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Women Factory Workers Form a Community in Lowell, Massachusetts

In the 1820s and 1830s, young farm women from all over New England flocked to Lowell to work a twelve-hour day in one of the first cotton textile factories in America. Living six to eight to a room in nearby boardinghouses, the women of Lowell earned an average of $3 a week. Some also attended inexpensive nighttime lectures or classes. Lowell, considered a model factory town, drew worldwide attention. As one admirer of its educated workers said, Lowell was less a factory than a "philanthropic manufacturing college."

The Boston investors who financed Lowell were businessmen, not philanthropists, but they wanted to keep Lowell free of the dirt, poverty, and social disorder that made English factory towns notorious. Built in 1823, Lowell boasted six neat factory buildings grouped around a central clock tower, the area pleasantly landscaped with flowers, shrubs, and trees. Housing was similarly well ordered: a Georgian mansion for the company agent; trim houses for the overseers; row houses for the mechanics and their families; and boardinghouses, each supervised by a responsible matron, for the workforce that made Lowell famous—young New England farm women.

The choice of young women as factory workers seemed shockingly unconventional. In the 1820s and 1830s, young unmarried women simply did not live alone; they lived and worked with their parents until they married. In these years of growth and westward expansion, however, America was chronically short of labor, and the Lowell manufacturers were shrewd enough to realize that young farm women were an untapped labor force. For farmers' sons, the lure of acquiring their own farms in the West was much stronger than factory wages, but for their sisters, escaping from rural isolation and earning a little money was an appealing way to spend a few years before marriage. To attract respectable young women, Lowell offered supervision both on the job and at home, with strict rules of conduct, compulsory religious services, cultural opportunities such as concerts and lectures, and cash wages.

When they first arrived in Lowell, the young women were often bewildered by the large numbers of townspeople and embarrassed by their own rural clothing and country ways. The air of the mill was hot, humid, and full of cotton lint, and the noise of the machinery—"The buzzing and hissing and whizzing of pulleys and rollers and spindles and flyers"—was constant. It was company policy for senior women to train the newcomers, and often sisters or neighbors who had preceded them to the mill helped them adjust to their new surroundings.

The work itself was simple, consisting largely of knotting broken threads on spinning machines and power looms. Most women, accustomed to the long days of farm work, enjoyed their jobs. One woman wrote home: "The work is not disagreeable. It tried my patience sadly at first, but in general I like it very much. It is easy to do, and does not require very violent exertion, as much of our farm work does."

Textile mills ran on a rigid work schedule with fines or penalties imposed on latecomers and slackers. Power-driven machinery operated at a sustained, uniform pace throughout every mill; human workers had to learn to do the same. This precise work schedule represented the single largest change from preindustrial work habits, and it was the hardest adjustment for the workers. Moreover, each mill positioned one or two male overseers on every floor to make sure the pace was maintained. They earned more than the women who made up most of the workforce, but this arrangement was unquestioned.

Why did young farm women come to Lowell? Some worked out of need, but most regarded Lowell as an opportunity: an escape from rural isolation and from parental supervision, a chance...
to buy the latest fashions and learn “city ways,” to attend lectures and concerts, to save for a dowry or to pay for an education. As writer Lucy Larcom, one of the most famous workers, said, the women who came to Lowell sought “an opening into freer life.” Working side by side and living with six to twelve other women, some of whom might be relatives or friends from home, the Lowell women built a close, supportive community for themselves.

The owners of Lowell made large profits and also drew praise for their carefully managed community, with its intelligent and independent workforce. But their success was short-lived. In the 1830s, facing competition and poor economic conditions, the owners imposed wage cuts and work speedups that their model workforce did not take lightly. Despite the system of paternalistic control at the mills, the close bonds the women forged gave them the courage and solidarity to “turn out” in spontaneous protests, which were, however, unsuccessful in reversing the wage cuts. By 1850, the “philanthropic manufacturing college” was no more. The original Lowell workforce of New England farm girls had been replaced by poor Irish immigrants of both sexes, who earned much less than their predecessors. Now Lowell was simply another mill town.

The history of Lowell epitomizes the process by which the North (New England and the Middle Atlantic states) industrialized. A society composed largely of self-sufficient farm families (Jefferson’s “yeoman farmers”) changed to one of urban wage earners. Industrialization did not occur overnight. Large factories were not common until the 1880s, but long before that decade, most workers had already experienced a fundamental change in their working patterns. Once under way, the market revolution changed how people worked, how they thought, how they lived: the very basis of community. In the early years of the nineteenth century, northern communities led this transformation, fostering attitudes far different from those prevalent in the agrarian South.

**KEY TOPICS**

- Preindustrial ways of working and living
- The nature of the market revolution
- The effects of industrialization on workers in early factories
- Ways the market revolution changed the lives of ordinary people
- The emergence of the middle class

**Preindustrial Ways of Working**

The Lowell mill was a dramatic example of the ways factories changed traditional patterns of working and living. When Lowell began operation, 97 percent of all Americans still lived on farms, and most work was done in or near the home. As had been true in colonial times, the lives of most people were family and community based and depended on local networks of mutual obligation (see Chapter 5).

**Rural and Urban Home Production**

Farm families worked together to produce food and other goods for their use and for their community network. In these community exchanges, barter was customary. Money rarely changed hands. People usually paid for a home-crafted item or a neighbor’s help with a particular task, in foodstuffs or a piece of clothing or by helping the neighbor with a job he needed to have done. Thus goods and services originating in the home were part of the complicated reciprocal arrangements among
community residents who knew each other well. The “just price” for an item was set by agreement among neighbors, not by some impersonal market. Another characteristic of traditional rural work was its relatively slow, unscheduled, task-oriented pace. There was no fixed production schedule or specified period of time for task completion. People did their jobs as they needed to be done, along with the daily household routine. “Home” and “work” were not separate locations or activities, but intermixed.

Likewise, in urban areas, skilled craftsmen controlled preindustrial production through the formal system of apprenticeship. Usually, the apprentice lived with the master craftsman and was treated more like a member of the family than an employee. Thus, the family-learning model used on farms was formalized in the urban apprenticeship system. At the end of the contract period, the apprentice became a journeyman craftsman. Journeymen worked for wages in the shops of master craftsmen until they had enough capital to set up shop for themselves.

Although women as well as men did task-oriented skilled work, the formal apprenticeship system was exclusively for men. Because it was assumed that women would marry, most people thought that girls only needed to learn domestic skills. Women who needed or wanted work, however, found a small niche of respectable occupations as domestic servants, laundresses, or seamstresses, often in the homes of the wealthy, or as cooks in small restaurants, or as food vendors on the street. Some owned and managed boardinghouses. Prostitution, another common female occupation (especially in seaport cities), was not respectable.

**Patriarchy in Family, Work, and Society**

In both rural and urban settings, working families were organized along strictly patriarchal lines. The man had unquestioned authority to direct the lives and work of family members and apprentices and to decide on occupations for his sons and
marriages for his daughters. His wife had many crucial responsibilities—feeding, clothing, child rearing, taking care of apprentices, and all the other domestic affairs of the household—but in all these duties she was subject to the direction of her husband. Men were heads of families and bosses of artisanal shops; although entire families were engaged in the enterprise, the husband and father was the trained craftsman, and assistance by the family was informal and generally unrecognized.

The patriarchal organization of the family was reflected in society as a whole. Legally, men had all the power: neither women nor children had property or legal rights. For example, a married woman’s property belonged to her husband, a woman could not testify on her own behalf in court, and in the rare cases of divorce, the husband kept the children because they were considered his property. When a man died, his son or sons inherited his property. The basic principle was that the man, as head of the household, represented the common interests of everyone for whom he was responsible—women, children, servants, apprentices. He thus controlled everything of value, and he alone could vote for political office.

THE SOCIAL ORDER

In this preindustrial society, everyone, from the smallest yeoman farmer to the largest urban merchant, had a fixed place in the social order. The social status of artisans was below that of wealthy merchants but decidedly above that of common laborers. Yeoman farmers, less grand than large landowners, ranked above tenant farmers and farm laborers. Although men of all social ranks mingled in their daily work, they did not mingle as equals, for great importance was placed on rank and status, which were distinguished by dress and manner. Although by the 1790s many artisans who owned property were voters and vocal participants in urban politics, few directly challenged the traditional authority of the rich and powerful to run civic affairs. The rapid spread of universal white manhood suffrage after 1800 democratized politics (see Chapter 11). At the same time, economic changes undermined the preindustrial social order. New York cabinetmaker Duncan Phyfe and sailmaker Stephen Allen amassed fortunes from their operations. Allen, when he retired, was elected mayor of New York, customarily a position reserved for gentlemen. These artisans owed much of their success to the economic changes fostered by the transportation revolution.

THE TRANSPORTATION REVOLUTION

Between 1800 and 1840, the United States experienced truly revolutionary improvements in transportation. More than any other development, these improvements encouraged Americans to look beyond their local communities to broader ones and to foster the enterprising commercial spirit for which they became so widely known.

Improved transportation had dramatic effects, both on individual mobility and on the economy. By 1840, it was easier for people to move from one locale to another, but, even more remarkably, people now had easy access in their own cities and towns to commercial goods made in distant centers. Thus even for people who remained
in one place, horizons were much broader in 1840 than they had been forty years before. The difference lay in better roads, in improvements in water transport, and in the invention and speedy development of railroads (see Map 12-1).

