

---

**ASSOCIATION FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ANALYSIS**

---

---

**DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES**

---



---

**This Association seeks to discuss, debate, elaborate and extend Marxian theory. Our particular reading of that theory focuses upon the concepts of overdetermination, contradiction, and class. Our concerns include the philosophical and epistemological, the abstract as well as concrete formulations comprising a comprehensive Marxian social theory. The goals of our publications and conferences are to stimulate interest in and debate over the explanatory power and social consequences of Marxian economic and social analysis.**

**For more information, or to obtain copies of other papers in our Discussion Paper Series, please write to:**

**AESA  
Department of Economics  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003**

---

THE ORIGINS OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS PROCESS  
IN THE UNITED STATES: THE EARLY MASSACHUSETTS  
BOOT AND SHOE INDUSTRY

By Rona S. Weiss

Discussion Paper #14

November 1983

Table of Contents

A New Approach to an Old Problem..... 1

Randolph in the Context of Class Processes of New England: 1780-1850..... 4

Boot and Shoe Production in Randolph and the Origins of Capitalism..... 7

The Putting Out System: A Transitional Form of Capitalism..... 8

Early Capitalism and Differentiation Between Ancient Producers.....11

Early Capitalism and Changing Conditions of Existence .....12

Class Processes and Individual Mobility.....15

On Models and Merchants.....19

Last Words.....20

Notes.....22

Tables and Appendices

Table I : Population and Number Employed in Manufacture for Randolph and  
Norfolk County, 1790-1865.....following p.7

Table II: Early Capitalists of Randolph.....following p.8

Appendix I: Sources for original research.....25

Appendix II: Continuity and Change in Randolph Firms.....30

A New Approach to an Old Problem

Over the past two decades, historians have displayed a new interest in the origins of capitalism in the United States. Marxist theory has much to contribute to this discussion. Indeed, participants in the newly formed Association for Economic and Social Analysis are particularly concerned with questions of transition, and the development of new class processes. Much of our work has been methodological-- we have attempted to articulate new theoretical approaches to issues that a Marxist science might address. We have been critical of those social scientists that use an "empirical" approach, as we have a different understanding of "data", "facts", etc.. In our rejection of epistemology in general, I believe that we have shied away from the use of so called "primary" sources to "produce" our own histories. If we understand that so called "original documents" do not provide us with a truth, but rather the overdetermined perceptions of persons in the past, then there is no reason why we cannot use these sources within our own framework. My aim for this presentation is to examine the development of capitalism with a very specific example, the boot and shoe industry of Randolph Massachusetts, 1780-1850.<sup>1</sup> This period covers only the early stages of capitalism in boot and shoe production-- before centralization and mechanization took hold.

My goals in this presentation are threefold, although not necessarily in the stated order. First, I would like to contrast the pervasive notion of social mobility as an agent of change with the concept of classes striving to secure their conditions of existence. Social mobility is a critical theme which runs through the literature of U.S. history in the pre-Civil War era.<sup>2</sup> This was the era of the "common man." It was a period when many states rewrote their constitutions to guarantee universal manhood suffrage for white males--thereby dropping property qualifications. It was an era of competition within the new capitalist class process. Individuals with limited means were able to enter the ranks of the

nascent capitalist class. Here we have the quintessential example of social mobility in U.S. history.

This approach has been criticized by Marxists and non-Marxists. For example, there are numerous empirical studies which attempt to "show" how limited this so called mobility was during the 19th century, i.e., how few ancient producers or workers<sup>3</sup> actually became capitalists. On another level, James Henretta and others<sup>4</sup> question the very concept of social mobility. They view this notion as class and culturally biased. As Henretta points out, the individualistic desire for self improvement may not be a cherished value of all groups in all societies. Therefore the desire for social mobility may not be a useful explanation for social change, nor a useful measure of equality.

The critique of social mobility theory offered here is different from those previously sketched and works within the framework of classes striving to secure their conditions of existence. The origins of capitalism in the boot and shoe industry of Randolph can be understood, in part, as a result of ancient producers (petty producers, artisans) and merchants (small general store owners) striving to secure their conditions of existence as merchants and ancient producers ! In the process ofcourse they changed these conditions and eventually created a new class process, capitalism. We understand the development of these new classes and relationships as a result of complexity, not simply as a result of individuals striving for mobility. Indeed, why should we call the movement of individuals from non-capitalist to capitalist classes "mobility"? This issue shall be developed below.

Secondly, I would like to examine the question of the capitalist as an "individual" in the context of the Randolph boot and shoe industry. In a recent paper, Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff suggested that there need not be an individual called the "capitalist" for the capitalist class process to be established or reproduced. Stated in another way, "the capitalist class process can exist even if the individuals appropriating surplus value, do not, themselves,

own, supervise or purchase capital." <sup>5</sup> Thus, the capitalist class process may be secured differently in various historic conjunctures. As we shall see for the case of the early Randolph boot and shoe industry, the conditions of existence of capitalism were secured through one individual owning capital and performing a variety of functions including supervision, purchase of capital, labor and marketing. As the conditions within the industry changed, subsumed classes developed to carry out these functions.

Perhaps the focus by contemporary non-Marxist historians on the individual and individual mobility in the 19th century is conditioned, in part, by this particular characteristic of early capitalism--that one individual capitalist fulfilled all or most functions. Some of these issues will be developed below, with both specific reference to Randolph and the the contemporary scene.

Finally, the rise of capitalism in Randolph will be discussed in light of previous Marxist models or paths of development. Marx made a distinction between the routes to capitalism, Way I and Way II. <sup>6</sup> This distinction was based in his study of the transition in Western Europe. In the Way II case, large merchants, already engaged in long distance trade, take control of the production process and become capitalists. In Way I (also called the really revolutionary way), the early capitalist class grows out of the ranks of the direct producers--i.e., prosperous ancient producers(artisans or farmers). <sup>7</sup> Marx and Dobb see Way II as eventually providing a barrier to the further development of capitalism because many of these large merchants turned capitalists were subsumed to feudalism and therefore unable to revolutionize the capitalist class process. There is no question that the Way I/II distinction is valuable for the analysis of European capitalism. Some contemporary historians have tried to show a relationship between 20th century <sup>8</sup> fascism and the earlier alternate routes to capitalism. I question, however, whether this distinction has the same significance for the origins of capitalism in the United States.

For the case of the Randolph boot and shoe industry, there is sufficient information to conclude that both merchants and ancient producers became capitalists and revolutionized the production process. Secondly, in other industries such as textiles, where Way II dominated in the U.S., it was hardly a barrier to further development. I would suggest that the constellation of forces in the U.S. was vastly different from that of Europe, thus rendering the Way I/II distinction less powerful.

### Randolph in the Context of Class Processes of New England:1780-1850

Our analysis of new class processes in the 19th century must ofcourse be constructed against the backdrop of the social formation.

The town of Randolph, which lies 13 miles south of Boston, was incorporated in 1793. It was originally a part of Braintree. At this time, class processes in Randolph included ancient, slave, perhaps feudal as well as the respective subsumed classes, merchants, members of the clergy, teachers, etc..

By 1793, the open field system in Randolph had largely broken down. This system was one of the earlier sustaining conditions of ancient production. The open field system was a town wide co-operative structure which involved specific forms of sharing between individual ancient households for fence construction, herding and use of implements. These forms of co-operation supported the survival of each individual ancient unit. One of the foremost features of this system was the "village-centered" plan of settlement. Each family was allotted a plot of land on which to farm by the town-proprietorship government. The farm or arable land lied within a large open or common field. Pasture land and woodlot were not individually divided, but were part of a common field as well. The town proprietorship government also allocated home lots upon which ancient producers could build homes and tend small gardens. These homelots were not adjacent to the arable land in the open



field--they were positioned close together around a central square to form a village. The village center was also a cultural unit, it was the site of the town meeting house or church. The proximity of residence by ancient producers (and others) around this village center, ensured a close watch over all activities by the subsumed classes of Puritan ministers and elders. Through various forms of co-operation and social pressure, the open field system constrained the effects of inequalities between ancient producers by restricting competition or differentiation between them.

