation. In 1820, factories were capitalized to $ 50,000,000; by 1840, to $ 250,000,000, and the number of people working in them had more than doubled.[76] Also by the 'twenties the whole direction of specialized bureaucratic control, realized a generation later in such large corporations as the railroads, had already become clear.[77] As the standardizing, quasi-military machine replaced the individual's tools, it provided authority with an invaluable, "objective" ally against "disorder". Not coincidentally did modern mass politics also labor to implant itself in the 'twenties: political hegemony, as a necessary part of social power, had also failed to fully resolve the issue in its favor in the struggles of the early Republic.[78] Conflict of all kinds was rampant, and a "terrible precariousness", in Page Smith's phrase,[79] characterized the cohesion of national power. In fact, by the early 'twenties a virtual breakdown of the legitimacy of traditional rule by informal elites was underway and a serious re-structuring of American politics was required.

[70] Quoted by Steve Dunwell, The Run of the Mill (Boston, 1978), p. 15.
[71] Quoted by Rowland Berthoff, An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History (New York, 1971), p. 167.
[72] James Michael Cudd, The Chicopee Manufacturing Company, 1823-1915 (Wilmington, 1974), p. 10.
[73] Prude, The Coming of Industrial Order, p. 138.
[74] Alex Inkeles and David H. Smith, Becoming Modern (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).
[75] Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 77.
[76] Fisher, Workshops in the Wilderness, op. cit., p. 33.
[77] Cochran, Frontiers of Change, p. 123.
[78] Peter Dobkin Hall, the Organization of American Culture, 1700-1900 (New York, 1982), p. 89.
[79] Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, p. 114.

Part of the re-structuring dealt with law, in a parallel to the social meaning of technology: "neutral" universal principles came to the fore to justify increased coercion. Modern bourgeois society was forced to rely on an increasingly objectified legal system, which reflected, at base, the progress of division of labor. It must, in David Grimsted's words, "elevate law because of what it is creating and what it has to destroy".[80] By the time of Jackson's ascendancy in the late 'twenties, America had become largely a government of laws not men (though juries mitigated legality), despite the unpopularity of this development as seen, for example, in the widespread scorn of lawyers.[81]

Along with the need to mobilize the lower orders into industrial work, it was important to greatly increase political participation in the interests of legitimizing the whole. Although by the mid 'twenties almost every state had extended the franchise to incude all white males, the numbers of voters remained very low during the decade.[82] By this time newspapers had proliferated and were playing a key role in working toward the critical integration achieved with Jackson and new, mass-political machinery. In 1826, a workingman was chosen for the first time as a mayoral candidate in Baltimore, explicitly in order to attract workingmen's participation,[83] an early example of a necessary part of moving away from narrow-based, old-style rule.

However, John Quincy Adams, who had become President in 1825, "failed to comprehend that voters needed at least the appearance of consultation and participation in making decisions."[84] A conservative and a nationalist, he was at least occasionally candid: as he told Tocqueville, there is "a great equality before the law, [which] ceases absolutely in the habits of life. There are upper classes and working classes."[85] Following Adams, the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 symbolized and accelerated a shift in American life. At the moment that mechanization was securing its domination of life and culture, the Jacksonian era signalled the arrival of professional politics and a crucial diversion of the remaining potentially dangerous energies. Embodying this domestication in his suc-

---

[80] David Grimsted, "Rioting in Its Jacksonian Setting", in: American Historical Review, LXXVII (1972), p. 370.
[81] Ibid., pp. 372-74.
[82] Paula Baker, "The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780-1920", in: American Historical Review, LXXXIX (1984), pp. 625-26; Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, p. 13.
[83] Gary Lawson Browne, Baltimore in the Nation, 1789-1861 (Chapel Hill, 1980), p. 97.
[84] John Mayfield, The New Nation, 1800-1845 (New York, 1982), p. 99.
[85] Quoted by Pessen, Jacksonian America, op. cit., p. 50.

cessful appeal to the "common man", the old General was in reality a plantation-owner, land speculator and lawyer, whose first case in 1788 defended the interests of Tennessee creditors against debtors.