**ROADS**

In 1800, travel by road was difficult for much of the year. Mud in the spring, dust in the summer, and snow in the winter all made travel by horseback or carriage uncomfortable, slow, and sometimes dangerous. Over the years, localities and states tried to improve local roads or contracted with private turnpike companies to build, maintain, and collect tolls on important stretches of road. In general, however, local roads remained poor. The federal government demonstrated its commitment to the improvement of interregional transportation by funding the National Road in 1808, at the time the greatest single federal transportation expense (its eventual cost was $7 million). Built of gravel on a stone foundation, it crossed the Appalachian Mountains at Cumberland, Maryland, thereby opening up the West. Built in stages—to Wheeling, Virginia (now West Virginia), by 1818, to Columbus, Ohio, by 1833, to Vandalia, Illinois, almost at the Mississippi River, by 1850—the National Road tied the East and the West together, strong evidence of the nation’s commitment to both expansion and cohesion, and helping to foster a national community.

**MAP 12-1**

*Travel Times, 1800 and 1857* The transportation revolution dramatically reduced travel times and vastly expanded everyone’s horizons. Improved roads, canals, and the introduction of steamboats and railroads made it easier for Americans to move, and made even those who did not move less isolated. Better transportation linked the developing West to the eastern seaboard and fostered a sense of national identity and pride.
Canals and Steamboats

However much they helped the movement of people, the National Road and other roads were unsatisfactory in a commercial sense. Shipments of bulky goods like grain were too slow and expensive by road. Waterborne transportation was much cheaper and still the major commercial link among the Atlantic seaboard states and in the Mississippi–Ohio River system. But before the 1820s, most water routes were north–south or coastal (Boston to Charleston, for example); east–west links were urgently needed. Canals turned out to be the answer.

The Erie Canal—the most famous canal of the era—was the brainchild of New York governor DeWitt Clinton, who envisioned a link between New York City and the Great Lakes through the Hudson River, and a 364-mile-long canal stretching from Albany to Buffalo. When Clinton proposed the canal in 1817, it was derisively called “Clinton’s Ditch”; the longest American canal, then in existence was only 27 miles long and had taken nine years to build. Nevertheless, Clinton convinced the New York legislature to approve a bond issue for the canal, and investors (New York and British merchants) subscribed to the tune of $7 million, an immense sum for the day.

Building the canal—40 feet wide, 4 feet deep, 364 miles long, with 83 locks and more than 300 bridges along the way—was a vast engineering and construction challenge. In the early stages, nearby farmers worked for $8 a month, but when malaria hit the workforce in the summer of 1819, many went home. They were replaced by 3,000 Irish contract laborers, who were much more expensive—50 cents a day plus room and board—but more reliable (if they survived). Local people regarded the Irish workers as different and frightening, but the importation of foreign contract labor for this job was a portent of the future. Much of the heavy construction work on later canals and railroads was performed by immigrant labor.

Clinton had promised, to general disbelief, that the Erie Canal would be completed in less than ten years, and he made good on his promise. The canal was the wonder of the age. On October 26, 1825, Clinton declared it open in Buffalo and sent the first boat, the Seneca Chief, on its way to New York at the incredible speed of four miles an hour. (Ironically, the Seneca Indians, for whom the boat was named, had been removed from the path of the canal and confined to a small reservation.) The Erie Canal provided easy passage to and from the interior, both for people and for goods. It drew settlers from the East and, increasingly, from overseas: by 1830, some 50,000 people a year were moving west on the canal to the rich farmland of Indiana, Illinois, and territory farther west. Earlier settlers now had a national, indeed an international, market for their produce. Moreover, farm families along the canal began purchasing household goods and cloth, formerly made at home. Indeed, one of the most dramatic illustrations of the canal’s impact was a rapid decline in the production of homespun cloth in the towns and counties along its route. In 1825, the year the Erie Canal opened, New York homesteads produced 16.5 million yards of textiles. By 1835, this figure had shrunk by almost half—8.8 million yards—and by 1855, it had dropped to less than 1 million.
Towns along the canal—Utica, Rochester, Buffalo—became instant cities, each an important commercial center in its own right. Perhaps the greatest beneficiary was New York City, which quickly established a commercial and financial supremacy no other American city could match. The Erie Canal decisively turned New York’s merchants away from Europe and toward America’s own heartland, building both interstate commerce and a feeling of community. As the famous song put it,

_You’ll always know your neighbor,_
_You’ll always know your pal,_
_If you’ve ever navigated_  
_On the Erie Canal._

The phenomenal success of the Erie Canal prompted other states to construct similar waterways to tap the rich interior market. Between 1820 and 1840, $200 million was invested in canal building. No other waterway achieved the success of the Erie, which collected $8.5 million in tolls in its first nine years. Nevertheless, the spurt of canal building ended the geographical isolation of much of the country.

An even more important improvement in water transportation, especially in the American interior, was the steamboat. Robert Fulton first demonstrated the commercial feasibility of steamboats in 1807, and they were soon operating in the East. Redesigned with more efficient engines and shallower, broader hulls, steamboats transformed commerce on the country’s great inland river system: the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and their tributaries. Steamboats were extremely dangerous, however; boiler explosions, fires, and sinkings were common, leading to one of the first public demands for regulation of private enterprise in 1838.

Dangerous as they were, steamboats greatly stimulated trade in the nation’s interior. There had long been downstream trade on flatboats along the Mississippi River system, but it was limited by the return trip overland on the arduous and dangerous Natchez Trace. For a time, steamboats actually increased the downriver flatboat trade, because boatmen could now make more round trips in the same amount of time, traveling home by steamboat in speed and comfort. The increased river- and canal-borne trade, like the New England shipping boom of a generation earlier, stimulated urban growth and all kinds of commerce. Cities such as Cincinnati, already notable for its rapid growth, experienced a new economic surge. A frontier outpost in 1790, Cincinnati was by the 1830s a center of steamboat manufacture and machine tool production as well as a central shipping point for food for the southern market.

**Railroads**

Remarkable as all these transportation changes were, the most remarkable was still to come. Railroads, new in 1830 (when the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad opened with 13 miles of track), grew to an astounding 31,000 miles by 1860. By that date, New England and the Old Northwest had laid a dense network of rails, and several lines had reached west beyond the Mississippi. The South, the least industrialized section of the nation, had fewer railroads. “Railroad mania” surpassed even canal mania, as investors—as many as one-quarter of them British—rushed to profit from the new invention.

Early railroads, like the steamboat, had to overcome many technological and supply problems. For example, locomotives, to generate adequate power, had to be heavy. Heavy locomotives, in turn, required iron rather than wooden rails. The resulting demand forced America’s iron industry to modernize (at first, railroad iron was imported from England). Heavy engines also required a solid gravel roadbed and strong wooden ties. Arranging steady supplies of both the labor to lay them was a construction challenge on a new scale. Finally, there were problems of standardization: because so many
early railroads were short and local, builders used any gauge (track width) that served their purposes. Thus gauges varied from place to place, forcing long-haul passengers and freight to change trains frequently. At one time, the trip from Philadelphia to Charleston involved eight gauge changes.

For some years after the introduction of the railroad, canal boats and coastal steamers carried more freight at lower cost. It was not until the 1850s that consolidation of local railroads into larger systems began in earnest. But already it was clear that this youngest transportation innovation would have far-reaching social consequences.

**The Effects of the Transportation Revolution**
The new ease of transportation fueled economic growth by making distant markets accessible. The startling successes of innovations such as canals and railroads attracted large capital investments, including significant amounts from foreign investors ($500 million between 1790 and 1861), which fueled further growth. In turn, the transportation revolution fostered an optimistic, risk-taking mentality in the United States that stimulated invention and innovation. More than anything, the transportation revolution allowed people to move with unaccustomed ease. Already a restless people compared with Europeans, Americans took advantage of new transportation to move even more often—and farther away—than they had before. Disease moved with them. Epidemics that once were localized in the nation’s seaports spread as travel expanded. In 1832 and 1849, cholera epidemics devastated New York City (see Chapter 13). Because of the Erie Canal and other westward travel routes, the effect of cholera was equally devastating in growing inland cities, among them St. Louis and Cincinnati, each of which lost 10 percent of their population. Cholera even stalked the Overland Trails, striking down eager gold seekers long before they reached California (see Chapter 14).

Every east–west road, canal, and railroad helped to reorient Americans away from the Atlantic and toward the heartland. This new focus was decisive in the creation of national pride and identity. Transportation improvements such as the Erie Canal and the National Road linked Americans in larger communities of interest, beyond the local communities in which they lived. And improved transportation made possible the larger market upon which commercialization and industrialization depended (see Map 12-2).
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Market revolution
The outcome of three interrelated developments: rapid improvements in transportation, commercialization, and industrialization.

WHAT CHANGES in preindustrial life and work were caused by the market revolution?

Map 12-2
The transportation revolution fostered a great burst of commercial activity and economic growth by making distant markets accessible. Transportation improvements accelerated the commercialization of agriculture by getting farmers’ products to wider, nonlocal markets. Access to wider markets also encouraged new textile and other manufacturers to increase their scale of production. The startling successes of innovations such as canals and railroads attracted large capital investments, including significant amounts from foreign investors, which fueled further growth. In turn, the transportation revolution fostered an optimistic, risk-taking mentality in the United States that stimulated invention and innovation.

HOW DID the transportation revolution of the mid-nineteenth century fuel the American economy?

The Market Revolution
The market revolution, the most fundamental change American communities ever experienced, was the outcome of three interrelated developments: the rapid improvements in transportation just described, commercialization, and industrialization. Commercialization involved the replacement of household self-sufficiency and barter with the production of goods for a cash market. And industrialization involved the use of power-driven machinery to produce goods once made by hand.