The original town records suggest that by 1793, this system had broken down for the following reasons. Randolph was started by settlers in the Southern Precinct of Braintree who petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts requesting this separation. They cited as their reason the inconvenience of having to travel a long distance to the original village center in the Middle Precinct of Braintree to vote in town meetings. This indicates that settlement outside of the village center had begun sometime earlier. Indeed, this out-movement had begun before 1727, because in that year, inhabitants of the South Precinct petitioned the General Court for the right to construct a Church there. (It would ofcourse be a Puritan Congregational Church.) In this case, as with the later separation from Braintree, the petition cited the inconvenience of the long trips to church each Sabbath. The 1727 petition was granted.

Thus, by the late 13th century, although ancient relations were, perhaps dominant in Randolph, one of their crucial conditions of existence had been transformed. The decline of open field farming and the rise of individual family farming laid one of the bases for increased differentiation between the ancient producers of Randolph, as in the rest of Massachusetts and New England.

During the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries, the farms of most ancient producers in New England, including the fertile valley areas of the Connecticut, Champlain and Merrimack rivers, were devoted both to agriculture and home manufacture.

It was in the more hilly, thin soiled regions (including Randolph) that some New England farms first reached the point of diminishing returns, so that additional labor, tools or domestic animals could not produce a sufficient increment in total output. The forces of nature contributed to this complex process of differentiation amongst producers. As some ancient producers were jeopardized, others prospered, produced surpluses and sold their goods in local markets. Those markets brought the more and less successful ancient producers into competition with each other and furthered the process of differentiation. Production for exchange in the market also furthered the pace of specialization so that by the 1830's, the hill regions concentrated on potatoes, fruits, maple sugar and sheep grazing while the valley areas specialized in more perishable crops as garden produce, dairy products, tobacco and onions.<sup>14</sup>

Once the Erie Canal was completed in 1825, competition from Western New York farms increased the pressure on New England agriculture and hastened the pace of differentiation between ancient producers. Simultaneously, increased production for the market and specialization of labor (on a few crops) implied the slow abandonment of home manufacture by many ancient producers. Rolla Tryon found that the household manufacture of textiles in New England had declined sharply by 1819.<sup>15</sup> Ancient producers (and others) in the rural areas no longer made all of their own clothing and implements. Thus, they provided a growing market for these commodities.

Some ancient producers, caught in the competitive crossfire between the more efficient farms of Western New York or the Connecticut River Valley and themselves, found that they could not make ends meet. Migration from the hill counties to more prosperous regions--in New England, the West or the cities began in earnest in the 1820's. There were other solutions for ancient producers before and during this decade. Some sent their young daughters to work in the textile factories of Lowell and Lawrence. Because of the tradition of home manufacture, some ancient producers, in need of additional income, had skills that they could utilize although

they remained on the land. It is in this context that capitalist production of boots and shoes began in Randolph. Slowly, ancient producers that used to engage in diversified forms of labor began to devote less time to agriculture and more to manufacture. New arrivals in New England, with less opportunity to acquire land than the earlier settlers, hastened this specializing tendency.

By 1820, the separation of agriculture from manufacture-- an integral part of the primary accumulation process, was well underway in Randolph. As Table I indicates, in that year, almost 20% of the town's folk listed their occupation as "manufacture". Indeed, the conditions in Randolph were typical for Norfolk County in general.

#### Boot and Shoe Production in Randolph and the Origins of Capitalism

By 1800, most historians of the shoe industry agree that production was in  
16  
the handicraft stage. In an earlier era, many ancient producers made crudely constructed boots and shoes for themselves with their own tools and materials. Some ancient producers and others also purchased imported shoes. Slowly, with new immigration, specialized craft production of shoes in the colonies developed. Skilled master craftsmen-ancient producers who specialized in this one commodity, made shoes on order for specific customers. These master craftsmen owned their own tools, although sometimes the raw materials were supplied by the customer. They worked in their own barns or shops. In other cases, itinerant craftsmen traversed the countryside and made shoes in the homes of their clients. This craftsmen-the ancient producer-made the entire shoe and was paid for the finished product. Payment was in the form of groceries, store orders, supplies or sometimes cash.

Over time, the craftsmen were left with extra material or a pair of unsold shoes which they found could be easily sold to local merchants (general store owners), subsumed to ancient, feudal or slave class processes. As the market for shoes grew,

Table I

Population and Number Employed in Manufacture for Randolph and Norfolk County, 1790-1865

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rand. Population</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u># Employ. in Mfr.</u>	<u>% Population</u>	<u>Norfolk Cty Population</u> <sup>b</sup>	<u># Employ. in Mfr.</u> <sup>e</sup>	<u>% Pop.</u>
1790	700			25,963		
1800	1,021			27,216		
1810	1,170			31,245		
1820	1,546	281 <sup>e</sup>	18.2%	36,471	5,415	14.8%
1830	2,200	1,170 <sup>g</sup>	53.3%	41,972		
1840	3,232	1,464 <sup>i</sup>	45.3%	53,140	7,756 <sup>h</sup>	14.6%
1850	4,741			78,892	15,628 <sup>j</sup>	19.8%
1855	5,538	1,532 <sup>k</sup>	27.7%			
1860	5,760			109,950 <sup>l</sup>	17,724 <sup>l</sup>	16.1%
1865	5,374	2,037 <sup>m</sup>	37.9%			

- 
- a- A.E. Sproul, "Randolph, Massachusetts", in D.H. Hurd, Ed. *The History of Norfolk County, Massachusetts* (Philadelphia: J.W. Lewis and Co., 1884) Ch XVII, 208
  - b- Heads of Families of the First Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1790 (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1908)
  - c- Return of the Whole Homes of Persons Within the Seventh District of the United States Taken in the Year 1800 (Reprinted by Luther M. Cornwall, New York City, 1909)
  - d- Aggregate Amount of Each Description of Persons Within the U.S. and Territories Thereof (Reprinted by Luther M. Cornwall, New York City, 1911)
  - e- Population Schedule of the 4th Census of the United States for the Year 1820 (Washington, D.C., National Archives and Record Service Administration, Publication of the National Archives Microfilm Foundation)
  - f- Population Schedule of the 5th Census of the United States for the Year 1830
  - g- Louis McLane, "Manufactures of the United States, 1831-2", by the Secretary of the Treasury, 22nd Congress, 1st Session, House Executive Document, #308

Notes to Table I (continued)

- h- Population Schedule of the 6th Census of the United States for the Year 1840
- i- The Randolph Herald, Souvenir Edition, July 2, 1968, 175th Anniversary, 8.
- j- Population Schedule of the 7th Census of the United States for the Year 1850
- k- Blanche Hazard, The Organization of the Boot and Shoe Industry of Massachusetts Before 1875 (New York; August Kelly , 1968)
- l- Population Schedule of the 8th Census of the United States for the Year 1860
  
- m- Statistical Information Relating to Certain Branches of Industry in Massachusetts for the Year Ending June, 1865 Prepared from Official returns by Oliver Warner, Secretary of the Commonwealth, (Boston: Wright and Potter, State Printer, 5 Spring Lane, 1866) 457

the possibilities of additional earnings each week expanded. These ancient producers or master craftsmen engaged more journeymen and apprentices to produce shoes for the market rather than for one particular client. We understand the relationship or process carried out between masters and apprentices at this point to be feudal, not capitalist, although in transition. It is precisely at this juncture that we may locate the beginning of capitalist production in the boot and shoe industry.