He reversed the decline in executive strength that had plagued his three predecessors, essentially renewing State power by a direct appeal to the working classes for the first time in United States history. The mob at the 1829 White House inaugural, celebrated in history text-books with its smashing of china and trampling on the furniture, did in fact "symbolize a new power", in Curti's phrase[86] – a power tamed and delivering itself to government. Jackson's "public statements address a society divided into classes invidiously distinguished and profoundly antagonistic."[87] And yet, employing the Jeffersonian argot, he regularly identified the class enemy in misleading terms as the money power, the moneyed aristocracy, etc.

By the presidential contest of 1832 the gentleman-leader had certainly been rendered an anachronism,[88] in large part *via* the use of class-oriented rhetoric. In Jackson's second term, after he had been overwhelmingly re-elected on the strength of his attacks on the Bank of the United States,[89] he vetoed the re-chartering of the Bank in the most popular act of his administration. Although many conservatives feared that Jackson's policies and conduct would result in a "disastrous, perhaps a fatal" revolution,[90] that the Jacksonians "had raised up forces greater than they could control",[91] the Bank proved a safe target for the Jacksonian project of deflecting popular anger. As Fish noted, "hostility was merely keenest against banks; it existed against all corporations."[92] Thus, the "Monster" Bank, which did reap outrageous profits and openly purchased members of Congress, was inveighed against as the incarnation of aristocracy, privilege and the spirit of luxury, while, missing the essential point, Daniel Webster and others warned against such inflaming of the poor against the rich.[93] Needless to say, the growth of an enslaving technology was never attacked; rather, as Bray Hammond maintained, Jackson represented "a blow at an older set of capitalists by a newer, more numerous set".[94] And meanwhile,

[86] Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, op. cit., p. 51.
[87] Marvin Meyers, The Jacksonian Persuasion (Stanford, 1957), pp. 12-13.
[88] Sydney Nathans, Daniel Webster and Jacksonian Democracy (Baltimore, 1973), p. 48.
[89] Peter Temin, The Jacksonian Economy (New York, 1969), p. 18.
[90] Charles D. Lowery, James Barbour, a Jeffersonian Republican (University, Alabama, 1984), pp. 217-18.
[91] The Diary of Philip Hone, 1828-1851 (New York, 1851), p. 142.
[92] Fish, The Rise of the Common Man, op. cit., p. 54.
[93] Glyndon Van Deusen, The Jackson Era, 1828-1848 (New York, 1959), pp. 66-67.
[94] Bray Hammond, Banks and Politics in America from the Revolution to the Civil War

along with the phrase-making of this "frontier democrat", class distinctions widened, and tensions increased, minus the means to successfully over-come them.

In the mid 'thirties various workers' parties also sprang up. Many were far from totally proletarian in composition, and few went much further than Jacksonian Democracy, in their denunciations of the "monopolists" and such demands as free public schools and equality of "opportunity". This political workerism only advanced the absorption of working people into the new political system and displayed, for the first time, the now familiar interchangeability of labor leader and politician.

But integration was not accomplished smoothly or automatically. For one thing, political insurrection was a legacy of the eighteenth century: from Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia (1675), by 1760 there had been eighteen uprisings aimed at overthrowing colonial governments,[95] and more recently there had appeared Shays's Rebellion in Massachusetts (1786-87), the Whiskey Rebellion in Western Pennsylvania (1794), and Fries's Rebellion in Eastern Pennsylvania (1798-99). Twenty-five years after the Constitu-tion was signed, extensive anti-Federalist rioting in Baltimore seemed to connect with this legacy, rather than to less authentic political alternatives to the old informal means of social control. Significantly, over the course of the summer 1812 upheavals, the composition of the mob shifted toward an exclusively proletarian, unpropertied make-up.[96]

Moving into the period under particular scrutiny, the depth of general contestation is somewhat reflected by a most unlikely revolt, that of a "vicious cadet mutiny" at West Point in 1826. On Christmas morning in that year, "drunken and raging cadets endeavored to kill at least one of their superior officers and converted their barracks into a bastion which they proposed to defend, armed, against assault by relieving Regular Army troops on the Academy reservation."[97] The fury of this amazing turn of events, though detailed in much Board of Inquiry and courts-martial testimony, remains a little-known episode in United States history; it can be seen to have introduced a whole chapter of wholesale tumult, nonetheless.