Map 12-2
Commercial Links: Rivers, Canals, Roads, 1830; and Rail Lines, 1850
By 1830, the United States was tied together by a network of roads, canals, and rivers. This transportation revolution fostered a great burst of commercial activity and economic growth. Transportation improvements accelerated the commercialization of agriculture by getting farmers’ products to wider, nonlocal markets. Access to wider markets also encouraged new textile and other manufacturers to increase their scale of production. By 1850, another revolutionary mode of transportation, the railroad, had emerged as a vital link to the transportation infrastructure.
THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

In the northern states, the business community was composed largely of merchants in the seaboard cities: Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Many had made substantial profits in the international shipping boom of the period from 1790 to 1807 (as discussed in Chapter 9). Such extraordinary opportunities attracted enterprising people. John Jacob Astor, who had arrived penniless from Germany in 1784, made his first fortune in the Pacific Northwest fur trade with China and eventually dominated the fur trade in the United States through his American Fur Company. Astor made a second fortune in New York real estate, and when he retired in 1834 with $25 million, he was reputed to be the wealthiest man in America. Many similar stories of success, though not as fabulous as Astor’s, demonstrated that risk-takers might reap rich rewards in international trade.

When the early years of the nineteenth century posed difficulties for international trade, some of the nation’s wealthiest men turned to local investments. In Providence, Rhode Island, Moses Brown and his son-in-law, William Almy, began to invest some of the profits the Brown family had reaped from a worldwide trade in iron, candles, rum, and African slaves in the new manufacture of cotton textiles. Cincinnati merchants banded together to finance the building of the first steamboats to operate on the Ohio River.

Much of the capital for the new investments came from banks, both those in seaport cities that had been established for the international trade and those, like the Lynn, Massachusetts, Mechanics Bank, founded in 1814 by a group of Lynn’s Quaker merchants, that served local clients. An astonishing amount of capital, however, was raised through family connections. In the late eighteenth century, members of the business communities in the seaboard cities had begun to consolidate their position and property by intermarriage. In Boston, such a strong community developed that when Francis Cabot Lowell needed $300,000 in 1813 to build the world’s first automated cotton mill in Waltham, Massachusetts (the prototype of the Lowell mills), he had only to turn to his family network (see Table 12.1).

Southern cotton provided the capital for continuing development. Because northerners built the nation’s ships, controlled the shipping trade, and provided the nation’s banking, insurance, and financial services, the astounding growth in southern cotton exports enriched northern merchants almost as much as southern planters. In 1825, for example, of the 204,000 bales of cotton shipped from New Orleans, about one-third (69,000) were transshipped through the northern ports of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. Southerners complained that their combined financial and shipping costs diverted forty cents of every dollar paid for their cotton to northerners. Profits from cotton shipping provided some of the funds the Boston Associates made available to Francis Cabot Lowell. In another example, New York merchant Anson Phelps invested the profits he made from cotton shipping in iron mines in Pennsylvania and metalworks in Connecticut. Although imperfectly understood at the time, the truth is that the development of northern industry was paid for by southern cotton produced by enslaved African American labor. The surprising wealth that cotton brought to southern planters fostered the market revolution.

Finally, the willingness of American merchants to “think big” and risk their

---

**Table 12.1** WEALTH IN BOSTON, 1687–1848

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of the Population</th>
<th>Percent of Wealth Held 1687</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1833</th>
<th>1848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 percent</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10 percent</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 80 percent</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table tracing the distribution of wealth in Boston reflects the gains made by merchants during the international shipping boom of 1790–1807 and the way in which intermarriage between wealthy families consolidated these gains.
money in the development of a large domestic market was caused in part by American nationalism. This confidence in a future that did not yet exist was not a sober economic calculation but an assertion of pride in the potential of this new and expanding nation.

The Putting-Out System

Initially, the American business community invested not in machinery and factories, but in the “putting-out system” of home manufacture, thereby expanding and transforming it. In this significant departure from preindustrial work, people still produced goods at home, but under the direction of a merchant, who “put out” the raw materials to them, paid them a certain sum per finished piece, and sold the completed item to a distant market. A crucial aspect of the new putting-out system was the division of labor. In the preindustrial system, an individual worker or his household made an entire item—a shoe, for example. Now an unskilled worker often made only a part of the finished product in large quantities for low per-piece wages.

A look at the shoe industry in Lynn, Massachusetts, shows how the putting-out system transformed American manufacturing. Long a major center of the shoe industry, Lynn, in 1800, produced 400,000 pairs of shoes—enough for every fifth person in the country. The town’s 200 master artisans and their families, including journeymen and apprentices, worked together in hundreds of small home workshops called “ten-footers” (from their size, about ten feet square). The artisans and journeymen cut the leather, the artisans’ wives and daughters did the binding of the upper parts of the shoe, the men stitched the shoe together, and children and apprentices helped where needed. In the early days, the artisan commonly bartered his shoes for needed products. Sometimes an artisan sold his shoes to a larger retailer in Boston or Salem. Although production of shoes in Lynn increased yearly from 1780 to 1810 as markets widened, shoes continued to be manufactured in traditional artisanal ways.

The investment of merchant capital in the shoe business changed everything. In Lynn, a small group of Quaker shopkeepers and merchants, connected by family, religious, and business ties, took the lead in reorganizing the trade. Financed by the bank they founded in 1814, Lynn capitalists like Micajah Pratt built large, two-story central workshops to replace the scattered ten-footers. Pratt employed a few skilled craftsmen to cut leather for shoes, but he put out the rest of the shoemaking to less-skilled workers who were no longer connected by family ties. Individual farm women and children sewed the uppers, which, when completed, were soled by farm men and boys. Putting-out workers were paid on a piecework basis; the men and boys earned more than the women and children but much less than a master craftsman or a journeyman. This arrangement allowed the capitalist to employ much more labor for the same investment than the traditional artisan workshop. Shoe production increased enormously: the largest central shop in 1832 turned out ten times more shoes than the largest shopkeeper had sold in 1789. Gradually the putting-out system and central workshops replaced artisans’ shops. Some artisans became wealthy owners of workshops, but most became wage earners, and the apprenticeship system eventually disappeared.

The putting-out system moved the control of production from the individual artisan households to the merchant capitalists, who could now control labor costs, production goals, and shoe styles to fit certain markets. For example, the Lynn trade quickly monopolized the market for cheap boots for southern slaves and western farmers, leaving workshops in other cities to produce shoes for wealthier customers. This specialization of the national market—indeed, even thinking in terms of a national market—was new. Additionally, and most important from the capitalist’s
point of view, the owner of the business controlled the workers and could cut back or expand the labor force as economic and marketplace conditions warranted. The unaccustomed severity of economic slumps like the Panics of 1819 and 1837 made this flexibility especially desirable.

While the central workshop system prevailed in Lynn and in urban centers like New York City, the putting-out system also fostered a more dispersed form of home production. By 1810, there were an estimated 2,500 so-called outwork weavers in New England, operating handlooms in their own homes. Other crafts that rapidly became organized according to the putting-out system were flax and wool spinning, straw braiding, glove making, and the knitting of stockings. For example, the palm-leaf hat industry that supplied farm laborers and slaves in the South and West relied completely on women and children, who braided the straw for the hats at home part-time. Absorbed into families’ overall domestic routines, the outwork activity seemed small, but the size of the industry itself was surprising: in 1837, 33,000 Massachusetts women braided palm-leaf hats, whereas only 20,000 worked in the state’s cotton textile mills. They were producing for a large national market, made possible by the dramatic improvements in transportation that occurred between 1820 and 1840.

**THE SPREAD OF COMMERCIAL MARKETS**

Although the putting-out system meant a loss of independence for artisans such as those in Lynn, Massachusetts, New England farm families liked it. From their point of view, the work could easily be combined with domestic work, and the pay was a new source of income that they could use to purchase mass-produced goods rather than spend the time required to make those things themselves. It was in this way that farm families moved away from the local barter system and into a larger market economy.

Cyrus McCormick is shown demonstrating his reaper to skeptical farmers. When they saw that the machine cut four times as much wheat a day as a hand-held scythe, farmers flocked to buy McCormick’s invention. Agricultural practices, little changed for centuries, were revolutionized by machines such as this.

Commercialization, or the replacement of barter by a cash economy, did not happen immediately or uniformly throughout the nation. Fixed prices for goods produced by the new principles of specialization and division of labor first appeared along established trade routes. Rural areas in established sections of the country that were remote from trade routes continued in the old ways. Strikingly, however, western farming frontiers were commercial from the very start. The existence of a cash market was an important spur to westward expansion.

**Commercial Agriculture in the Old Northwest**

Every advance in transportation—better roads, canals, steamboats, railroads—made it easier for farmers to get their produce to market. Improvements in agricultural machinery increased the amount of acreage a farmer could cultivate. These two developments, added to the availability of rich, inexpensive land in the heartland, moved American farmers permanently away from subsistence agriculture and into production for sale.

The impact of the transportation revolution on the Old Northwest was particularly marked. Settlement of the region, ongoing since the 1790s, accelerated. In the 1830s, after the opening of the Erie Canal, migrants from New England streamed into northern Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, southern Wisconsin, and Michigan and began to reach into Iowa.