#### The Putting Out System: A Transitional Form of Capitalism

The first capitalists began their operations (in Randolph and elsewhere) by purchasing leather and supplying it to the master craftsman/ancient producer. The masters and their jorks would cut up this leather and make boots and shoes with their own tools, in their own shops. The capitalists would then pay the master/ancient producer for the completed commodities and market them. I recognize that the classification of this individual as a "capitalist" is problematic to this point. Indeed, the capitalist class process, characterized by the appropriation of surplus in value form, is not present here. Other historians call this individual the "merchant-capitalist". I like this term because it implies participation in two class processes. The capitalist class process is viewed here in its earliest, transitional form-- a domestic or putting out operation which was transformed rather quickly. This crucial transformation will be explored below. First I would like to specify this new development for Randolph. (See Table II)

Between approximately 1793 and 1830, there were at least 23 of these early capitalist putting out operations, although at least four involved more than one individual. Their origins are most interesting. Five of these early boot and shoe putting out operations were begun by subsumed merchants--general store owners. These local merchants occasionally received a pair of shoes in payment for supplies. As the early primary accumulation process advanced, they found a growing market for ready made shoes. Therefore they moved to create a steady supply of this commodity by putting out leather to local ancient producers. They

Table II

Early Capitalists of Randolph

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Pre-Capital. Class Prod.</u>	<u>Parents &amp; Siblings</u>	<u>Marriage &amp; Children</u>	<u>Marketing Arrangements</u>	<u>Years of Bus. Other Info.</u>
Horatio Bingley Alden	1786 - ?	Ancient	Simeon Alden 1764-1843 carrier/ merchant	Mary Belcher (married 1811) Mary 1816- ?	Retail store in Baltimore Wholesale con- tacts in Calif. Australia	through 1850's, when H.B. Alden Jr runs Randolph factory with 170 workers
			Rachel French 1765-1844	Horatio Jr. 1821 - ?		
			Hosea - 1789-1825 ancient prod. (shoemaker*)	capitalist		
			John 1799 - ? capitalist			
			Hiram 1804 - ? capitalist			
			Silas Alden (bro. of Simeon)			
			1766 see below			
Silas Alden	1766- 1845	Ancient	he is brother of Simeon Alden, father of H.B. Alden (see above)	Polly French 1765-1810 10 children including Silas Jr. 1786 - ? (see below) Calvin 1788 - ? shoemaker (ancient)	Rode boots to Boston himself	approx. 1808- 1821

Table II continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Pre-Capital. Class Proc.</u>	<u>Parents &amp; Siblings</u>	<u>Marriage &amp; Children</u>	<u>Marketing Arrangements</u>	<u>Years of Bus. Other Inf.</u>
Silas Alden Jr	1786-1854	Father was ancient Prod. turned capital.	Silas Alden 1766-1845	Harriet French 1792 - ? (his cousin)	Rode boots to Boston himself	1820-1840
		see above	Polly French 1765-1810 (sister of Cap'T. Thomas French, see below)	9 children		
John Arnold		Ancient (farmer who ran a cider mill)			Rode boots to Boston himself, later hired Amasa Clark, as his agent to market boots	One of the first capitalists to hire an agent to take out stock to domestic workers collect it and then take boots to Boston
John Belcher	1771-1856	Ancient	Joseph Belcher 1733-1818 (ancient, shoemaker) Susan Baxter 1735- ?	Sally Nash 1778- ? Henry 1810- ?	Rode boots to Boston himself	1807-1824
			Ebenezer Belcher 1778-1838 (ancient, shoe maker)	John Jr. 1799 - ? capitalist		
			Joseph Belcher 1774-1856 (ancient, shoe maker)			



Table II -Continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Pre-Capital. Glass Proc.</u>	<u>Parents &amp; Siblings</u>	<u>Marriage &amp; Children</u>	<u>Marketing Arrangements</u>	<u>Years of Bus. Other Inf.</u>
Jonathan Wales Belcher	1800- ?	Ancient	Ebenezer Belcher 1778-1838 (ancient, shoe maker) Eulalia Nash 1778- ?	Emeline Arnold 1810- ? Lyman 1845 -? Bradford W. 1832-? Ancient, boot maker) Francis 1842-?		1825-1840's By 1850, J.W. Belcher was a merchant, not a capitalist
			Eulalia 1803-? Sally 1805 - ? Clarissa 1808 - ? Maria 1816 - ? Harvey 1819- ? Ebenezer Stepehr 1821 (ancient, shoe maker)			
David Burrell Jr.	1802- ?		David Burrell 1769-1854		Rode boots to Boston himself	became very successful capitalist still in business during 1860's as Burrell & Maguire with over 100 workers
			related by marriage to Ebenezer Belcher			
Daniel Faxon	1800- ?	Merchant (general store owner) & Ancient		Mary Adams Daniel Jr. 1844 -?	Retail store in Randolph Rode boots to Boston himself	1820-1850

Table II Continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Pre-Capital Process</u>	<u>Parents &amp; Siblings</u>	<u>Marriage &amp; Children</u>	<u>Marketing Arrangements</u>	<u>Years of Bus. Other Inf.</u>
Michah Faxon		Ancient			Sold his first lot to Monroe, Nash of Long Wharf, Boston	Was supposedly the first person recorded to mfr. shoes exclusively by 1811
Thaddaus French	1785-1848	Ancient	Joshua French 1758-?		Rode boots to Boston himself	1830-1840
(Captain) Thomas French	1751-1822	Ancient (owner of Tannery)	Thomas French 1723-? Ancient (tanner)	Hannah Wild 1751-1835	Sold shoes to contacts in Vermont, N.H., Canada; Rode boots to market himself	
Littlefield Brothers (Nathaniel, James, Isaac, Darius)		Merchants (general storeowners)	Silence Wild	8 children including Samuel 1787-?	Retail stores in New Orleans, East Stoughton, (near Randolph) Wholesale contacts in the South, Philadelphia, Boston wholesale office	1814-1845
of East Stoughton put out leather to ancient prods. of Randolph				capitalist		

Table II Continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Pre-Capital. Class Proc.</u>	<u>Parents &amp; Siblings</u>	<u>Marriage &amp; Children</u>	<u>Marketing Arrangements</u>	<u>Years of Bus. Other Inf.</u>
Ephraim Lincoln	1780-?	Merchant (General Store owner)		Clarrissa 1793- ? Ephraim W. merchant Mary 1837 - ? Clarrissa - 1830	Retail store in Randolph Rode boots to Boston himself	1810-1850
Seth Mann	1781-1843	Ancient		Polly Seth Jr. 1817- ? Capitalist		
Isaac Thayer	1774-1844	Ancient			Rode Shoes to Boston himself	1800-1825
Luther & Seth Thayer		Merchants (by 1800 they were large wholesale, long distance merchants in Boston, mostly trading leather)			They are wholesale merchants	1800-1821
Tucker Brothers		Merchants (General Store Owners)			Retail store in Randolph Wholesale office in Boston with contacts in the South and West	

Table II. Continued.

Name	Date of Birth	Pre-Capital. Class, Proc.	Parents & Siblings.	Marriage & Children	Marketing Arrangements	Years of Bus. Other Inf.
Royal	1792-1861	Merchant (General Store Owner)		Marla 1801- ?	Retail Store in Randolph	1315-1825
Turner (Bass & Turner Tollman " Dubols " )				Royal W. 1825 - ? Capitalist & Merchant		Was President of Randolph's First Bank
Calvin Alden				Seth 1822 - ? Banker		
Samuel French	1787 - ?	Father was Capitalist and Tannery owner	Thomas French 1751-1822 capitalist Hannah Wild 1751-1835			1815-1823
Thomas White						1811-1815
Nathaniel Spear						
Joseph Faxon						1827-1832

\* - Both the town's vital statistics and the Federal Census included terms like currier, bootmaker, shoemaker, shoe manufacturer etc. The manufacturers were the capitalists whereas the boot / or/ shoe makers were ancient producers as were other craftsmen--curriers, tanners etc.

were acting in their capacity as merchants, traders, middlemen, subsumed to ancient, feudal, slave and nascent capitalist class processes. They put out the leather in their struggle to secure their conditions of existence as merchants. At this point they continued to sell a variety of commodities including shoes.

In some instances, these merchants sold shoes from their local retail stores in Randolph. In other cases, the merchants took the boots to Boston where they were sold to large wholesale merchants. In still other instances, these Randolph merchants had long distant contacts in the South, West or even overseas (as Cuba or the West Indies) where they sold these shoes. It is important to note here that these merchants or general store owners often saved up other commodities received in trade for long distance exchange as well. For example, a Randolph merchant might save up grain received as "country pay" and sell it in Boston or ship it to one of his long distance contacts. Shoes and grain were both commodities for exchange.

The owners of the general stores in Randolph were Daniel Faxon, the Littlefield Brothers, Ephraim Lincoln, the Tucker Brothers and Bass and Turner. In one case, that of Daniel Faxon, the merchant was also an ancient producer, a skilled master craftsman. He engaged in two processes simultaneously and slowly, in his attempt to secure a supply of shoes for exchange, he was creating a new class process--capitalism.