By the late 'twenties group violence had reached great prominence in American life, such that within a few years "many Americans had a strong

(Princeton, 1957), p. 238.

[95] Howard Zinn, A People's History of the United States (New York, 1980), p. 59.

[96] Paul A. Gilje, "The Baltimore Riots of 1812 and the Breakdown of the Anglo-American Mob Tradition", in: Journal of Social History, XIII (1979-80).

[97] James B. Agnew, Egg Nog Riot: The Christmas Mutiny at West Point (San Rafael, 1979), p. ix.

sense of social disintegration".[98] The annual New York parade of artisans in November 1830 was another incident that told a great deal about the mounting unruliness. Printers, coopers, furniture-makers and a great many other tradesmen assembled at the culmination of the procession, to hear speeches expressing the usual Republican virtues. But on this day politicians mouthing the old ritual phrases about political freedom and the dignity of labor were suddenly confronted by curses, scuffling and a defiant temper. "As the militia tried to quiet the militants, the dissatisfied crowd knocked out the support of the scaffolding, causing the entire stage to crash to the ground",[99] and bringing the ceremonies to an undignified end. The public violence of the 'thirties was more a prolonged aftershock, however, than a moment of revolutionary possibility. For the reasons given above, the triumph of industrial technology was a fact by the end of the 'twenties, and the ensuing aftermath, though major, could not be decisive.

But it is true that, by Hammett's reckoning, "A climate of disorder prevailed, [. . .] which seemed to be moving the nation to the edge of disaster."[100] As Page Smith described urban life in the early 'thirties, "What is hard to comprehend today is the constant ferment of social unrest and bitterness that manifested itself almost monthly in violent riots and civic disorders."[101] Gilje's research revealed "nearly 200 instances of riot between 1793 and 1829 in New York City alone",[102] for example, and Weinbaum counted 116 in that city just in the period of 1821 to 1837.[103] Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston witnessed outbreaks on a similar scale, often directed at bankers and "monopolists". Michael Chavalier wrote a chapter entitled "Symptoms of Revolution", against the backdrop of four days of rioting in Baltimore over exploitative practices of the Bank of Maryland in the summer of 1835.[104] Also in that year, disorders that caused Jackson to increasingly resort to the use of Federal troops, occasioned William Ellery Channing's report from Boston: "The cry is, 'Property is

[98] John J. Duffy and H. Nicholas Muller, III, An Anxious Democracy: Aspects of the 1830's (Westport, Conn., 1982), p. 4.
[99] Sean Wilentz, "Artisan Republican Festivals and the Rise of Class Conflict in New York City, 1788-1837", in: Working-Class America, op. cit., p. 54.
[100] Theodore M. Hammett, "Two Mobs of Jacksonian Boston: Ideology and Interest", in: Journal of American History, LXII (1975-76), p. 867.
[101] Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, p. 746.
[102] Gilje, "The Baltimore Riots", loc. cit., p. 564.
[103] Paul Owen Weinbaum, Mobs and Demagogues: The Response to Collective Violence in New York City in the Early Nineteenth Century (Ann Arbor, 1977), p. iv.
[104] Michael Chavalier, Society, Manners, and Politics in the United States (Garden City, N.Y., 1961), pp. 371ff.