Government policy strongly encouraged western settlement. The easy terms of federal land sales were an important inducement: terms eased from an initial rate of $2.00 per acre for a minimum of 320 acres in 1800, to $1.25 an acre for 80 acres in 1820. Still, this was too much for most settlers to pay all at once. Some people simply squatted, taking their chances that they could make enough money to buy the land before someone else bought it. Less daring settlers relied on credit, which was extended by banks, storekeepers, speculators, promoters, and, somewhat later, railroads, which received large grants of federal lands.

The very need for cash to purchase land involved western settlers in commercial agriculture from the beginning. Farmers, and the towns and cities that grew to supply them, needed access to markets for their crops. Canals, steamboats, and railroads ensured that access, immediately tying the individual farm into national and international commercial networks. The long period of subsistence farming that had characterized colonial New England and the early Ohio Valley frontier was superseded by commercial agriculture stimulated by the transportation revolution.

Commercial agriculture in turn encouraged regional specialization. Ohioans shipped corn and hogs first by flatboat and later by steamboat to New Orleans. Cincinnati, the center of the Ohio trade, earned the nickname “Porkopolis” because of the importance of its slaughterhouses. By 1840, the national center of wheat production had moved west of the Appalachians to Ohio. Wheat flowed from the upper Midwest along the Erie Canal to eastern cities and increasingly to Europe. Because in each new western area wheat yields were higher than in earlier ones, farmers in older regions were forced to shift away from wheat to other crops. The constant opening of new farmland encouraged mobility and wasteful soil practices. Many farmers did not wish to make a permanent commitment to their land, but rather counted on rising land prices and short-term crop profits to improve their financial situation. Prepared to move on when the price was right, they regarded their farmland not as a permanent investment but as a speculation.

At the same time, farmers who grew wheat or any other cash crop found themselves at the mercy of far-off markets, which established crop prices; distant canal or railroad companies, which set transportation rates; and the state of the national economy,
which determined the availability of local credit. This direct dependence on economic forces outside the control of the local community was something new. So, too, was the dependence on technology, embodied in expensive new machines that farmers often bought on credit.

New tools made western farmers unusually productive. John Deere’s steel plow (invented in 1837) cut plowing time in half, making cultivation of larger acreages possible. Seed drills were another important advance. But the most remarkable innovation was Cyrus McCormick’s reaper, patented in 1834. Earlier, harvesting had depended on manpower alone. A man could cut two or three acres of wheat a day with a cradle scythe, but with the horse-drawn reaper he could cut twelve acres. Impressed by these figures, western farmers rushed to buy the new machines, confident that increased production would rapidly pay for them. In most years, their confidence was justified. But in bad years, farmers found that their new levels of debt could mean failure and foreclosure. They were richer, but more economically vulnerable than they had been before.

**British Technology and American Industrialization**

Important as were the transportation revolution and the commercialization made possible by the putting-out system, the third component of the market revolution, industrialization, brought the greatest changes to personal lives. Begun in Britain in the eighteenth century, industrialization was the result of a series of technological changes in the textile trade. In marked contrast to the putting-out system, in which capitalists had dispersed work into many individual households, industrialization required workers to concentrate in factories and pace themselves to the rhythms of power-driven machinery.

The simplest and quickest way for America to industrialize was to copy the British, but the British, well aware of the value of their machinery, enacted laws forbidding its export and even the emigration of skilled workers. Over the years, however, Americans managed to lure a number of British artisans to the United States.

In 1789, Samuel Slater, who had just finished an apprenticeship in the most up-to-date cotton spinning factory in England, disguised himself as a farm laborer and slipped out of England without even telling his mother good-bye. In Providence, Rhode Island, he met Moses Brown and William Almy, who had been trying without success to duplicate British industrial technology. Having carefully committed the designs to memory before leaving England, Slater promptly built copies of the latest British machinery for Brown and Almy. Slater’s mill, as it became known, began operation in 1790. It was the most advanced cotton mill in America.

Following British practice, Slater drew his workforce primarily from among young children (ages seven to twelve) and women, whom he paid much less than the handful of skilled male workers he hired to keep the machines working. The yarn spun at Slater’s mill was then put out to local home weavers, who turned it into cloth on handlooms. As a result, home weaving flourished in areas near the mill, giving families a new opportunity to make money at a task with which they were already familiar.

Many other merchants and mechanics followed Slater’s lead, and the rivers of New England were soon dotted with mills wherever water-power could be tapped. Embargo and war sheltered American factories from British competition from 1807 to 1815, but when the War of 1812 ended, the British cut prices ruthlessly in an effort to drive the newcomers
out of business. In 1816, Congress passed the first tariff, aimed largely against British cotton textiles, in response to the clamor by New England manufacturers for protection for their young industry.

**The Lowell Mills**

Another way to deal with British competition was to beat the British at their own game. With the intention of designing better machinery, a young Bostonian, Francis Cabot Lowell, made an apparently casual tour of British textile mills in 1810. Lowell, the founder of the Lowell mills described in the opening of this chapter, made a good impression on his English hosts, who were pleased by his interest and his intelligent questions. They did not know that each night, in his hotel room, Lowell made sketches from memory of the machines he had inspected during the day.

Lowell was more than an industrial spy, however. When he returned to the United States, he went to work with a Boston mechanic, Paul Moody, to improve on the British models. Lowell and Moody not only made the machinery for spinning cotton more efficient, but they also invented a power loom. This was a great advance, for now all aspects of textile manufacture, from the initial cleaning and carding (combing) to the production of finished lengths of cloth, could be gathered together in the same factory. Such a mill required a much larger capital investment than a small spinning mill such as Slater’s, but Lowell’s family network gave him access to the needed funds. In 1814, he opened the world’s first integrated cotton mill in Waltham, near Boston. It was a great success: in 1815, the Boston Associates (Lowell’s partners) made profits of 25 percent, and their efficiency allowed them to survive the intense British competition following the War of 1812 (see Chapter 9). Many smaller New England mills did not survive. The lesson was clear: size mattered.

The Boston Associates took the lesson to heart, and when they moved their enterprise to a new location in 1823, they thought big. They built an entire town at the junction of the Concord and Merrimack Rivers where the village of East Chelmsford stood, renaming it Lowell in memory of Francis, who had died, still a young man, in 1817. As the opening of this chapter describes, the new industrial community boasted six mills and company housing for all the workers. In 1826, the town had 2,500 inhabitants; ten years later the population was 17,000 (see Map 12-3).

**Family Mills**

Lowell was unique. No other textile mill was ever such a showplace. None was as large, integrated so many tasks, or relied on such a homogeneous workforce. Its location in a new town was also unusual. Much more common in the early days of industrialization were small rural spinning mills, on the model of Slater’s first mill, built on swiftly running streams near existing farm communities. Because the owners of smaller mills often hired entire families, their operations came to be called family mills.

The employment pattern at these mills followed that established by Slater at his first mill in 1790. Children aged eight to twelve, whose customary job was “doffing” (changing) bobbins on the spinning machines, made up 50 percent of the workforce. Women and men each made up about 25 percent of the workforce, but men had the most skilled and best-paid jobs.
Relations between these small rural mill communities and the surrounding farming communities were often difficult, as the history of the towns of Dudley and Oxford, Massachusetts, shows. Samuel Slater, now a millionaire, built three small mill communities near these towns in the early years of the nineteenth century. Each consisted of a small factory, a store, and cottages and a boardinghouse for workers. Most of Slater’s workers came from outside the Dudley-Oxford area. They were a mixed group—single young farm women of the kind Lowell attracted, the poor and destitute, and workers from other factories looking for better conditions. They rarely stayed long: almost 50 percent of the workforce left every year.
Slater’s mills provided a substantial amount of work for local people, putting out to them both the initial cleaning of the raw cotton and the much more lucrative weaving of the spun yarn. But in spite of this economic link, relations between Slater and his workers on one side and the farmers and shopkeepers of the Dudley and Oxford communities on the other were stormy. They disagreed over the building of mill dams (essential for the mill power supply, these dams sometimes flooded local fields), over taxes, over the upkeep of local roads, and over schools. The debates were so constant and so heated that in 1831, Slater petitioned the Massachusetts General Court to create a separate town, Webster, that would encompass his three mill communities. For their part, the residents of Dudley and Oxford became increasingly hostile to Slater’s authoritarian control, which they regarded as undemocratic. Their dislike carried over to the workers as well. Disdaining the mill workers for their poverty and transiency, people in the rural communities began referring to them as “operatives,” making them somehow different in their work roles from themselves. Industrial work thus led to new social distinctions. Even though the people of Dudley and Oxford benefited from the mills, they did not fully accept the social organization on which their new prosperity rested, nor did they feel a sense of community with those who did the work that led to their increased well-being.

“The American System of Manufactures”

Not all American industrial technology was copied from British inventions, for there were many home-grown inventors. Indeed, calling Americans “mechanic[s] by nature,” one Frenchman observed that “in Massachusetts and Connecticut there is not a labourer who had not invented a machine or tool.” By the 1840s, to take but one example, small towns like St. Johnsbury, Vermont, boasted many small industries based on local inventions, such as those by Erastus Fairbanks in scales and plows, Lemuel Hubbard in pumps, and Nicanor Kendall in guns. But perhaps most important was the pioneering American role in the development of standardized parts.

The concept of interchangeable parts, first realized in gun manufacturing, was so unusual that the British soon dubbed it the American system. In this system, a product such as a gun was broken down into its component parts and an exact mold was made for each. All pieces made from the same mold (after being hand filed by inexpensive unskilled laborers) matched a uniform standard. As a result, repairing a gun that malfunctioned required only installing a replacement for the defective part rather than laboriously making a new part or perhaps an entirely new gun.