Most of the early capitalists in Randolph, indeed the creators of the nascent capitalist class process were ancient producers. They were both farmers and master craftsmen. These independent producers purchased leather with surpluses they produced themselves in the ancient class process. They took this leather and put it out to other mastercraftsmen/ancient producers, less prosperous and/or less ambitious men who used it to make shoes. This ancient producer turned capitalist may still be working in his own shop, side by side with his own apprentices. Indeed, the ancient producer may simultaneously take in more jous and apprentices to produce in his own shop.

Of the 23 early capitalists in Randolph, 13 were known to be ancient producers as described above. (See Table II) Unlike the general store owners/merchants, few of these ancient producers had previous market contacts. Therefore, with the exception of H.B. Alden, all of these ancient producers/capitalists collected the finished boots and shoes from the master craftsmen/ancient producers and transported these goods in saddlebags or wagons to Boston. Usually they brought the boots to Boston themselves and sold them to large wholesale merchant houses.

There are a few interesting variations that merit attention here. Of the 13 known ancient producers turned capitalists, all but one were previously engaged in diversified forms of market and non-market production. Captain Thomas French, however was an older man (born in 1751, unlike most of the others born between 1770-1790) who owned and operated Randolph's Tannery. He was thus already committed to specialized market production. (There is evidence that this tannery or bark pit had been built sometime before 1770.)<sup>19</sup> French had leather at his disposal and had surpluses accumulated from his market production of this leather. French put out this leather to local ancient producers. He had market contacts in New Hampshire, Vermont and Canada where he sold the finished boots and shoes. One of his sons, Samuel, became a capitalist boot and shoe producer by 1820.

The second exception was that of Luther and Seth Thayer. These brothers, and early capitalists who put out leather to Randolph ancient producers, were large leather dealers in Boston. They were wholesale merchants specializing in leather. Their offices were located on the busy "Merchants Row".<sup>20</sup> They were known to deal in the West Indies. Here we have one example of long distance merchants, large established traders, entering into the production process. There is clear evidence in the account books of two Randolph ancient producers/master craftsmen that Seth and Luther Thayer put out leather to make large amounts of mens and boys shoes. It appears, therefore, that they put out this leather to create another commodity for

their already prosperous merchant activities. They were acting to secure one of their necessary conditions as merchants. At this point, I've found no record of their dealings past 1821. It is possible that they began to devote more of their energies to the capitalist class process.

### Early Capitalism and Differentiation Between Ancient Producers

The beginnings of capitalism in the boot and shoe industry of Randolph are hardly linear. Ancient producers, local merchants as well as one partnership of long distance merchants entered, or more properly created the bases of the new capitalist class process. In most cases, the putting out of leather to master craftsmen/ancient producers by these individuals was part of an attempt to secure their conditions of existence in non-capitalist process. The merchants/capitalists sought a larger and perhaps cheaper supply of commodities to trade. The ancient producers/capitalists also sought a larger supply of boots and shoes to sell. It is important to understand that some of these ancient producers were already producing shoes themselves. Some were still producing custom made shoes for specific customers. They continued to work on their farms or in their shops. Slowly, the subtle process of differentiation brought changes which none of them planned, and perhaps few imagined or desired.

The process of differentiation between ancient producers of Randolph is typified here by one ancient producer/capitalist now putting out leather to another ancient producer. The property or wealth differences between them initially may have been very small. Equally as significant, this differentiation process was beginning in a culturally homogeneous community with a tight kinship network.

Until approximately 1815, the Congregational Church was the only denomination  
21  
in Randolph. Thus, most ancient producers shared religious affiliation. Although some Randolph residents were born outside of the town, most were native born and of English ancestry. Indeed, for the county of Norfolk as a whole, as late as 1820, less

than 1 % of all inhabitants were foreign born.

The kinship network, alongside the open field system, played an important role in the continuity of ancient relations. As the officially sanctioned, community wide forms of co-operation receded, the viability of the extended family grew and changed. There are countless instances, recorded in diaries, journals or day books, of co-operation between family members outside of the household. These forms of co-operation included house construction, harvesting of crops, etc.. Slowly these forms of co-operation, in some instances, became market transactions. Indeed, these various forms of family co-operation were important in launching the early capitalist putting out system. For example, Jonathan W. Belcher, one of the ancient producers/capitalists, put out leather to Ebenezer Belcher a master craftsmen/ancient producer and his father.<sup>23</sup> This same Ebenezer Belcher lent out his horse to his young nephew David Burrell, another ancient producer/capitalist.<sup>24</sup> Burrell used the horse to carry finished shoes to market in Boston and paid Belcher for the use of the horse. By 1850, Burrell was a partner in one of the largest capitalist manufacturing operations in Randolph--Burrell and Maguire.

### Early Capitalism and Changing Conditions of Existence.

By the 1820's, there were a number of significant changes in this transitional putting out form of the capitalist class process. With these changes, we can begin to see capitalism emerge as a process of surplus extraction in value form.

During the early 19th century, the market for shoes expanded locally, nationally and internationally. The early capitalists were engaged in a competitive industry with much room for expansion. Some were particularly interested in producing boots and shoes for the growing markets of the South and West Indies. These were the markets for slaves shoes--therefore a lower quality commodity.<sup>25</sup> The early capitalists therefore sought ways to produce boots and shoes more quickly and more cheaply.

At this point, we begin to see a division of labor in the process of boot and shoe production.<sup>26</sup> The work of constructing the whole shoe was divided into three



parts: cutting up leather, "fitting" or sewing the upper pieces, and "making" or bottoming the shoe. Secondly, at this point, less skilled workers, particularly women and children, were brought into the production process. Finally, with the division of labor came the spatial re-organization of the production process-- first decentralization and then centralization.

Up until this point, the capitalist put out uncut leather to the ancient producers. The latter cut up the leather and kept any scraps (called "cabbage") for himself. If the capitalist began to oversee this part of the process, costs could be reduced. Therefore, the early merchant/capitalists hired skilled workers-- cutters or "clickers" to cut up leather in the former's general stores. These cutters were the most skilled of all shoe workers and came to be the most highly paid. Their introduction marks the beginning of the control over the production process by the capitalist. Secondly, it denotes the beginning of wage labor in boot and shoe production. Most of the cutters were not paid by the piece, they were employed by the merchant/capitalist to work for a specified period of time in his shop.

Those early capitalists who were originally ancient producers sometimes cut the leather up themselves in their shops or barns. In other instances, they too hired skilled cutters.

The next step was to actually put out the pre-cut leather for the upper portion of the shoe or "uppers" to domestic workers. In some instances, the early capitalists continued to perform this function. In other cases, they hired agents, a new subsumed group, to transport the leather and thus co-ordinate the now separated parts of the production process. In Randolph, Amasa Clark was hired by John Arnold (and later other capitalists) as such an agent. <sup>27</sup> Sidney French was another agent, subsumed to the capitalist class process in this early period. He went on to become the manager (another subsumed position) of one of Randolph's pre-Civil War boot and shoe factories. <sup>28</sup>

Agents and/or capitalists brought the pre-cut upper leather to the homes or farms of domestic workers. These were the stitchers--primarily women and children. They sewed the maleable upper sides together. The availability of their labor power to the capitalist can be understood in the context of the ongoing process of differentiation between ancient producers. As many ancient units were unable to produce enough (on their own farms or in their own shops) to survive, women and children began to seek other sources of income. The labor supplied by these domestic workers may be simultaneously understood as part of the attempt by the ancient producers' household unit to secure one of its conditions of existence-- i.e. to keep their own land. These workers did not leave the ancient production unit, they did not migrate to the cities. They continued to work in their own homes, on their own land with their own tools. They also worked, however, on the raw materials of nascent capitalists and they did not keep or use the products of this portion of their labor. They were paid by the piece, not for their labor time.

When the uppers were completed, they were returned to the capitalists. The cutters now cut up the thicker sole leather, which was put out with the finished "uppers" to the "bottomers". These bottomers were usually men. They were more skilled than the stitchers. In many cases, they were ancient producers who knew how to make the whole shoe. Indeed, during this period and throughout the 19th century, some ancient producers or master craftsmen continued to produce the whole shoe for the higher quality custom markets. Others were employed by nascent capitalists and produced only a part of the shoe. They worked in their own shops or barns. In other cases, they worked side by side, with other bottomers, in small shops called "ten footers". These workers, used their own tools, controlled their own work pace and were paid by the piece for the finished shoe.