insecure, law a rope of sand, and the mob sovereign.'"[105] Likewise, the Boston *Evening Journal* pondered the "disorganizing, anarchical spirit" of the times in an August 7, 1835 editorial. February 1836 saw hundreds of debtor farmers attack and burn offices of the Holland Land Company in Western New York.[106] During 1836 and 1837 crowds in New York City broke into warehouses several times, furious over high food, rent and fuel prices. The Workingmen's Party in New York, known as the Locofoco Party, has been linked with these "flour riots", but, interestingly, at the February 1837 outburst most closely tied to Locofoco speech-making, of fifty-three rioters arrested none was a party member.[107]

Despite the narrow chances for the ultimate success of the uprisings of the 'thirties, it is impossible to deny the existence of deep and bitter class feelings, of the notion that the promise of equality contained in the Declaration of Independence was mocked by reality. Serious disturbances continued: the 1838 "Buckshot War", in which Harrisburg was seized by an irate, armed crowd in a Pennsylvania senatorial-election dispute, for example; the "Anti-rent" riots by New York tenants of the Van Rensselaer family in 1839; the "Dorr War" of 1842 (somewhat reminiscent of the independent "Indian Stream Republic" of 1832-35 in New Hampshire), in which thousands in Rhode Island approached civil war in a fight over rival state constitutions; and the sporadic anti-railroad riots in the Kensington section of Philadelphia from 1840 to 1842 were among major hostilities. But ethnic, racial and religious disputes began fairly early in the decade to begin to supersede class-conscious struggles, though often disparate elements coexisted in the same occasions. This decline in consciousness was manifested in anti-Irish, anti-abolitionist and anti-Catholic riots largely, and must be seen in the context of the earlier, principal defeat of working people by the factory system, in the 'twenties. Cut off from the only terrain on which challenge could gain basic victories, could change life, the upheaval in the 'thirties was destined to sour. Characteristically, the end of the 'thirties saw both the professionalization of urban police forces and organized gang violence in place as permanent fixtures.

If by 1830 virtually every aspect of American life had undergone major alteration, the startling changes in drinking habits shed particular light on the industrialism behind this transformation. The "great alcoholic binge of

---

[105] Michael Kammen, People of Paradox (New York, 1972), p. 253.
[106] Lee Benson, The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy (Princeton, 1970), pp. 151-52.
[107] Walter Hugins, Jacksonian Democracy and the Working Class (Stanford, 1960), pp. 45-46.

the early nineteenth century'',[108] and its precipitous decline in the early 'thirties, have much to say about how the culture of the new technology took shape.

Drinking, on the one hand, was a part of the pre-industrial blurring of the distinction between work and leisure. On into the early decades of the century, small amounts of alcohol were commonly consumed throughout the day, at work and at home (sometimes the same place); reference has been made above to the frequent, spontaneous holidays of all kinds, and the widespread observance of "blue Mondays" or three-day weekends, "which run pretty well into the week", according to one complaining New York employer.[109] Drinking was the universal accompaniment to these parties, celebrations and extended weekends, as it was to the normal work-day. The tavern or grog-shop, with its "unstructured, leisurely, and wholly unproductive, even anti-productive, character",[110] was a social center well-suited to a non-mechanized age, and in fact became more than ever the workingman's club as modernization cut him off from other emotional outlets.[111]

But drunkenness – binge-drinking and solitary drinking, most importantly – was increasing by 1820; significantly, alcoholic delirium, or delirium tremens, first appeared in the United States during the 'twenties.[112] Alcoholism is an obvious register of strains and alienation, of the inability of people to cope with the burden of daily life which a society places on them. Clearly, there is little healthy or resistant about the resort to such drinking practices.