In 1798, Eli Whitney contracted with the government to make 10,000 rifles in twenty-eight months, an incredibly short period had he been planning to produce each rifle by hand in the traditional way. Whitney’s ideas far outran his performance. It took him ten years to fulfill his contract, and even then he had not managed to perfect the production of all the rifle parts. Two other New Englanders, Simeon
North and John Hall, created milling machines that could grind parts to the required specifications and brought the concept to fruition. North in 1816 and Hall in 1824. When the system of interchangeable machine-made parts was adopted by the national armory in Springfield, Massachusetts, the Springfield rifle got its name.

America’s early lead in interchangeable parts was a substantial source of national pride. As American gunmaker Samuel Colt boasted, “There is nothing that cannot be made by machine.” Standardized production quickly revolutionized the manufacture of items as simple as nails and as complicated as clocks. By 1810, a machine had been developed that could produce 100 nails a minute, cutting the cost of nail making by two-thirds. Finely made wooden and brass clocks, previously made (expensively) by hand, were replaced by mass-produced versions turned out in the Connecticut factories of Eli Terry, Seth Thomas, and Chauncey Jerome and sold nationwide by Yankee peddlers. Now ordinary people could keep precise time rather than estimate time by the sun, and factories could require workers to come to work on time. The need of railroads for precise timekeeping gave further support to the new system of manufacture.

Like the factory system itself, the American system spread slowly. For example, Isaac Singer’s sewing machine, first patented in 1851, was not made with fully interchangeable parts until 1873, when the company was already selling 230,000 machines a year. The sewing machine revolutionized the manufacture of clothing, which up to this time had been made by women for their families at home and by hand.

American businesses mass-produced high-quality goods for ordinary people earlier than manufacturers in Britain or any other European country were able to do. The availability of these goods was a practical demonstration of American beliefs in democracy and equality. As historian David Potter has perceptively remarked: “European radical thought is prone to demand that the man of property be stripped of his carriage and his fine clothes. But American radical thought is likely to insist, instead, that the ordinary man is entitled to mass-produced copies, indistinguishable from the originals.”

**From Artisan to Worker**

The changes wrought by the market revolution had major and lasting effects on ordinary Americans. The proportion of wage laborers in the nation’s labor force rose from 12 percent in 1800 to 40 percent by 1860. Most of these workers were employed in the North, and almost half were women, performing outwork in their homes. The young farm woman who worked at Lowell for a year or two, then returned home; the master craftsman in Lynn who expanded his shop with the aid of merchant capital; the home weaver who prospered on outwork from Slater’s mill—all were participating, often unknowingly, in fundamental personal and social changes.

**Personal Relationships**

The immense increase in productivity made possible by the principles of division of labor and specialization effectively destroyed artisan production and the apprenticeship system. For example, in New York by the mid-1820s, tailors and shoemakers...
were teaching apprentices only a few simple operations, in effect using them as
delpers. Printers undercut the system by hiring partly trained apprentices as jour-
neymen. In almost every trade, apprentices no longer lived with the master’s family,
and their parents received cash payment for the child’s work. Thus, in effect, the
apprenticeship system was replaced by child labor.

Although the breakdown of the family work system undoubtedly harmed
independent urban artisans, it may have had a liberating effect on the women
and children of farm families. About a third of the Lowell women workers did
not return to their farm homes, instead remaining in town and marrying urban
men or continuing to work. And of the women who did return home, fewer than
half married farmers. There is no doubt that working at Lowell provided these
women with new options. Women and children who earned wages by doing out-
work at home may have found their voices strengthened by this evidence of their
power and worth. Patriarchal control over family members was no longer absolute
(see Figure 12-1).

The breakdown of the patriarchal relationship between the master craftsman
and his workers became an issue in the growing political battle between the North
and the South over slavery. Southern defenders of slavery compared their cradle-
to-grave responsibility to their slaves with northern employers’ “heartless” treat-
ment of their “wage slaves.” Certainly the new northern employer
assumed less responsibility for individual workers than had the tradi-
tional artisan. Although the earliest textile manufacturers, like those
at Lowell, provided housing for their workers, workers soon became
responsible for their own food and housing. Moreover, northern
employers felt no obligation to help or care for old or disabled work-
ers. Southerners were right: this was a heartless system. But northerners
were also right: industrialization was certainly freer than the slave sys-
tem, freer even than the hierarchical craft system, although it sometimes
offered only the freedom to starve.

**Mechanization and Women’s Work**

Industrialization posed a major threat to the status and independence
of skilled male workers. In trade after trade, mechanization meant that
most tasks could be performed by unskilled labor. For example, the tex-
tile mills at Lowell and elsewhere hired a mere handful of skilled mechan-
cics; most of the rest of the workers were unskilled and lower paid. In
fact, the work in the textile mills was so simple that children came to
form a large part of the workforce. By 1850, in New York City, many former
skilled trades, including shoemaking, weaving, silversmithing, pot-
tery making, and cabinetmaking, were filled with unskilled, low-paid
workers who did one specialized operation or tended machinery. Many
former artisans were reduced to performing wage labor for others.
Because women were so frequently hired in the putting-out system, male
workers began to oppose female participation in the workforce, fearing
that it would lower their own wages.

Mechanization changed the nature of women’s work as well. The
industrialization of textiles—first in spinning, then in weaving—
relieved women of a time-consuming home occupation. To supple-
ment family income, women now had the choice of following textile
work into the factory or finding other kinds of home work. At first,
these were attractive options, but negative aspects soon developed, especially in the nation’s cities.

The 1820s saw the birth of the garment industry. In New York City, employers began hiring women to sew ready-made clothing, at first rough, unfitted clothing for sailors and southern slaves, but later overalls and shirts for westerners, and finer items, such as men’s shirts. Most women performed this work at low piecework rates in their homes. Although by 1860, Brooks Brothers, the famous men’s clothing firm, had 70 “inside” workers in a model central workshop, the firm relied primarily on putting out sewing to 3,000 women who worked at home.

Soon the low pay and seasonal nature of the industry became notorious. Overcrowding of the market—all women could sew—led to low wages. Women were pushed into the garment trade because they were barred from many occupations considered inappropriate for them, and the oversupply of workers led to wage cutting. To make matters worse, most people believed that “respectable” women did not do factory work (Lowell in its “model” years was the exception that proved the rule), and this disparagement fostered low pay and poor working conditions.

Manufacturers in the garment trade made their profits not from efficient production but by obtaining intensive labor for very low wages. The lower the piece rate, the more each woman, sewing at home, had to produce to earn enough to live. The invention of the sewing machine only made matters worse. Manufacturers dropped their piecework rates still lower, and some women found themselves working fifteen to eighteen hours a day, producing more than ever but earning the same pay.
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Time, Work, and Leisure

Preindustrial work had a flexibility that factory work did not, and it took factory workers a while to get accustomed to the constant pace of work. Long hours did not bother them because they were accustomed to twelve-hour workdays and six-day weeks on the farm and in the shop. But in the early days of Slater’s mill in Rhode Island, workers sometimes took a few hours off to go berry picking or to attend to other business. And when Slater insisted on a twelve-hour day that required candles for night work, one upset father demanded that his children be sent home at sunset, the traditional end of the workday.

Factory workers gradually adjusted to having their lives regulated by the sound of the factory bell, but they did not necessarily become the docile “hands” the owners wanted. Absenteeism was common, accounting for about 15 percent of working hours, and there was much pilfering. Workers were beginning to think of themselves as a separate community whose interests differed from those of owners, and the tyranny of time over their work was certainly one reason for this.

Another adjustment required by the constant pace was that time now had to be divided into two separate activities—work and leisure. In preindustrial times, work and leisure were blended for farmers and artisans. The place of work—often the home—and the pace made it possible to stop and have a chat or a friendly drink with a visitor. Now, however, the separation of home and workplace and the pace of production not only squeezed the fun out of the long workday but left a smaller proportion of time for leisure activities.

For many workingmen, the favored spot for after-hours and Sunday leisure became the local tavern. Community-wide celebrations and casual sociability, still common in rural areas, began to be replaced in cities by spectator sports—horse racing, boxing, and (beginning in the 1850s) baseball—and by popular entertainments, such as plays, operas, minstrel shows, concerts, and circuses. Some of these diversions, such as plays and horse racing, appealed to all social classes, but others, like parades, rowdy dance halls, and tavern games like quoits and ninepins were favored working-class amusements. The effect of these changes was to make working-class amusements more distinct, and visible, than they had been before.

The Cash Economy

Another effect of the market revolution was the transformation of a largely barter system into a cash economy. For example, a farm woman might pay in butter and eggs for a pair of shoes handmade for her by the local shoemaker. A few years later that same woman, now part of the vast New England outwork industry, might buy ready-made footwear with the cash she had earned from braiding straw for hats. Community economic ties were replaced by distant, sometimes national ones.

The pay envelope became the only direct contact between factory worker and (often absentee) owner. For workers, this change was both unsettling and liberating. On the minus side, workers were no longer part of a settled, orderly, and familiar community. On the plus side, they were now free to labor wherever they could, at whatever wages their skills or their bargaining power could command. That workers took their freedom seriously is evidenced by the very high rate of turnover—50 percent a year—in the New England textile mills.

But if moving on was a sign of increased freedom of opportunity for some workers, for others it was an unwanted consequence of the market revolution. In New
England, for example, many prosperous artisans and farmers faced disruptive competition from factory goods and western commercial agriculture. They could remain where they were only if they were willing to become factory workers or commercial farmers. Often the more conservative choice was to move west and try to reestablish one’s traditional lifestyle on the frontier.