The capitalist or his agent collected the boots and shoes and returned them to the general store or shop. This central location, where leather was cut up, quickly evolved into central shops. This was the site of the eventual centralization

of all aspects of the production process under the supervision and control of the capitalists and/or subsumed managers, foremen, agents, etc. . Before 1840, however, the central shop was the place for cutting and finishing.

When the shoes were returned from the shops of the bottomers to the central shop, the operation of finishing(treeing) was performed by workers and/or the capitalist there. The tree is a form over which a shoe is placed to be shaped, smoothed, cleansed and polished. In this way, the shoe becomes more attractive for marketing purposes.

### Class Processes and Individual Mobility

By the third or fourth decade of the 19th century, vast changes reshaped the capitalist class process of boot and shoe production. Initially, early capitalists performed many functions including actual labor, supervision, purchase of constant and variable capital, lending the original money form of capital and marketing. By the 1840's, new classes, fundamental and subsumed, arose to perform many of these functions.

Most obviously, the ranks of wage laborers and domestic workers grew. In the late 1840's, masses of Irish immigrants swelled the ranks of Randolph's growing proletariat. By the 1850's, capitalists in the Randolph boot and shoe industry no longer labored beside their employees. In addition, new subsumed groups, agents, managers, and the like, were developing to supervise and co-ordinate the decentralized production process.

The early capitalists relied on surpluses that they produced in the ancient process or that they garnered in the subsumed merchant process to start shoe production. By 1836, however, the Randolph Bank was incorporated with a capital stock of \$150,000. <sup>29</sup> The bank, or indeed the bankers constituted a new class subsumed to the capitalist class process (and others). The bankers would ofcourse lend money to some capitalists to expand the accumulation process -- to start new

firms or to expand old ones. It is important to point out that some of the most prosperous capitalists were simultaneously bankers; they actually started the bank with surpluses produced by capitalist boot and shoe production. Thus, they participated in two class process simultaneously. Royal Turner of Bass and Turner's general store was one of the bank's presidents during its early years.

With the exception of the Thayer brothers, most capitalists sold their finished commodities to wholesale merchants who would market them. Before the panic or depression of 1837, this arrangement involved long term credit extension for the capitalists. After this 1837 collapse of the credit structure, some capitalists began to take over the process of marketing their own shoes. They opened wholesale offices in Boston and/or retail stores, specializing in shoes, in other cities.<sup>30</sup> Here we see still more new subsumed classes-- salespersons, clerks, etc., created or expanded. They were directly employed by the capitalists. This change was more pronounced after 1850. For the first generation of capitalists--the group discussed in this paper-- only the Littlefield Brothers and the Tucker Brothers,<sup>31</sup> both originally merchant-general store owners, had Boston offices. There were four Littlefield brothers who it appears "divided the duty of capitalist, manufacturer and salesmen between them."<sup>32</sup>

These changes in the early process of boot and shoe production resulted from competition. They were the complex responses of new classes striving to secure their conditions of existence initially as non-capitalists, slowly as capitalists. Indeed, it was this very subtle process of experimentation that created the ongoing, changing, capitalist class process. The new class process is seen here as a result of interactions between and amongst individuals in classes. This understanding is presented in stark contrast to the mobility model. The latter approach gives center stage to the individual's desire for self improvement. This motivated individual operates in a laissez-faire environment, unbridled by government or

other individuals. In contrast, I am suggesting that it was the intricate course of social processes which created the avenues for this so called mobility, individual desire and initiative notwithstanding.

There is certainly another level upon which the mobility literature may be critiqued. For many years, the changing class positions of individuals over time (mobility) has been seized upon by academics and politicians as a justification for, or verification of the democratic character of the present class structure. But what types of "changing class positions" do they mean? Does the individual move from one fundamental class process to another or does s/he move to a different position within the same process? <sup>33</sup> For example, a serf or indentured servant may become a worker. In either position, however, the individual is still a direct producer and is still exploited by a class of surplus appropriators--lords or capitalists.

Another example, most commonly cited as evidence of mobility, would be individual movement within the same fundamental class process, i.e., worker to capitalist. In this case, the individual is no longer exploited, as a capitalist, s/he simply exploits other workers. The relationship of surplus expropriation has not changed.

It is important to note here that this movement of individuals from worker to capitalist was not prevalent during the pre-Civil War era--the era of the "common man." This was, as indicated here, a period of transition. Ofcourse the ranks of the nascent capitalist class were filled with individuals who had previously participated in one or many non-capitalist class processes. Capitalism, as a class process, was new, it had not always existed in the U.S. Therefore the individuals who eventually were to become capitalists by necessity came from other, non-capitalist classes, ancient producers or merchants. Most of the new capitalists were generally not workers <sup>34</sup> and certainly most workers never became capitalists.

Once again we confront vast methodological differences. We may examine a society through individuals' movements or through changing class processes constituted by redefined "individuals". The question of the nature and meaning

of the concept "individual" is a significant one and should be addressed by this group in the future. The remainder of this paper will deal with the implications of the history of the boot and shoe industry produced here for the "mobility" issue and the other two points raised in the introduction.

As we have seen, the deployment of concepts such as class processes and conditions of existence allows us to re-evaluate the idea of mobility. Can we consider an individual mobile if s/he moves from one position of class exploitation to another? Certainly the individual freedoms of a worker are different from those of a slave. But why call this mobility? Why is individual movement the object of great scrutiny when the relationship of class exploitation persists?

Individual mobility is the object or point of entry for many historians who assume that class relationships cannot, should not or will not change. To concern oneself with individual mobility in the past may well highlight this as an avenue for individual and social betterment today. Instead, to open the more potent question of changing class processes in the past might imply that the present class structure may be altered as well.

The focus on individuals, individual mobility and individuals as the embodiment of class processes prevails with some interesting results on the left. The capitalist class process has been viewed by some as simply the manifestation of the activities of individual capitalists. This approach handily supports the unfortunately simplistic good guy/bad guy formulations. Individuals are inherently allies or enemies depending upon their position in class processes. If the capitalist is an individual, then s/he can be easily singled out as the bad guy, the perpetrator of all evil, exploitation and oppression. The individuals who are in the working class are seen as saintly, special; they are idealized and patronized. Once we entertain the notion of a complex class process, it becomes more necessary to analyze the social formation and social change in greater depth.

The recognition of complexity, of the overdetermined nature of class processes

need not, on the other hand, lead to political quietism. Indeed, I believe it can offer much hope to those on the left presently wallowing in cynacism; those pointing their fingers here and there. If the left has made errors both here and abroad, so be it. We are developing powerful conceptual tools to understand these errors and to examine them in a non-deterministic setting. They might even have concrete implications for our future.

### On Models and Merchants

The last point I would like to address deals with the significance of the previously described "paths to capitalism".for the North American case. First, it is necessary to state that the question itself deserves more attention. Any comments or suggestions here are drawn from the shoe industry case of Randolph. We have seen that both merchants and ancient producers entered the capitalist class. Their different respective origins were important for the further development of capitalism, but neither group seemed to present barriers to the revolutionization of the production process. The general stores of the merchants became the central shops as did the workshops or barns of the ancient producers. The centralization process took place quickly and easily.

This is different from the English experience where merchants/capitalists, subsumed to feudalism blocked the centralization of production. In some instances they were forced to circumvent craft guilds in the towns, so they extended the decentralized putting out operations. In other instances, these merchants, beholden to feudal lords, would not or could not move domestic labor out of the countryside. In short, the conditions of existence of the feudal classprocess were secured differently in England than in the U.S. or North American colonies. Certainly some of the Randolph merchant/capitalists were subsumed to feudalism and slavery. But their subsumed functions in no way conflicted with their participation in the ongoing technical transformation of capitalist production.

Thus, the Way I/ Way II distinction does not appear to carry the same meaning or import at least for the boot and shoe industry of Randolph as it did for the textile industry of England.

One study of the boot and shoe capitalist production process of Lynn by  
35  
Alan Dawley maintains that it was these merchant/general store owners who pushed the development of capitalism furthest. This was possible, according to Dawley, because of their competitive advantages, they had easier access to market contacts, cash and supplies than most ancient producers. This might have been the case for Lynn, although it certainly wasn't for Randolph. Dawley insists that through competition, these general store merchants forced the eclipse of ancient producers who tried to enter capitalist production. In Randolph, however, it is clear that many of the capitalists that started boot and shoe production as late as 1840-50 were ancient  
36  
producers. Indeed, an interesting variation for the period after 1840 in Randolph was capitalist production of shoes organized by a partnership between a merchant  
37  
and an ancient producer.

