

Kristofferson, Robert B. *Craft Capitalism: Craftworkers and Early Industrialization in Hamilton, Ontario, 1840–1872.*
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007. 328 pp.

Darren Ferry

Volume 38, Number 1, Fall 2009

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/038468ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/038468ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Ferry, D. (2009). Review of [Kristofferson, Robert B. *Craft Capitalism: Craftworkers and Early Industrialization in Hamilton, Ontario, 1840–1872.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007. 328 pp.] *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 38(1), 41–42. <https://doi.org/10.7202/038468ar>

about these not only makes for a better urban history, it may also contribute to better, more just cities today.

Notes

1. After much effort, the lectures have been reassembled and edited by Michel Senelleart. After initially appearing in French, they have been translated into English by noted Foucault specialist Graham Burchell. On "governmentality," see Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population* (2004; repr., London: Palgrave, 2007) and *The Birth of Biopolitics* (2004; repr., London: Palgrave, 2008).
2. Three key scholars in the field map this evolution in Nikolas Rose, Pat O'Malley, and Mariana Valverde, "Governmentality," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2 (2006): 83–104.

John C. Walsh
Carleton University

Kristofferson, Robert B. *Craft Capitalism: Craftworkers and Early Industrialization in Hamilton, Ontario, 1840–1872*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007. 328 pp.

A provocative and exceptionally well-researched book, Robert Kristofferson's *Craft Capitalism* offers nothing less than a fundamental reinterpretation of Ontario's early industrialization in the mid-nineteenth century. Focusing on the embryonic urban environment of Hamilton from 1840 to 1872, Kristofferson argues persuasively that the effects of early industrial capitalism among craftworkers were largely positive, leading not to urban proletarianization, but to increased economic opportunity. Taking issue with the "dispossession theory" held by labour historians such as Gregory Kealey and Bryan Palmer, Kristofferson claims that "Hamilton craftworkers were eager participants in the unfolding of industrialization because their situation within it allowed them to understand themselves and to act as its beneficiaries." (243) Emphasizing the triumph of craft continuity over the uneven pace of capitalistic change, Kristofferson stresses the commonality of interests and experiences held by artisanal masters and journeymen. *Craft Capitalism* presents a carefully nuanced vision of the "transmodal" phase of early urban industrialism, as craftworkers and artisans successfully straddled emerging industrial capitalist modes of production with an enduring craft culture.

The first three chapters situate the material composition of craft capitalism within the burgeoning industrial expansion of Hamilton itself. The resulting flexibility of this industrial growth was achieved without a fundamental altering of economic relationships, as "an expanded number of small handicraft enterprises stood in generally peaceful co-existence with a considerable number of enlarged manufactories." (21) Utilizing meticulously gathered census schedules, city directories, urban newspapers and individual biographies, Kristofferson offers a convincing depiction of an industrial city built by its migrant craftworkers. The relative absence of class conflict is explained through these migratory labour patterns; with the vast majority of craftworkers emigrating from the British Isles, many came to Hamilton in search of economic advancement and prosperity, aspirations seemingly unattainable in the Old World.

And, by and large, they succeeded. With assiduous attention to detail, Kristofferson traces the origins of 233 proprietors of industrial establishments in Hamilton, and concludes that roughly 85 to 95% of these owners were former artisans who "rose through the ranks." (72) Their visible presence within the industrial community provided a powerful symbol of craft mobility for journeymen and apprentices, and the mentoring process offered by craft culture would provide practical means of "masculine independence" for a large majority of journeymen artisans and craftworkers.

With the socio-economic context of craft capitalism firmly established, Kristofferson argues that both master and journeymen forged a particular craft culture, one that emphasized "mutualism" in social relations rather than adversarial capitalistic competition. This craft continuity reinforced the social construction of workplace masculinities, through shared workspace on the shop floor and seminal cultural celebrations such as picnics, excursions, testimonials and parades.

Kristofferson is particularly persuasive when he adheres to the inner workings of workplace craft mutualism, and the craft identity of masculine exclusiveness. However, the author does not explore as thoroughly the intricate negotiations of power inherent in these obligations and dependencies—contractual or otherwise—between masters, journeymen and apprentices, nor does he examine how these employment responsibilities might have been atypical in a capitalist shop. Less convincing is his discussion of craft mutualism when it moves outside the workplace context. The rhetoric of craft mutualism found in various testimonials merely resonates as a remnant of earlier paternalist discourse. Likewise, while Kristofferson claims that the larger dwellings of masters illustrate craft continuity and economic promise, it could easily be demonstrated that differentiated urban space could become an authoritative symbol of the power dynamics existing between masters and journeymen.

A comparable difficulty in recognizing occupational power relationships exists in Kristofferson's otherwise engaging look at the culture of the "self-made artisan" and the ideology of the "self-improving craftsworker." Correctly accentuating the reality that the "self-made man is a slippery concept and needs to be used with some caution," (138) Kristofferson notes that craftworkers employed this image to foster a craft ideology of masculine independence, sobriety and industriousness, separate from the aristocratic pretensions of the commercial/professional classes. Similarly, recognizing that self-education was the key to craft continuity and advancement, craftworkers often took advantage of such institutions as the Hamilton Mechanics' Institute, mercantile libraries and literary societies.