**Free Labor**

At the heart of the industrializing economy was the notion of free labor. Originally, “free” referred to individual economic choice—that is, to the right of workers to move to another job rather than be held to a position by customary obligation or the formal contract of apprenticeship or journeyman labor. But “free labor” soon came to encompass the range of attitudes—hard work, self-discipline, and a striving for economic independence—that were necessary for success in a competitive, industrializing economy. These were profoundly individualistic attitudes, and owners cited them in opposing labor unions and the use of strikes to achieve wage goals (see Chapter 13).

For their part, many workers were inclined to define freedom more collectively, arguing that their just grievances as free American citizens were not being heard. As a group of New Hampshire female workers rhetorically asked, “Why [is] there . . . so much want, dependence and misery among us, if forsooth, we are freemen and freewomen?” Or, as the Lowell strikers of 1836 sang as they paraded through the streets:

**Oh! Isn’t it a pity, such a pretty girl as I,**  
**Should be sent to the factory to pine away and die?**  
**Oh! I cannot be a slave,**  
**I will not be a slave,**  
**For I’m so fond of liberty**  
**That I cannot be a slave.**

**Early Strikes**

Rural women workers led some of the first strikes in American labor history. In 1824, in one of the first of these actions, women workers at a Pawtucket, Rhode Island, textile mill led their co-workers, female and male, out on strike to protest wage cuts and longer hours.

More famous were the strikes led by the women at the model mill at Lowell. The first serious trouble came in 1834, when 800 women participated in a spontaneous turnout to protest a wage cut of 25 percent. The owners were shocked and outraged by the strike, considering it both unfeminine and ungrateful. The workers, however, were bound together by a sense of sisterhood and were protesting not just the attack on their economic independence, but the blow to their position as “daughters of freemen still.” Nevertheless, the wage cuts were enforced, as were more cuts in 1836, again in the face of a turnout. Many women simply packed their clothes in disgust and returned home to the family farm.

Like these strikes, most turnouts by factory workers in the 1830s—male or female—were unsuccessful. Owners, claiming that increasing competition made wage cuts inevitable, were always able to find new workers—Irish immigrants or, after the failed 1837 revolt, French-Canadians for example—who would work at lower wages. The preindustrial notion of a community of interest between owner and workers had broken down and workers, both female and male, began to band together to act on their own behalf.
A New Social Order

The market revolution reached into every aspect of life, down to the most personal family decisions. It also fundamentally changed the social order, creating a new middle class with distinctive habits and beliefs.

Wealth and Class

There had always been social classes in America. Since the early colonial period, planters in the South and merchants in the North had comprised a wealthy elite. Somewhere below the elite but above the mass of people were the “middling sort”: a small professional group that included lawyers, ministers, schoolteachers, doctors, public officials, some prosperous farmers, prosperous urban shopkeepers and innkeepers, and a few wealthy artisans such as Boston silversmith Paul Revere. “Mechanics and farmers”—artisans and yeoman farmers—made up another large group, and the laboring poor, consisting of ordinary laborers, servants, and marginal farmers were below them. At the very bottom were the paupers—those dependent on public charity—and the enslaved. This was the “natural” social order that fixed most people in the social rank to which they were born. Although many a male servant in early America aspired to become a small farmer or artisan, he did not usually aspire to become a member of the wealthy elite, nor did serving maids often marry rich men.

The market revolution ended this stable and hierarchical social order, creating the dynamic and unstable one we recognize today: upper, middle, and working classes, whose members all share the hope of climbing as far up the social ladder as they can. This social mobility was new. In the early nineteenth century, the upper class remained about the same in size and composition. In the seacoast cities, as the example of Francis Cabot Lowell showed, the elite was a small, intermarried group, so distinctive in its superior cultural style that in Boston its members were nicknamed “Brahmins” (after the highest caste in India). The expanding opportunities of the market revolution enriched this already rich class: by the 1840s, the top 1 percent of the population owned about 40 percent of the nation’s wealth. At the other extreme, one-third of the population possessed little more than the clothes they wore and some loose change (see Table 12.2).

The major transformation came in the lives of the “middling sort.” The market revolution downgraded many independent artisans but elevated others, like Duncan Phyfe and Stephen Allen of New York. Other formerly independent artisans or farmers (or more frequently, their children) joined the rapidly growing ranks of managers and white-collar workers such as accountants, bank tellers, clerks, bookkeepers, and insurance agents. Occupational opportunities shifted dramatically in just one generation. In Utica, New York, for example, 16 percent of the city’s young men held white-collar jobs in 1855, compared with only 6 percent of their fathers. At the same time, 15 percent fewer younger men filled artisanal occupations than older men.

These new white-collar workers owed not only their jobs but their lifestyles to the new structure and organization of industry. The new economic order demanded certain habits and attitudes of workers: sobriety, responsibility, steadiness, and hard work. Inevitably, employers found themselves not only enforcing these new standards but adopting them themselves.

Religion and Personal Life

Religion, which had undergone dramatic changes since the 1790s, played a key role in the emergence of the new attitudes. The Second
Great Awakening had supplanted the orderly and intellectual Puritan religion of early New England. The new evangelistic religious spirit, which stressed the achievement of salvation through personal faith, was more democratic and more enthusiastic than the earlier faith. The concept of original sin, the cornerstone of Puritan belief, was replaced by the optimistic belief that a willingness to be saved was enough to ensure salvation. Conversion and repentance were now community experiences, often taking place in huge revival meetings in which an entire congregation focused on the sinners about to be saved. The converted bore a heavy personal responsibility to demonstrate their faith in their own daily lives through morally respectable behavior. In this way, the new religious feeling fostered individualism and self-discipline.

The Second Great Awakening had its greatest initial success on the western frontier in the 1790s, but by the 1820s, evangelical religion was reaching a new audience: the people whose lives were being changed by the market revolution and who needed help in adjusting to the demands made by the new economic conditions. In 1825, in Utica, New York, and other towns along the recently opened Erie Canal, evangelist Charles G. Finney began a series of dramatic revival meetings. His spell-binding message reached both rich and poor, converting members of all classes to the new evangelistic religion. In 1830, made famous by these gatherings, Finney was invited by businessmen to preach in Rochester. Finney preached every day for six months—three times on Sundays—and his wife, Lydia, made home visits to the unconverted and mobilized the women of Rochester for the cause. Under the Finneys' guidance and example, prayer meetings were held in schools and businesses, and impromptu religious services were held in people's homes.

Middle-class women in particular carried Finney's message by prayer and pleading to the men of their families, who found that evangelism's stress on self-discipline and individual achievement helped them adjust to new business conditions. The enthusiasm and optimism of evangelism aided what was often a profound personal transformation in the face of the market's stringent new demands. Moreover, it gave businessmen a basis for demanding the same behavior from their workers. Businessmen now argued that traditional paternalism had no role in the new business world. Because achievement depended on individual character, each worker was responsible for making his own way.

**The New Middle-Class Family**

The economic changes of the market revolution reshaped family roles, first in the middle class and eventually throughout the entire society. As men increasingly concentrated their energies on their careers and occupations, women assumed new major responsibilities for rearing the children and inculcating in them the new attitudes necessary for success in the business world. The division of labor that occurred in industry was reflected in the middle-class home: father the breadwinner, mother the nurturer, working together in partnership to raise successful middle-class children.

When the master craftsman became a small manufacturer, or the small subsistence farmer began to manage a large-scale commercial operation, production moved away from both the family home and its members. Husbands and fathers became managers of paid workers—or workers themselves—and although they were still considered the heads of their households, they spent most of the day away from their homes and families. The husband was no longer the undisputed head of a family unit that combined work and personal life. Their wives, on the other hand, remained at home, where they were still responsible for cooking, cleaning, and other domestic tasks but no longer contributed directly to what had previously been the family enterprise. Instead, women took on a new responsibility,
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that of providing a quiet, well-ordered, and relaxing refuge from the pressures of the industrial world.

Catharine Beecher’s *Treatise on Domestic Economy*, first published in 1841, became the standard housekeeping guide for a generation of middle-class American women. In it, Beecher combined innovative ideas for household design (especially in the kitchen, where she introduced principles of organization) with medical information, child-rearing advice, recipes, and numerous discussions of the mother’s moral role in the family. The book clearly filled a need: for many pioneer women, it was the only book besides the Bible that they carried west with them.

As the work roles of middle-class men and women diverged, so did social attitudes about appropriate male and female characteristics and behavior. Men were expected to be steady, industrious, responsible, and painstakingly attentive to their business. They had little choice: in the competitive, uncertain, and rapidly changing business conditions of the early nineteenth century, these qualities were essential for men who hoped to hold their existing positions or to get ahead. In contrast, women were expected to be nurturing, gentle, kind, moral, and selflessly devoted to their families. They were expected to operate within the “woman’s sphere”—the home.

The maintenance or achievement of a middle-class lifestyle required the joint efforts of husband and wife. More cooperation between them was called for than in the preindustrial, patriarchal family. The nature of the new, companionate marriage that evolved in response to the market revolution was reflected most clearly in decisions concerning children.