Perhaps the lesson here is that careful analysis of specific conjunctural conditions is necessary at all times. Marx himself made the Way I/II distinction in passing, it was not a major issue for him. Dobb and others seized upon this device because it appeared to carry great explanatory powers for the English or West European case. To paraphrase Engels hopelessly out of context, "...more than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted."

### Last Words

I have attempted to show how one might use "primary source" material in a class theoretic framework. This is a first attempt, a first approximation. There are many issues discussed here which bear closer attention. There are many questions which come from the conclusions or suggestions made here. First, the question of the



"individual", at least the biological individual must be addressed more seriously by our group. Is the biological individual simply the cite of complex, overdetermined social processes ? How do we understand "individual " decisions within a class theoretic context ? Secondly, how is the development of new class processes affected by racial, ethnic or cultural differences ? Perhaps these differences, in certain conjunctures, act to secure the conditions of existence of class exploitation.

For example, it was only with the importation of black Africans to the North American colonies that the process of feudal indentured servitude was transformed for these Africans to slavery. The process of differentiation between ancient producers turned capitalists in Randolph was hastened at the time of the influx of the Irish. Maybe the availability of this foreign labor in a community that was previously culturally homogeneous, made the transition to new forms of class exploitation more palatable.

The questions are endless, as are their implications .

Notes

1. Much of the work here is based on an earlier paper: Rona S. Weiss, "The Transition to Industrial Capitalism: Workers and Entrepreneurs in Randolph, Massachusetts, 1800-1870" (Unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts, 1976) See Appendix I for sources used.
2. See for examples: Charles Hession and Hyman Sardy, Ascent to Affluence: A History of American Development (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971) Louis Hacker, The Triumph of American Capitalism, (New York: McGraw Hill Books, 1965)
3. For example see: Paul Faler, Mechanics and Manufacturers in the Early Industrial Revolution: Lynn Massachusetts, 1780-1860 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1981) Steven Thernstrom, Poverty and Progress (New York, Antheneum, 1974)
4. James Henretta, "The Study of Social Mobility: Ideological Assumptions and Conceptual Bias," Labor History, 18(1977) 165-178
5. Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff, "The Concept of Classes in Marxian Theory" (unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts, 1981) 37  
The revised version was published as "Classes in Marxian Theory" Review of Radical Political Economy Volume 13, #4, Winter, 1982, 1-18
6. Karl Marx, Capital, Volume III (New York: International Publishers, 1974) 334-335
7. Maurice Dobb, Studies in the Development of Capitalism (New York: International Publishers, 1970) Ch. IV, 123-176
8. Barrington Moore Jr. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966)
9. Perhaps a more significant problem for the development of U.S. capitalism was slavery, market production of the commodity cotton by the slave class process. Specifically, those capitalists dependent upon this commodity, their subsumed classes, as well as the classes subsumed to slavery, provided various economic, political and cultural barriers to the expansion of capitalism.
10. A.E. Sproul, "Randolph, Massachusetts" in D.H. Hurd, ed., The History of Norfolk County, Massachusetts (Philadelphia: J.W. Lewis and Co., 1884) Ch. XVII, 186
11. For a discussion of feudal relations in Massachusetts, see Rona S. Weiss, "The Development of the Market Economy in Colonial Massachusetts" (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1981), 42-51 and passim.
12. Ibid. 38-44, 73-98

13. A.E. Sproul, op. cit.
14. Margaret R. Pabst, "Agricultural Trends of the Connecticut River Valley Region of Massachusetts 1800-1900" Smith College Studies in History Volume 26, nos. 1-4, October 1940-July, 1941, 47-57
15. Rolla Tryon, Household Manufacture in the United States (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1917)
16. Blanche Hazard, The Organization of the Boot and Shoe Industry in Massachusetts Before 1875 (New York, August Kelly, 1968 ) 8-15
17. For a discussion of indentured servitude and apprenticeship as feudalism, see Rona S. Weiss, "The Development of the Market Economy..." op. cit. 42-51
18. For example, George Rogers Taylor, The Transportation Revolution (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951) John R. Commons, "American Shoemakers, 1648-1895, A Sketch of Industrial Evolution" Quarterly Journal of Economics Vol. 24, (Nov, 1909) 39-81
19. Hazard, op. cit. 13
20. Seth Bryant, Shoe and Leather Trade of the Last Hundred Years (Boston, Massachusetts, Seth Bryant, Ashmont Publishers, 1891) 41
21. A.E. Sproul, op.cit. 196
22. Population Schedules of the Fourth Census of the United States, 1820 (The National Archival and Research Service, General Service Administration)
23. Belcher Books Account books of a master craftsman, Ebenezer Belcher, for 1807-1844 of South Randolph, presently located at the Baker Business Library, Harvard University
24. Ibid.
25. In the 1840's, Randolph boot and shoe producers (capitalists) began to specialize, insome instances, in the production of boots for the miners of California and other western territories
26. For an excellent discussion of the changing technique of production in the boot and shoe industry see:  
Ross Thompson, "The Origin of Modern Industry in the United States: The Mechanization of Shoe and Sewing Production," (Unpublished Ph. D dissertation, Yale University, 1976)
27. Hazard, op. cit. 46
28. A.E. Sproul, op. cit. 207
29. Ibid. 202

30. W.H. Richardson, (ed.) The Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Assistant's Guide (Boston: Higgins, Bradley and Dayton, 1858) 16-17
31. Seth Bryant, op. cit. 50 , Hazard, op. cit. p.72
32. Hazard op. cit. 49
33. Rona S. Weiss, "The Development of the Market Economy..." op. cit. 25-29
34. There is evidence that some of the cutters or clickers, the most highly skilled workers became capitalists. As they worked in the central shops, close to the boss, sometimes they entered partnerships with these capitalists. The former cutter offered the knowledge of production to the partnership while the merchant/capitalist or ancient producer/capitalist had market contacts, etc.
35. Alan Dawley, Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1976) 26
36. Rona S. Weiss, "The Transition to Industrial Capitalism..." op. cit. .31
37. Ibid. 31.

Appendix I

I- Primary Sources

A- Oral

Ray McGerrigle, son and grandson of Randolph shoe businessmen  
May, 1974, in Randolph

B- Manuscripts

Belcher Books Account books of a master craftsman, Ebenezer Belcher  
for 1807-1844 in South Randolph, presently located at the Baker  
Library, Harvard University.

Dunn & Bradstreet's Records of a Credit-(Detective-Information)  
Agency(1846-79) for Norfolk County, Massachusetts. Presently located  
at the Baker Library, Harvard University.

Dyer Book Account Book of Adoniram J. Dyer, shoemaker of Randolph for  
1832-58, with a few diary entries. Presently at Baker Library,  
Harvard University.

Hollis Book Account book of Hosea Hollis, a Randolph shoemaker for  
1816-1843 Presently at Baker library, Harvard University.

Howard and French Books Account Book and Journal of Howard and French  
shoe firm for 1842-1855 in Randolph. Presently at Baker Library,  
Harvard University.

Maguire Papers Account books and letters of James Maguire and Company  
which had a Boston Office and Randolph factory, records for 1852-1870.  
Presently at Baker Library, Harvard University.

Turner Papers Account Book of R.W. Turner and Company, a general  
store turned shoe manufacturer central shop, owner, Turner had an  
interest in Hermitage Mining Company, records for 1842-1888.  
Presently at Baker Library, Harvard University.

Randolph Vital Records Book I. Births and Several Publishments copied  
by Grace Bonsall from the town records and from the diary of Dr. J.  
Wales (1798-1850). Presently at New England Historical Geneological  
Society, Boston, Massachusetts.

Randolph Vital Records 1844-1854 Register of Births, Marriages and  
Deaths in the town of Randolph. Presently at Stetson Hall in  
the town of Randolph.

Schedule of the Products of Industry in Randolph in the County of Norfolk,  
State of Massachusetts for the years ending 6/1/1850, 6/1/1860,  
6/1/1870. Presently at the State Archives, State House, Boston, Mass.