Temperance reform was a part of the larger syndrome of social disciplining expressed in industrialization, as irregular drinking habits were an obstacle to a well-managed population. Not surprisingly, factory-owners were in the forefront of such efforts, having to contend with troublesome wage-earners who had little taste for such dictums as "the steady arm of industry withers from drink".[113] Tyrrell's examination of Worcester, Massachusetts, also found that "the leading temperance reformers were

[108] W. J. Rorabaugh, The Alcoholic Republic (New York, 1979), p. 25.
[109] Ian R. Tyrrell, Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860 (Westport, 1979), p. 107.
[110] Richard D. Brown, Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865 (New York, 1976), p. 155.
[111] Foster Rhea Dulles, America Learns To Play: A History of Recreation (New York, 1965), p. 90.
[112] Rorabaugh, The Alcoholic Republic, op. cit., p. 169.
[113] Bruce Laurie, "Nothing on Compulsion: Life Styles of Philadelphia Artisans, 1820-1850", in: American Working Class Culture, ed. by Milton Cantor (Westport, 1979), p. 106.

those with a hand in the work of inventions and of innovations in factory and machine production".[114]

While at one point workers considered a daily-liquor issue a non-negotiable right and an emblem of their independence, increasing reliance on alcohol signified the debility that went along with their domination by machine culture. The Secretary of War estimated in 1829 that "three-quarters of the nation's laborers drank daily at least 4 ounces of distilled spirits",[115] and in 1830 the average annual consumption of liquor exceeded five gallons, nearly triple the amount one hundred and fifty years later.[116]

The anti-alcohol crusade began in earnest in 1826 with the formation of the American Temperance Society, and other local groups such as the Society in Lynn (Massachusetts) for the Promotion of Industry, Frugality and Temperance (also 1826). In the same year Beecher wrote his *Six Sermons on Intemperance*, the leading statement of antidrinking of the period, which pronounced tippling to be politically dangerous. In Gusfield's excellent summation, Beecher's writings "displayed the classic fear the creditor has of the debtor, the propertied of the propertyless, and the dominant of the subordinate – the fear of disobedience, renunciation, and rebellion."[117] Temperance exertions in the 'twenties revealed in their propaganda the tenuous influence that the respectable held over the laboring classes during the height of the battle to establish industrial values and a predictable workforce. As this battle was won, drinking suddenly leveled off at the end of the 'twenties and began to plummet in the early 'thirties toward an unprecedented low.[118] As working people became domesticated, the temperance movement shifted toward the goal of complete abstinence, and in the 'forties a "dry" campaign swept the nation.[119]

The other major reform movement, also arising in the mid 'twenties, was for a public school system, and like the temperance campaign it was explicitly undertaken to "make the dangerous classes trustworthy".[120] The concept of mass schooling had arrived by the early Jacksonian period, when innovative forms of coercion were demanded by deteriorating restraints on social behavior, and auxiliary institutions came to the aid of the factory.

[114] Tyrrell, Sobering up, op. cit., p. 127.
[115] Rorabaugh, The Alcoholic Republic, p. 15.
[116] Ibid., p. 8.
[117] Joseph R. Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement (Urbana, 1963), p. 43.
[118] Rorabaugh, The Alcoholic Republic, p. 187.
[119] This generalization does not mean to imply an easy or complete end of the issue. Concerning the severity and persistence of this phenomenon see Jed Dannenbaum's study of nineteenth-century Cincinnati, Drink and Disorder (Urbana, 1984).
[120] Ronald G. Waters, American Reformers, 1815-1860 (New York, 1978), p. 209.

The "willingness of early nineteenth-century school promoters to intervene directly and without invitation in the lives of the working class"[121] was a consequence of the notion that education was something the ruling orders did to the rest to make them orderly and tractable. Thus "the first compulsory schools were alien institutions set in hostile territory",[122] as Katz put it, owing largely to the spirit of autonomy and egalitarianism that parents had instilled in their children. Faux noted, in 1819, the "prominent want of respect for rule and rulers", which he connected with a common refusal of "strict discipline" in schools;[123] Marryat's diary reported that students "learn precisely what they please and no more".[124] Drunkennness and rioting occurred in schools as well as in the rest of society, and educators interpreted the overall situation as announcing general subversion; in an 1833 address on education, John Armstrong declared: "When Revolution threatens the overthrow of our institutions, everything depends upon the character of the people."[125] Industrial morality – obedience, self-sacrifice, restraint and order – constituted the most important goal of public education; character was of far greater importance than intellectual development.[126] The school system came into existence to shape behavior and attitudes, and thus reinforce the emerging world. The belief that attendance should be universal and compulsory followed logically from assumptions about its importance.[127]