**Family Limitation**

Middle-class couples chose to have fewer children than their predecessors. Children who were being raised to succeed in the middle class placed considerable demands on family resources: they required more care, training, and education than children who could be put to work at traditional tasks at an early age. The dramatic fall in the birthrate during the nineteenth century (from an average of seven children per woman in 1800 to five in 1860) is evidence of conscious decisions about family limitation, first by members of the new middle class and later by working-class families. Few couples used mechanical methods of contraception such as the condom, partly because these were difficult to obtain and partly because most people associated their use with prostitution and the prevention of venereal disease rather than with family planning. Instead, people used birth control methods that relied on mutual consent: coitus interruptus (withdrawal before climax), the rhythm method (intercourse only during the woman’s infertile period), and, most often, abstinence or infrequent intercourse.

When mutual efforts at birth control failed, married women often sought a surgical abortion, a new technique that was much more reliable than the folk remedies women had always shared among themselves. Surgical abortions were widely advertised after 1830, and widely used, especially
by middle-class married women seeking to limit family size. Some historians estimate that one out of every four pregnancies was aborted in the years between 1840 and 1860 (compared to one in six in 2000). The rising rate of abortion by married women (in other words, its use as birth control) prompted the first legal bans; by 1860, twenty states had outlawed the practice.

Accompanying the interest in family limitation was a redefinition of sexuality. Doctors generally recommended that sexual urges be controlled, but they believed that men would have much more difficulty exercising such control than women, partly because they also believed that women were uninterested in sex. (Women who were visibly interested ran the risk of being considered immoral or “fallen,” and thereupon shunned by the middle class.) Medical manuals of the period suggested that it was the task of middle-class women to help their husbands and sons restrain their sexuality by appealing to their higher, moral natures. Although it is always difficult to measure the extent to which the suggestions in advice books were applied in actual practice, it seems that many middle-class women accepted this new and limited definition of their sexuality because of their desire to limit the number of their pregnancies.

Many women of the late eighteenth century wanted to be free of the medical risks and physical debility that too-frequent childbearing brought, but they had little chance of achieving that goal until men became equally interested in family limitation. The rapid change in attitudes toward family size that occurred in the early nineteenth century has been repeated around the world as other societies undergo the dramatic experience of industrialization. It is a striking example of the ways economic changes affect our most private and personal decisions.

**MIDDLE-CLASS CHILDREN**

Child rearing had been shared in the preindustrial household, boys learning farming or craft skills from their fathers while girls learned domestic skills from their mothers. The children of the new middle class, however, needed a new kind of upbringing, one that involved a long period of nurturing in the beliefs and personal habits necessary for success. Mothers assumed primary responsibility for this training, in part because fathers were too busy but also because people believed that women’s superior qualities of gentleness, morality, and loving watchfulness were essential to the task.

Fathers retained a strong role in major decisions concerning children, but mothers commonly turned to other women for advice on daily matters. Through their churches, women formed maternal associations for help in raising their children to be religious and responsible. In Utica, New York, for example, these extremely popular organizations enabled women to form strong networks sustained by mutual advice and by publications such as *Mother’s Magazine*, issued by the Presbyterian Church, and *Mother’s Monthly Journal*, put out by the Baptists.

Middle-class status required another sharp break with tradition. As late as 1855, artisanal families expected all children over fifteen to work. Middle-class families, in contrast, sacrificed to keep their sons in school or in training for their chosen professions, and they often housed and fed their sons until the young men had “established” themselves financially and could marry. Mothers took the lead in an important informal activity: making sure their children had friends and contacts that would be useful when they were old enough to consider careers and marriage. Matters such as these, rarely considered by earlier generations living in small communities, now became important in the new middle-class communities of America’s towns and cities.
Contrary to the growing myth of the self-made man, middle-class success was not a matter of individual achievement. Instead it was usually based on a family strategy in which fathers provided the money and mothers the nurturance. The reorganization of the family described in this section was successful: from its shelter and support emerged generations of ambitious, responsible, and individualistic middle-class men. But although boys were trained for success, this was not an acceptable goal for their sisters. Women were trained to be the nurturing, silent “support system” that undergirded male success. And women were also expected to ease the tensions of the transition to new middle-class behavior by acting as models and monitors of traditional values.

**Sentimentalism**

The individualistic competitiveness engendered by the market revolution caused members of the new middle class to place extraordinary emphasis on sincerity and feeling. So-called sentimentalism sprang from nostalgia for the imagined trust and security of the familiar, face-to-face life of the preindustrial village. Sermons, advice manuals, and articles now thundered warnings to young men of the dangers and deceits of urban life, and especially of fraudulent “confidence men and painted ladies” who were not what they seemed. Middle-class women were expected to counteract the impersonality and hypocrisy of the business world by the example of their own morality and sincere feeling.

For guidance in this new role, women turned to a new literary form, the sentimental novel. In contrast to older forms like sermons and learned essays, the novel was popular, accessible, and emotionally engrossing. Although denounced by ministers and scholars as frivolous, immoral, and subversive of authority, the novel found...
a ready audience among American women. Publishers of novels found a lucrative
market, one that increased from $2.5 million in 1820 to $12.5 million in 1850. By
1850, Harper’s Magazine estimated, four-fifths of the reading public were women,
and they were reading novels written by women.

To be a “lady novelist” was a new and rather uncomfortably public occupation
for women. Several authors, such as Susan Warner, were driven to novel writing when
their fathers lost their fortunes in the Panic of 1837. Novel writing could be very
profitable: Warner’s 1850 novel The Wide Wide World went through fourteen editions
in two years, and works by other authors such as Lydia Maria Child, Catherine
Sedgwick, and E.D.E.N. Southworth sold in the thousands of copies. Sentimental
novels concentrated on private life. Religious feeling, antipathy toward the dog-eat-
dog world of the commercial economy, and the need to be prepared for unforeseen
troubles were common themes. Although the heroines usually married happily at
the end of the story, few novels concentrated on romantic love. Most of these domes-
tic novels, as they were known, presented readers with a vision of responsibility and
community based on moral and caring family life.

Although sentimentalism originally sprang from genuine fear of the dangers
individualism posed to community trust, it rapidly hardened into a rigid code of eti-
quette for all occasions. Moments of genuine and deep feeling, such as death, were
smothered in elaborate rules concerning condolences, expressions of grief, and
appropriate clothing. A widow, for example, was expected to wear “deep mourning”
for a year—dresses of dull black fabrics and black bonnets covered with long, thick
black veils—and in the following year “half mourning”—shiny black silk dresses, per-
haps with trim of gray, violet, or white, and hats without veils. Thus sentimentalism
rapidly became concerned not with feelings but social codes. Transformed into a set
of rules about genteel manners to cover all occasions, sentimentalism itself became
a mark of middle-class status. And it became one of the tasks of the middle-class
woman to make sure her family conformed to the social code and associated only with
other respectable families. In this way, women forged and enforced the distinctive
social behavior of the new middle class.

**Transcendentalism and Self-Reliance**

As the new middle class conformed to the rules of sentimental behavior, it also sought
a more general intellectual reassurance. Middle-class men, in particular, needed to
feel comfortable about their public assertions of individualism and self-interest. One
source of reassurance was the philosophy of transcendentalism and its well-known
spokesman, Ralph Waldo Emerson. Originally a Unitarian minister, Emerson quit
the pulpit in 1832 and became what one might call a secular minister. Famous as a
writer and lecturer, he popularized transcendentalism, a romantic philosophical the-
ory claiming that there was an ideal, intuitive reality transcending ordinary life. The
best place to achieve that individual intuition of the Universal Being, Emerson sug-
gested, was not in church or in society but alone in the natural world. As he wrote in
“Nature” (1836), “Standing on the bare ground—my head bathed by the blithe air,
and uplifted into infinite space—all mean egotism vanishes. I become a transparent
Eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through
me; I am part and parcel of God.” The same assertion of individualism rang through
Emerson’s stirring polemic “Self-Reliance” (1841). Announcing “Whoso would be a
man, must be a nonconformist,” Emerson urged that “Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind.” Inspirational but down to earth, Emerson was just
the philosopher to inspire young businessmen of the 1830s and 1840s to achieve suc-
cess in a responsible manner.
Emerson’s younger friend, Henry David Thoreau, pushed the implications of individualism further than the more conventional Emerson. Determined to live the transcendental ideal of association with nature, Thoreau lived in solitude in a primitive cabin for two years at Walden Pond, near Concord, Massachusetts, confronting “the essential facts of life.” His experience was the basis for Walden (1854), a penetrating criticism of the spiritual cost of the market revolution. Denouncing the materialism that led “the mass of men [to] lead lives of quiet desperation,” Thoreau recommended a simple life of subsistence living that left time for spiritual thought. Margaret Fuller, perhaps the most intellectually gifted of the transcendental circle, was patronized by Emerson because she was a woman. She expressed her sense of women’s wasted potential in her pathbreaking work Woman in the Nineteenth Century (1845). Intellectually and emotionally, however, Fuller achieved liberation only when she moved to Europe and participated in the liberal Italian revolution of 1848. The romantic destiny she sought was tragically fulfilled when she, her Italian husband, and their child died in a shipwreck off the New York coast as they returned to America in 1850.