Appendix I

C- Government Documents

Louis McLane Report "Manufactures of the United States, 1831-32 by the Secretary of the Treasury" 22nd Congress, 1st Session, House Executive Document #308.

Statistics of the United States Collected and Returned by the Marshalls of the Several Judicial Districts Under the 13th Section of the act for taking the 6th Census conducted at the Department of State, 6/1/1840 (Washington , D.C. reprinted by Blair & Rivers 1841)

Statistics of the Conditions and Products of Certain Branches of Industry in Massachusetts for the years ending 4/1/1845, 6/1/1855, 5/1/1865 prepared by official returns of the Secretary of the Commonwealth .

The Census of Massachusetts -1875 prepared under the direction of Carroll D. Wright-chief of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor. Volume II Manufacturers and Occupations - 3rd Edition (Boston:Albert J. Wright- State Printer, 79 Milk Street, 1877)

Population Schedule of the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th Census of the United States for the years 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860, and 1870. (Washington D.C.:National Archives and Records Service, General Service Administration- Publication of the National Archives Micro Film Publication 1959-1967)

Town Report of Randolph 1835-51 Including the Report of the Treasury, School Committee and the Taxable Valuation of the Town for 1850.

D- Printed

Bartlett, William F., The Boot and Shoe Trade Containing a List of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers and Dealers in the U.S..(New York: William F. Bartlett, 1859)

Dockham's Shoe and Leather Directory of the Great Centers of the Trade in the U.S. 1876-1877 (Boston :C.A. Dockahm and Co. 242 Washington St. Boston, 1878)

Proceedings of the Convention of Manufacturers, Dealers and Operatives In the Shoe and Leather Trade in the State of Massachusetts. Held in Boston, March 1842. (Boston: Published by Saxon and Pierce, 133 Washington Street, 1842)

Richardson, W.H. Jr. Ed. The Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Assistant and Guide. (Boston : Higgins, Bradley and Daxton, 20 Washington St. 1858)

Sources (continued)

Appendix I

E- Newspapers

Alden, Ebenezer, "Historical Geneological Sketches of Randolph before 1800" in the Randolph Transcript 1857-1858.

New York Daily Tribune June 18, 1850 Microfilm Collection in the New York Public Library 521 West 43rd Street New York City .

Randolph Herald Souvenir Edition, July 2, 1968-- Randolph's 175th Anniversar

II-Secondary Sources

A- Books

Allen, Frederick Jr., The Shoe Industry (New York : Henry Holt and Company , 1922)

Bryant, Seth Shoe and Leather Trade of;the Last Hundred Years (Boston : Seth Bryant, Ashmont Publisher, 1891)

Butman, Reverand Harry A. History of the Town of Randolph, Massachusetts (Standard Massathusetts Printing Company, Brockton, Massachusetts, 1946)

Commons, John R., and Associates, History of Labor in the United States .. Volume I (New York : The Macmillian Company, 1918)

Faler, Paul, "Workingmen, Mechanics, and Social Change;Lynn Massachusetts 1800-1860", Unpublished Dissertation, University of Wisconsin 1971.

Hazard, Blanche, The Organization of the Boot and Shoe Industry of Massachusetts before 1875. (New York: August Kelly 1968, first published in 1921 by Harvard University Press)

Hoover, Edgar Location T heory and the Shoe Leather Industry. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1937)

Kier, Malcolm, Manufacturing Industries of America. (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1928)

Lebergott, Stanley , Manpower in Economic Growth and Development (New York :McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965)

Marx, Karl Capital., Volume I Part VII Chapters 26-33, Volume III Part IV, Chapters 16-20. (New York : International Publishers, 4th Printing, 1972)

McDermott, Charles, H. A History of the Shoe and Leather Industry of the United States. (Boston : John W. Deheney and Company, 1918)

Appendix I

Sources (continued)

Page, Joel, C. Recollections of Sixty Years in the Shoe and Leather Trade. (Boston, Massachusetts, The Arthur L. Evans Co., 1916)

Pred, Alan R., Spatial Dynamics of the United States Urban-Industrial Growth. 1800-1914. (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1966)

Quimby, Harold R., Pacemakers of Progress: The Story of Shoes and the Shoe Industry (Chicago, Illinois: Hide and Leather Publishing Company, 1946)

Ware, Norman The Industrial Worker 1840-1860., (Chicago Illinois: Quadrangle Books Incorporated, first paperback edition, 1964)  
Originally published Houghton Mifflin 1924.

Wilson, Harold Fisher, The Hill Country of Northern New England: Its Social and Economic History, 1790-1930. (New York :Ams. Press, Incorporated, 1967, first published 1936, Columbia University Press)

B- Articles

Commons, John R., "American Shoemakers, 1648-1895, A Sketch of Industrial Evolution ", Quarterly Journal of Economics " Volume 24, November 1909, pp.39-81.

Fox, Kenneth Paul, "Agricultural Productivity in the Context of Economic Development ", A Study of New England Agriculture 1800-1840. Unpublished Seminar Paper, University of Pennsylvania, 1968.

Jones, Frederick Mitchell , "Middlemen in the Domestic Trade of the United States 1800-1860" Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences Volume 21, Number 3., 1937.

Pabst, Margaret R., "Agricultural Trends in the Connecticut River Valley Region of Massachusetts 1800-1900" Smith College Studies in History Volume XXVI Numbers 1-4, October 1940-1941.

Rice, William B., "The Boot and Shoe Trade " Chapter 87 of Depew, Chauncey M. ed. One Hundred Years of American Commerce Volume II (New York: D.O. Hayes and Company 1895)

Sproul, A.E. , "Randolph, Massachusetts" in D.H. Hurd, ed., The History of Norfolk County, Massachusetts. (Philadelphia: J.W. Lewis and Company; 1884) Chapter XVIII pp. 188-222.

Weiss, Rona, "The United States and England: The Markets, Barriers and Primitive Accumulation- A Comparative Essay".-A Paper submitted Fall, 1974 at the University of Massachusetts- Economics Department

\_\_\_\_\_, "Once Upon a Times When the American Dream Came True: The Randolph Boot and Shoe Entrepreneurs in the Jacksonian Period" A Seminar Paper submitted Spring 1974, University of Massachusetts.



Appendix I

Sources (Continued)

Wooster, Harvey, "A Forgotten Factor in American Industrial History "  
American Economic Review XVI Number 1 (March, 1926) pp. 14-27

Journal of Political Economy XXXIV Number 1 (February, 1926) pp. 61-77.  
"Manufacturers and Artisans 1790- 1840"

Appendix II - Continuity and Change - Randolph Firms

The following charts try to show the entry, exit and life span of the boot or shoe firms of Randolph for the entire period of the study. The year at the top of each column (except the first one) indicates the latest year of entry, thus all firms in the 1850 column entered the trade no later than 1850. Continuity is shown by the horizontal reading of the chart. The numbers following the firm names are the number of male and female employees respectively for the year in question,  
NOTE: New partnerships are often shown by new names for the same firm.

\* \* \* \* \*

Early Period(1800-1840)	1850	1860	1870
H.B. Alden			
Silas Alden Sr.			
Silas Alden Jr.			
John Alden			
John Arnold			
John Belcher			
Jonathan W. Belcher			
David Burrell.....	Burrell&Maguire..... 85-43	Maguire 85-3	Maguire
Daniel Faxon			
Micah Faxon			
Thaddeus French			
Thomas French			
Littlefield Brothers			
Ephraim Lincoln.....	E, Lincoln 14-6		
Seth Mann			
Isaac Thayer			
Seth & Luther Thayer			
Tucker Brothers			
Turner and Bass			
" Tolman			
" Dubois			
<hr/>			
	William Abbott 30-10.....	William Abbot 12	
	H.B. Alden Jr. 113-57		
	Hiram Alden.....	Hiram Alden 21-6	
	John Alden.....	John Alden	
	26-10		
	John Adams.....	John Adams	
	12-6		
	Eldridge B. Arnold 4-2		
	Eleazer Beal 2-1		
	Henry Belcher 10-4		

Appendix II (Continued)