While this perspective offers a welcome and effective corollary to the existing paradigm that craftworkers and artisans operated in opposition to the "producer ideology" of industrial capitalism, his argument appears to mirror an outmoded liberal historiography of the Victorian period as an age of improvement and progress. By taking the rhetoric of the self-made and

self-improved craftsworker at face value, Kristofferson once again runs the risk of ignoring the complex negotiations of cultural authority in the fluid gradations of class existing between the craftworkers themselves, and the development of power relations within the larger urban community. Surely the lessons of Horatio Alger and Samuel Smiles were manipulated and enforced by the hegemonic forces of commercialization in dissimilar terms and often in direct opposition to this durable craft culture, often in the very same periodicals and institutions exemplified in *Craft Capitalism*.

The strengths and weaknesses of Kristofferson's book are exhibited in the final chapter, as the Nine Hours Movement of 1872 is described as a divergence of this transmodal culture of mutualism in the face of increasing capitalistic pressure. Although a compelling argument, it becomes difficult for Kristofferson to simply localize these conflicts to Hamilton masters and journeymen, particularly as he positions the conflict around debates over the nature of "industrial citizenship." If, as Kristofferson claims, that younger craftworkers demanded shorter hours as their natural right in an emerging "liberal economy," (207) then he should engage with the broader political tenets of liberalism and their effects within the larger urban community.

Although *Craft Capitalism* may at times deliver less than what was promised, Kristofferson's conclusions are both original and wide-ranging, calling on historians to recognize the complexities of urban industrial development in the mid-Victorian era, while opening up valuable new avenues of investigation in the process.

Darren Ferry
Nipissing University

Moore, Paul S. *Now Playing: Early Moviegoing and the Regulation of Fun*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008. Pp. 250. Illustrations, photographs.

Now Playing looks at the normalization of movie-going as an ordinary part of everyday urban experience, bringing together an impressive amount of research from a variety of sources including government documents, trade periodicals, religious literature, and newspapers. The intense local focus on Toronto belies the transnational context of this study, where Paul Moore argues that film had to be integrated into the local culture of particular cities before it could become a national or global mass practice. Toronto, he claims, is "an ideal bridge between the U.S. and its global markets" (p. 3) because it was treated as part of the U.S. domestic market, but generated uniquely Canadian responses to Hollywood production. The study begins in 1906, the year the first theatriciums opened in Toronto, and ends in 1918 when Moore asserts that movie-going was established as an ordinary way for the public to participate in the war effort.

Approaching movie-going through its urban social history shows how the city responded to being used, surveyed, and policed in new, modern ways. Movie-going presented municipal

bureaucrats and civic groups with unprecedented safety issues and moral questions, while ordinary people adapted to expanding options and increased regulation over their leisure time. Moore establishes the local context of movie-going and contends that integrating and regulating films in Toronto was largely unproblematic due to the homogeneity of Toronto's "British-born" population, the strict, moralistic policing of "Toronto the Good," and striking a balance between commercial shows for pleasure, and uplifting scientific, educational or religious films. Ontario's fire-safety law of 1908, the first piece of provincial legislation to focus on film specifically, called attention to the need for defining the parameters of socially and physically safe movie-going. The flammability of celluloid, coupled with the perceived "social combustibility" of movie audiences prompted swift and decisive action on the part of legislators and politicians. Rather than making movie-going innocuous, the fire-safety law laid a foundation for the further regulation of film.

The balance between local practice and transnational distribution, and local regulation versus centralized bureaucracy is a major theme of this study. Entrepreneurs were challenged by the need to respond to both local concerns and the rhythms of the U.S. film production and distribution industry during a period of flux. Moore details the shift from local showmanship to large outside chains dedicated to promoting a universal form of cinema. The standardization of film showmanship further defined movie-going as both a local and transnational industry. The emergence of a centralized bureaucracy of film regulation produced standardized forms of licensing, censorship and theatre inspection, expediting efficient police and government surveillance of movie-going.

Moore emphasizes the daily press and its role in engendering a sense of global spectatorship. This is the most theoretically grounded portion of this study, with a foundation in the sociological works produced by Robert E. Park and his Chicago School colleagues. Moore argues that the introduction of a "rhetoric of commonality" through the press bonded temporally and spatially separate movie-goers into a mass audience. Integrating films with serial fiction in women's magazines and weekend newspaper editions, for example, signalled the arrival of movie-going's mass appeal and movie-goers became increasingly aware that they were part of a transnational audience. This awareness took on new significance during WWI when Canadians attended movies as an active form of citizenship. Despite the relative absence of nationally produced films Moore argues that movie-going took on a patriotic air. Showmen promoted movie-going as an ordinary way for city dwellers to participate in the homefront war effort through fund-raising and recruiting. The state sanctioned mass movie-going through its wartime amusement tax, funnelling audience's pocket-money into government coffers.

Moore differentiates his study from other histories of film, by-passing a discussion of developing film technology and focussing instead on the social processes and practices that shaped modern movie-going. While Moore acknowledges that location,