Moral instruction was also amplified by the churches during the 'twenties and 'thirties, an antidote to that tendency to "rejoice in casting off restraints & unsettling the foundations of social order",[128] woefully recorded by the Reverend Charles Hall. Sunday School and the society for diffusion of religious tracts were two new ecclesiastical contributions to social control in this period. The Jacksonian period is also synonymous with the "Age of the Asylum", a further development in the quest for civic docility. The regularity and efficiency of the factory was the model for the penitentiaries, insane asylums, orphanages and reformatories that now appeared.[129]

---

[121] Michael B. Katz, Michael J. Doucet, Mark J. Stern, The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. 349.
[122] Michael B. Katz, Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. xvii.
[123] Faux, "Memorable Days in American", loc. cit., pp. 130-31 (August 5, 1819).
[124] Frederick Marryat, A Diary in America (New York, 1962), p. 352.
[125] Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, p. 80.
[126] Carl F. Kaestle, Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860 (New York, 1983), pp. 96-97.
[127] Katz et al., Early Industrial Capitalism, op. cit., p. 378.
[128] Clifford S. Griffin, "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860", in: Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIV (1957-58), p. 436.
[129] Kasson, Civilizing the Machine, op. cit., p. 73. Also the important David J. Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum (New York, 1971).

Embodying uniformity and regularity, the factory was indeed the model, as we have seen, for the whole of society. Religious revivalism and millenarianism grew in strength after the mid 'twenties, and one of the new denominations to appear was the Millerites (today's Seventh-day Adventists). On October 22, 1844, the group gathered to await what they predicted would be the end of the world. Their expectation was but the most literal manifestation of a feeling that began to pervade the country after 1830;[130] without unduly elevating the pre-industrial past, one can recognize the lament for a world that was indeed ended.

The early stages of industrial capitalism introduced a sharpened division between the worlds of work and home, male and female, and private and public life, with large extended families eroding toward small, isolated nuclear families. Along with this process of increasing separation and isolation came a focused repression of personal feelings, stemming from new requirements for rationalized, predictable behavior. As planning and organization moved ahead *via* the progress of the machine model of the individual, the range of human sentiments became suspect, a target for suppression. For example, whereas in 1800 it was not considered "unmanly" for a man to weep openly, by the 'thirties a proscription against any extreme emotional display, especially crying, was gaining strength.[131] Similarly, in child training this tendency became very pronounced; in the widely distributed *Advice to Christian Parents* (1839), the Reverend John Hersey emphasized that "In every stage of domestic education, children should be disciplined to restrain their appetites and desires."[132]

The seventeenth-century Puritans were hardly "puritanical" about sexual matters, and eighteenth-century American society, especially in the latter part of the century was characterized by very open sexuality;[133] during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, moreover, much emphasis was placed on the arousal, pleasure and satisfaction of women. *Aristotle's Master Piece*, for example, was a very popular work of erotica and anatomy in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, predicated on the sexual interest of women. There were at least one hundred editions of the book prior to 1830 – and no known complaints about it in any newspapers or periodicals.[134] In 1831, the year that the last edition of *Aristotle's Master*

[130] Rorabaugh, The Alcoholic Republic, p. 213.
[131] Page Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land: Women in American History (Boston, 1970), p. 64.
[132] Quoted by Cochran, Business in American Life, op. cit., p. 91.
[133] Stephen Nissenbaum, Sex, Diet and Debility in Jacksonian America (Westport, 1980), p. 26.
[134] Carl Degler, At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present (New York, 1980), p. 251.