<u>1850</u>	<u>1860</u>	<u>1870</u>
John Belcher Jr.		
Thomas & A. Belcher		
David Blanchard 25-10		
Benjamin Bryant 5-2		
Stephen Cheesman 1-1	(out of business)	Stephen Cheesman 2-
Danforth Clark 3-1	Danforth Clark 2-1	Danforth Clark 0
Matthew Clark 29-14	Matthew Clark 50-3	Matthew Clark 25-2
John Curran 10-4	John Curran	
Asa Cushing 2-1		
George & John Cushing 2-1		
A & S Derby 7-3		
Daniel Faxon 12-6		
Charles & Luther French 9-4	Charles & Luther French 9-2	
Sidney French		
(Alexstrong's) 46-22	Alex Strong's 88-15	Alex Strong's 75-25
Elijah Hayden 14-7		
Caleb S. Holbrook 75-36	Caleb S. Holbrook 25-5	
Elisha Holbrook 60-60		
Ludovicious Holbrook 1-1		
Howard & French 31-14	Howard & French 60-15	Howard & French 35-3
Daniel Howard 22-10	Daniel Howard 85-6	Daniel Howard 50-5
George W. Jones 3-2		
Amasa Joy 1-1		
John W. Kelly 5-2	John W. Kelly 3-0	John W. Kelly 2-0
Daniel Kennison 1-1		
Barnabus Lathrop 1		
Caleb Lathrop		
Oliver H. Leach 6-4	Oliver H. Leach 12-3	Oliver H. Leach 10-6
Joseph Leeds 25-14	Joseph Leeds 20-10	
Levi Mann 36-15		
Warren Mann 2-2	Warren Mann 2-2	
Charles McCarty 3-2	Charles McCarty 2-1	Charles McCarty 15-2
Thomas Moren 2-1	Thomas Moren 9-3	
Isaac Niles 12-10	Isaac Niles 8-3	
Jacob Niles 30-12		
Ira Odell 3-2		
George W. Paine 4-3	George W. Paine 10-3	George W. Paine 8-1
Charles H. Paine 4-2		
Levi Paine 7-3		
Silas Paine 6-2		
David Parker 45-20	David Parker	
Benjamin Payne 9-1	(out of business)	Benjamin Payne 6-0
Darius L. Paine 26-13	(out of business)	
Nathan Pendergrass 1-1		N. Pendergrass
Henry Pratt 12-10	Henry Pratt 9-2	
Cornelius Ryan 6-2	Cornelius Ryan 16-3	
Adoniram Smith 12-4	Adoniram Smith 25-3	Adoniram Smith 20-0
George Smith 5-2		
George N. Spear 15-7	George N. Spear 27-0	
Asa Thayer 9-4		
Geo. W. Thayer 2-1	Geo. W. Thayer 5-0	

Appendix II (Continued)

1850

Joel Thayer 11-6  
 Jonathan E. Thayer 37-15  
 Washington Thayer 6-3  
 Samuel A. Vining 11-4.....  
 Erastus Wales 36-12  
 Abner Welcome .....  
 Wales Wentworth & Don 16-6...  
 Alfred W. Whitcomb 63-25...  
 Joseph Whitcomb 8-4  
 Lemuel S. Whitcomb 30-14  
 Lewis Whitcomb 30-12.....  
 Simeon L. Whitcomb 8-4  
 Isaac W. White  
 Jonathan White 18-8  
 David White 7-3 .....  
 Jarius White 16-8  
 Thomas White 28-12 .....  
 Harrison Whittenmore 7-3  
 Ludovicious Wild 10-5.....

1860

.....Samuel A. Vining 29-41.....  
 .....Abner Welcome  
 .....Wales Wentworth & Son 40  
 .....Alfred W. Whitcomb 28-0 ..  
 .....Lewis Whitcomb 18  
 White & Whitcomb 22-16  
 David White 12-4  
 Thomas White 20-5 .....  
 Ludovicious Wild 13-9.....  
 Washington L. Bates 8-3 ..  
 Charles L. Belcher 14-4  
 John P. Blanchard 24-7  
 Calvin French 9-16.....  
 Charles B. French 11  
 Thomas Hill  
 E.E. Holbrook 17-8 .....  
 John L. Howard 22-13  
 John Hunt 20-5  
 A.W. Kingman 45-15  
 R.T. Pratt 2-0.....  
 W.A. Ransom 27-12  
 G.A.&W.F. Reynolds 20-10  
 J. Snow & Co. 20-7  
 Edward Thayer 10-0  
 E.Wales Thayer 4-2 .....  
 Horatio Thayer 20-10  
 James A. Tower 43-4  
 George W. Wales 30-4  
 Edmund White 24-0  
 Newton White 3-0

1870

Samuel A. Vining 35-4  
 Alfred W. Whitcomb 28  
 Thomas White 65-10  
 Ludovicious Wild 14-0  
 Washington L. Bates  
 15-5  
 Calvin French 15-0  
 E.E. Holbrook 8-  
 R.T. Pratt 7 -0  
 G.A.&W.F. Reynolds  
 10-2  
 E.Wales Thayer 35-1  
 Edmund White  
 Newton White 12-1  
 C.H. Belcher 25  
 Elisha Belcher  
 J. Warren Belcher 30-5  
 F.A. Bigelow 8-0  
 David Blanchard Jr.  
 20-5  
 J.M. Capen 5-3  
 S.A. Capon 25-7  
 R.P. Chandler 4-0  
 Hugh Clark 13-0

Appendix II (Continued)

1370

Claffin & Thayer 51-5  
Cressy, Mann & Bracket 25-3  
John P. Curran 6  
James F. Curtis 3-1  
W. Donavan  
Farrell & Sheriden  
Micah B. Faxon 3-4  
John T. Flood 12-0  
Joseph W. French  
L.E. French & Son 14-5  
James Frizzel & Ero. 12-4  
William Gibbins 4-3  
R.H. Gay 10-0  
Ed. P. Hand 2-0  
E.F. Hayden 10-1  
W. Hayes 10-0  
Geo. W. Holbrook  
Holbrook & French 16-8  
C.H. Howard 50-10  
Leo James 6-0  
John Kane 4-0  
Daniel Leahy  
Thomas Lynch 3-25  
McGrath Borthers 1-1  
Nelson Mann  
Dennis Milliken 2-0  
H.&C. Newcomb 25-0  
H.P. Niles 5-0  
J.W. Paine 5-0  
Royal Ram 4-0  
O. Pendergrass 25-2  
Sylvanus Pratt 0  
Thomas Purcell 20-1  
Simon O'Brien  
Nathaniel P. Sprague 6-0  
Royal T. Stetson 0  
W.B. Thayer 27-8  
Thayer & Holbrook 25-2  
John Underhog 12-1  
Whitcomb & Paine 50  
White & Sprague 15-1

AESA DISCUSSION PAPERS AS OF NOVEMBER 1983

1. "The Theory of Commodity Fetishism and the Social Constitution of Individuals", by Jack Amariglio and Antonio Callari.
2. "The Value of African Labor-Power in South Africa: 1948-1978", by Fred Curtis.
3. "Adam Smith, the Theory of Value, and the History of Economic Thought", by Antonio Callari.
4. "Genovese and the Slave Mode of Production: A Marxian Critique", by Susan F. Feiner.
5. "Marx and Freud: Brothers in Overdetermination", by Harriet Fraad.
6. "Structure and Contradictions of Primitive Communism in Pre-Sixteenth Century West Africa", by Rolf Jenson.
7. "Towards a Class Analysis of the Relationship between Corporations and Banks", by E. Thomas Kuh.
8. "Some Comments on the Construction of Paradigms of Social Development", by Joseph E. Medley.
9. "The Accumulation of Capital as Historical Essence: A Critique of the Theory of Monopoly Capitalism", by Bruce Norton.
10. "Towards a Nonessentialist Class Consciousness", by Elizabeth Oakes.
11. "A Contribution Towards an Alternative Marxian Theory of Fixed Capital", by Bruce B. Roberts.
12. "Marx's Theory of Money: A Reinterpretation", by John T. Roche.
13. "Social Theory and Socialist Economic Planning: A Critique of Optimal Planning Theory", by David F. Ruccio.
14. "The Origins of the Capitalist Class Process in the United States: The Early Massachusetts Boot and Shoe Industry", by Rona S. Weiss.
15. "A Marxian Reconceptualization of Income Distribution", by Richard Wolff and Stephen Resnick.

For reprints, please send \$1 per copy to:

AESA  
Economics Department  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA. 01003