Although Thoreau and Fuller were too radical for many readers, Emerson’s version of the romantic philosophy of transcendentalism, seemingly so at odds with the competitive and impersonal spirit of the market revolution, was in fact an essential component of it. Individualism, or, as Emerson called it, self-reliance, was at the heart of the personal transformation required by the market revolution. Sentimentalism, transcendentalism, and evangelical religion all helped the new middle class to forge values and beliefs that were appropriate to their social roles.
George Inness was an American artist of the Hudson River School. Like the better-known Thomas Cole (see Chapter 11), Inness specialized in painting settled and cultivated eastern landscapes. This painting was commissioned by the president of the Delaware Lackawanna and Western Railroad to mark its opening. Inness rose to the challenge of showing both the double tracks (foreground) and the roundhouse (background) in a rural landscape, but the railroad committee was not satisfied, demanding that he show all four company locomotives (three are in the background) and that the letters D.L. & W be painted on the side of the locomotive. At first Inness refused on artistic grounds, but being in need of money, he finally agreed. The painting is thus one of the first American examples of a “fine art” advertisement. Even at this early date, there was conflict between the demands of art and those of the advertiser.

The presence of a locomotive, the symbol of the machine age, in this pastoral setting must have been a real shock to the first viewers, who were familiar with pastoral landscapes but uncomfortable with new inventions like the steam locomotive. Contrast this painting to the Currier and Ives print The Express Train on p. 389.

What does the Inness painting insist that you notice about the impact of industrialization on rural life?

CHAPTER 12
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CONCLUSION

The three transformations of the market revolution: improvements in transportation, commercialization, and industrialization changed the ways people worked, and in time, changed how they thought.

For most people, the changes were gradual. Until midcentury, the lives of rural people were still determined largely by community events, although the spread of democratic politics and the availability of newspapers and other printed material increased their connection to a larger world. Wage earners made up only 40 percent of the working population in 1860, and factory workers made up an even smaller percentage.

The new middle class was most dramatically affected by the market revolution. All aspects of life, including intimate matters of family organization, gender roles, and the number and raising of children, changed. New values—evangelical religion, sentimentalism, and transcendentalism—helped the members of the new middle class in their adjustment. As the next chapter describes, the nation’s cities were the first arena where old and new values collided.

AP* DOCUMENT-BASED QUESTION

Directions: This exercise requires you to construct a valid essay that directly addresses the central issues of the following question. You will have to use facts from the documents provided and from the chapter to prove the position you take in your thesis statement.

Evaluate and describe how the market revolution transformed two of the following areas of American life:

(a) Status of labor
(b) Class structure
(c) Family life

DOCUMENT A

Woman is to win every thing by peace and love; by making herself so much respected, esteemed and loved, that to yield to her opinions and to gratify her wishes, will be the free-will offering of the heart. But this is to be all accomplished in the domestic and social circle. There let every woman become so cultivated and refined in intellect, that her taste and judgment will be respected; so benevolent in feeling and action; that her motives will be reverenced; — so unassuming and unambitious, that collision and competition will be banished; — so “gentle and easy to be entreated,” as that every heart will repose in her presence; then, the fathers, the husbands, and the sons, will find an influence thrown around them, to which they will yield not only willingly but proudly. A man is never ashamed to own such influences, but feels dignified and ennobled in acknowledging them. But the moment woman begins to feel the promptings of ambition, or the thirst for power, her ægis of defence is gone. All the sacred protection of religion, all the generous promptings of chivalry, all the poetry of romantic gallantry, depend upon woman’s retaining her place as dependent and defenceless, and making no claims, and maintaining no right but what are the gifts of honour, rectitude and love.

Catharine Beecher wrote this essay as a warning that women should not take a frontal role in public protest as they supported the abolitionist movement. They should leave the public role to men. Beecher is discussing the “woman’s sphere” in the excerpt on the previous page. Look at the discussion of the role of women in the middle class on page 406 and examine the photo below (left) of the middle-class family. Look at the 1821 painting below (right) of a tea party among the wealthy of Boston.

- How did these women fit into Beecher’s idea of the “woman’s sphere”?
- What was the “woman’s sphere” that Beecher was discussing?
- Where did women fit in society under this concept?
- How did the market revolution and industrialization contribute to this change in the role of middle-class women?

**Document B**

Look at the image of women’s work in the drawing on page 144 in the colonial age. Compare it to the whirligig shown on page 395. Now turn to the discussion on page 384 of the “patriarchal organization of the family.” Examine the role of women in work under the putting-out system (beginning on page 392) or in the patriarchal family unit.

- How did industrialization and the market revolution change work for these women?
- What is happening to children during this period?
- What happened to the apprentice system after the market revolution? Remember, some changes will be for the good, others might not be as beneficial.
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Document C
Look at the Hicks painting of a rural farm taken from the childhood memories of the artist (page 384). Compare it to the discussion of the “patriarchal organization of the family” on the same page. Now look at the Neagle painting of the blacksmith on page 385 and notice the young apprentice boy in the dim background.

• As industrialization and the market revolution worked their changes on America, how did these scenes change?

Document D
Look at the table on page 391 on the distribution of wealth in Boston between 1687 and 1848, and then reexamine the painting of the tea party. Read the story of Duncan Phyfe or Stephen Allen on page 385. Look at the story of Francis Cabot Lowell on page 404. Look at the size of the middle group and the lower group in 1848 and compare it against 1771.

• What was happening to class structure in the United States as a result of industrialization and the market revolution?

AP* PREP TEST

Select the response that best answers each question or best completes each sentence.

1. A major difference between preindustrial production and factory work was:
   a. that only adult family members worked in the factories.
   b. workers were organized along strictly patriarchal lines.
   c. that prior to industrialism, workers never received wages.
   d. the way workers were given a voice in settling work conditions.
   e. the precise and unrelenting work schedule in factories.

2. At the beginning of the 1800s:
   a. the majority of working-class Americans lived in large cities.
   b. about half the American population was still engaged in agriculture.
   c. most Americans lived lives that were family- and community-based.
   d. western expansion meant that family ties were dramatically weakened.
   e. most workers received money that was required for community exchanges.

3. The revolutionary transportation development of the 1820s was:
   a. the Erie Canal.
   b. the Yankee Clipper.
   c. a transcontinental railroad.
   d. the creation of the national highway.
   e. the Soo Locks in Sault St Marie.

4. One unanticipated result of the transportation revolution was:
   a. a sharp reduction in the average number of hours worked by Americans.
   b. an infrastructure that tied all regions of the nation directly to New York City.
   c. a surprising rise in the cost of moving goods from the east to the west.
   d. the spread of epidemic diseases throughout much of the nation.
   e. the lack of foreign investments and a U.S. decline in the international market.

5. A critical element in the American Industrial Revolution was:
   a. the capital produced by southern cotton growers.
   b. large-scale investment capital from foreign banks.
   c. the growing availability of inexpensive high-grade steel.
   d. a reduction in the income tax rate to encourage investment.
   e. the political rights it allowed women to successfully assert.

6. The emergence of the market economy:
   a. eliminated poverty in most regions of the United States.
   b. limited growth and agricultural production outside the South.
   c. had little influence outside of the manufacturing Northeast.

Answer Key
1-E 4-D 7-C 10-E 13-D
2-C 5-A 8-D 11-C 14-A
3-A 6-E 9-B 12-B
d. spread to all areas of the country within just a few years.
e. helped encourage expansion into the western territories.

7. An important characteristic of industrial production was the:
   a. division of profits between owners, workers, and investors.
   b. seasonal and familial cycles that shaped production.
   c. concentration and centralization of the workforce.
   d. number of African Americans employed in factories.
   e. the effectiveness of the organized labor movement.

8. The breakdown of traditional systems of production in the United States:
   a. gave men more power over women since wage earning had come to be so important.
   b. had little influence on the nature of families and the relations between men and women.
   c. meant that for the first time children played an important function in supporting their families.
   d. dramatically altered the role of women in their families and their place in American society.
   e. allowed women more independence and economic opportunity, while allowing children an education.

9. As industrial production became more common in the United States:
   a. Americans began to work longer hours than they had in the past.
   b. attitudes toward the nature of work and leisure changed profoundly.
   c. social divisions between the wealthy and the working class disappeared.
   d. employees found that they never had time to do anything except work.
   e. workers found it easier to balance their work and leisure time.

10. During the years 1790 through 1840:
    a. there was no direct correlation between religion and the changes in the social structure of society.
    b. the social dislocations associated with the Industrial Revolution led to a decline in church attendance in the United States.
    c. most religious leaders criticized industrialism because the impersonality of the factory system undermined Christian compassion.
    d. the first religious revival in American history occurred as workers looked for ways to ease the transition to the market economy.
    e. religion generally strengthened and reinforced the emerging middle-class values characteristic of the market revolution.

11. The growth of the middle class in the United States:
    a. eliminated almost all forms of gender discrimination.
    b. encouraged women to attend college if at all possible.
    c. helped define new and differing roles for men and women.
    d. allowed women to gain equal political rights for the first time.
    e. led most couples to have larger families than their predecessors.

12. The new focus on sentimentalism in America:
    a. meant that people were always expected to express their feelings.
    b. provided a social code of appropriate behavior for the middle class.
    c. demanded that men be more sensitive to the emotional needs of women.
    d. was a feminine experience that had little social influence on men or children.
    e. taught children of all classes their gender and educational expectations.

13. The key to achieving the Universal Being of transcendentalism was:
    a. wealth and power.
    b. Christianity.
    c. political authority.
    d. the natural world.
    e. within society.

14. The market revolution:
    a. helped set the stage for conflicts between traditional values and new ideals.
    b. led to a consensus among Americans that eliminated social differences.
    c. led all Americans to accept the middle-class values of the industrial age.
    d. quickly and effectively eliminated old ways of thinking in the United States.
    e. led to a more evenly distributed income among the classes in American society.

For additional study resources for this chapter, go to *Out of Many, AP® Edition* at [www.myhistorylab.com](http://www.myhistorylab.com)