Piece was published, J. N. Bolles's *Solitary Vice Considered* appeared, an anti-masturbation booklet of a type that would proliferate from the early 'thirties on.[135] While the advice books on sex of the early part of the century could be quite explicit concerning women's sexual satisfaction, the trend was that "medical, biological, instructional, and popular literature contained countless defenses of extreme modern moderation and self-control".[136] The turning-point, again, in this area as elsewhere, was the 'twenties.

By the 'forties the very idea of women's sexuality was becoming virtually erased. In the middle years of the century Dr William Acton's *Functions and Disorders of the Reproductive Organs* was a popular standby; it summed up the official view on the subject thus: "The majority of women (happily for them) are not very much troubled with sexual feelings of any kind. What men are habitually, women are only exceptionally."[137] Among working and non-white women (not exclusive categories, obviously) this ideology had less impact than among those of higher station, for whom the relentless quelling of the recognition of "animal passions" caused vast physical and psychological damage.[138] The cult of female purity, or cult of the lady, or "true womanhood", emerged among the latter in the 'thirties, stressing piety and domesticity.[139] This American woman was now exclusively a consumer of her husband's income, at a period when advertising developed on a scale and sophistication unique in the world.

Not surprisingly, national expansionist policy came into its own now, too. The claim of hemispheric rights proclaimed in late 1823 – the Monroe Doctrine – coincided with the beginnings of real Indian genocide, both occurring, of course, against the backdrop of a gathering industrial ethos. The Seminoles and Creeks were crushed at this time, an answer to the "especially menacing" specter of a combined Indian and runaway-slave coalition: the First Seminole War was in large part undertaken "to secure Indian lands and therewith deny sanctuary to runaway slaves".[140] From 1814 to 1824, Jackson had been "the moving force behind southern Indian

---

[135] Nissenbaum, Sex, Diet and Debility, op. cit., p. 28.
[136] Jayne A. Sokolow, Eros and Modernization (Cranbury, N.Y., 1983), pp. 12-13.
[137] Degler, At Odds, op. cit., p. 250.
[138] Smith, The Nation Comes of Age, p. 714.
[139] Gerda Lerner, "The Lady and the Mill Girl: Changes in the Status of Women in the Age of Jackson", in: Midcontinental American Studies Journal, X (1969), p. 11-12.
[140] Richard Drinnon, Facing West: Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building (Minneapolis, 1980), p. 107.

removal",[141] a policy inherited from Jefferson and one which he completed upon becoming President in 1828. Indian destruction, surely one of the major horror tales of the modern age, was more than an ugly stain on American politics and culture; indeed, Rogin's argument that its scope "defines for America the stage of primitive capitalist accumulation"[142] is at least partly true. At the very least it presaged the further acquisitiveness that blossomed in the Manifest Destiny conquest spirit of the 'forties. But the more monstrous perhaps is its moral dimension, committed under Jackson's description of "extending the area of freedom".[143] The Red Man, as Noble Savage, had to disappear; he was "savage", after all. The Dead Indian is obviously a more apt symbol for the trajectory of industrial capitalism, though the romantic use of the Indian reached its height at the moment of capital's victory, when, by the 'thirties, Nature truly became an evil to be subdued, while the machine was the fountainhead of all values that counted.

Nevertheless, voices and symbols of opposition survived. Johnny Appleseed (John Chapman), for instance, who was respected by the Indians during the first forty years of the century, and who represents riches of a wholly non-productionist, non-commodity type. There were such doubters of the period as Thoreau, Hawthorne, Poe and Melville. Lee Clark Mitchell, among other contemporary scholars, has found, in letters, diaries and essays, the record of a popular sense of deep foreboding about the conquest of the wilds by technological progress.[144] The victories of the dominant order have certainly never completely erased this alternative spirit of refusal, a spirit renewing itself today.

[141] Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York, 1975), p. 165.
[142] Ibid., p. 13.
[143] Quoted by Major L. Wilson, Space, Time and Freedom (Westport, 1974), p. 12.
[144] Lee Clark Mitchell, Witnesses to a Vanishing America (Princeton, 1980).