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peut comprendre, et l’auteur le souligne, que des pratiques associées à l’économie de marché, comme la comptabilité dont les agents de l’État soulignaient l’importance, aient encore bien peu d’adeptes en fin de période. La question des pratiques culturales aurait mérité un traitement un peu plus approfondi, un défi que les sources utilisées ne permettaient probablement pas de relever.

Ces quelques remarques ne font que montrer la complexité des études sur l’évolution de l’agriculture. Elles n’enlèvent rien aux conclusions intéressantes de l’étude de Régis Thibault sur les transformations de l’agriculture et les disparités régionales et intra-régionales. Les nuances et les paradoxes observés permettent surtout de relativiser les écarts dans le rythme des changements et rappellent que la transformation de l’agriculture dans une société traditionnelle est un processus de longue haleine.

NORMAND PERRON
Institut national de la recherche scientifique


Robert B. Kristofferson’s Craft Capitalism investigates craftworker culture in the early industrialization of Hamilton, Ontario. Specifically, Kristofferson outlines the social relations associated with craft culture between 1840 and 1872. By highlighting an alternate, non-revolutionary path towards industrialization, he develops a compelling case for revising the received view of the transition towards modern industry.

Laying the foundation for a thoughtful analysis, Craft Capitalism begins with a literary overview. Kristofferson skilfully situates his work within the relevant historiography, exploring the social consequences of industrialization in general, and the Canadian experience in particular. What emerges is an academic discipline struggling to shed the vestiges of past conceptions of a singular, revolutionary path towards modern capitalist economies. The cruelties of capitalism are almost always portrayed as instant sources of worker alienation through the dispossession of the means of production. While there have been recent challenges to the orthodoxy of the dispossession model, Kristofferson argues that they remain “ultimately rooted in the same teleology and
determinism as the scholarship they revise” (p.4). Instead, he suggests that historians should re-examine the social relations of industrialization. This, Kristofferson urges, will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of industrialization as a process that manifests itself in a variety of ways, each deserving of historical analysis. In the case of Hamilton, the social dimensions of craftworkers’ experience amid early industrialization reveal that there can exist “another craft-based road to industrialization that is not revolutionary at all” (p.18-19).

Craft Capitalism follows a clear and logical structure. The book’s seven chapters contribute to Kristofferson’s purpose of promoting a “profound reconsideration of class formation” (p.18). Furthermore, Kristofferson explicitly lays out the work’s format, intentions, and methods in the introduction, thereby eliminating any possibility of confusion or surprise. Chapter one introduces the reader to 1870’s Hamilton, a leading Canadian industrial centre. Interestingly, the city’s dominant form of industrial proprietorship at this time was the small enterprise, employing five workers or less. The vast majority of the skilled workers were foreigners attempting to escape the ravages of capitalist mass production in their home countries. Industrial proprietors primarily rose from the ranks of craft journeymen, providing young craftworkers with the strong yet practicable aspiration to achieve similar status in their own careers. Class mobility was thus an omnipresent feature of craft capitalism. The persistence of traditional master-worker camaraderie, characteristic of conventional craft culture, was another defining facet of Hamilton’s craft scene. Novel features began to materialize, however, as the craft tradition operated within an increasingly modern, capitalist economy. Kristofferson identifies the craft community’s emphasis on the virtues of being self-made and self-improving as two crucial examples of such emergent features. Craft Capitalism culminates with a discussion of the Nine Hours Movement, the quintessential manifestation of craft capitalism’s condition in 1872.

Kristofferson rejects typical accounts of worker proletarianization because they overlook the fascinating period of early industrialization during which craftworkers optimistically straddled both capitalist and non-capitalist worlds. This “transmodalism” was characterized by the persistence of residual elements of the craft tradition, as well as emergent features resulting from the changing economic climate. As such, Hamilton craftworkers experienced the benefits of craft mobility and
master-worker mutualism of the craft world. Many also gained the independence, wealth, and prestige enabled by an increasingly capitalist atmosphere.

Kristofferson’s analysis draws upon wide-ranging sources, creating a comprehensive portrait of craft capitalism. Local newspapers, the Industrial Schedules of the 1871 Census of Canada, city directories, credit records, commissioned biographies, industrial promotion materials, government and trade union journals, as well as personal papers and diaries all contribute to Kristofferson’s study. For the most part, this produces a rich analysis replete with examples from diverse industrial sectors. In some cases, however, the author seems too quick to interpret these sources literally rather than deciphering their underlying meanings. For example, Kristofferson ignores the possibility that public statements issued by those affected by the Nine Hours Movement might reflect strategic positions rather than firm convictions. Thankfully, however, Kristofferson makes transparency a priority in his work. While his analysis may sometimes verge on the speculative, Kristofferson crafts an intelligent investigation from a multitude of persuasive and diverse sources.

While diversity is a virtue with respect to historical sources, *Craft Capitalism* faces the challenge of characterizing a broad social group. “Craftsworker,” of course, denotes a massive category encompassing all types of manufacturers and skilled workers. Kristofferson unites these individuals in their experience of industrialization by extrapolating from specific cases. Some sections of the book document the experience of a particular kind of craftsworker. For example, when discussing the culture of self-improvement in Hamilton, the author centres his analysis upon the Hamilton & Gore Mechanics’ Institute. While this may feel unnatural at times, this is not actually a weak point. Rather it is an expected result of exploring uncharted territory. In doing so, Kristofferson lays the groundwork for future directions for critical study. The various factions that make up craftworkers need to be disentangled by future generations of historians. Similarly, the supporting cast of women, children, the tavern and the church are new research directions Kristofferson offers as natural extensions to his work.

The implications of Kristofferson’s work transcend mid-nineteenth century Hamilton. The transmodal milieu of craftworkers in Hamilton’s early industrial period illustrates how changes in society produce
pervasive social effects. Through processes such as technological innovation and globalization, modern society is characterized by increasingly rapid change. This inevitably exerts pressure on social relations. By demonstrating that younger generations derive expectations based on the experience of the older generation, and what effects this may have, *Craft Capitalism* raises important questions. What happens when change is so rapid that generations become disconnected in their experiences? Where will younger generations turn to for role models?

By illustrating how craftworkers prospered during the early days of industrial Hamilton, Kristofferson’s *Craft Capitalism* makes an important contribution to the social history of industrialization in Canada. Misconceptions about the path to industrial economies ought to be dispelled in order to enhance our understanding of the more subtle social consequences of transitional periods in history. *Craft Capitalism* is a valuable resource for seasoned historians and amateurs alike.

**JULIA AGAPITOS**

*University of Toronto*

---

**Medicine / Médecine**


Après un rappel des débuts de la chirurgie militaire, les premiers chapitres de l’ouvrage de Bill Rawling offrent un résumé de son évolution au Canada de 1812 aux rébellions métisses. Les principaux progrès sont alors ceux de la médecine préventive (civile), mais à l’approche du 20e siècle, le besoin d’un corps de médecine militaire se fait sentir pour répondre aux besoins de l’armée. Dans ces chapitres, dominent donc les effets des découvertes fondamentales du 19e siècle, y compris l’asepsie, l’anesthésie et la microbiologie. Cela dit, jusqu’à la Première Guerre mondiale, l’organisation médicale militaire demeure quelque peu théorique : même durant la campagne contre les Boers, les médecins militaires luttent surtout contre la contagion. Cette époque est tout de même celle de la reconnaissance, qui passe par la nomination d’un *Surgeon General* en 1885, par la création d’un état-major médical en 1898-1899 et par l’*Army Medical Department* de 1904. Le premier hôpital de campagne canadien date de 1885.