

The Ten-Hour Movement and the Massachusetts State Legislative Election in 1845

Yukako HISADA

In the 1840s massive petitions were submitted to the General Court of Massachusetts requesting the passage of a law regulating a ten-hour day for work. While the ten-hour movement in Massachusetts began to build up momentum, the New England Workingmen's Association was created in the fall of 1844. Despite its name "workingmen," the organization accepted women delegates from the mill towns, including Sarah Bagley and Huldah J. Stone from Lowell.¹ In January of 1845 Lowell factory workers organized their own organization: the Lowell Female Labor Reform Association (LFLRA). While the LFLRA started with only twelve members, within six months the membership amounted to nearly 500 persons.² Many of the petitioners were women factory workers from mill towns, such as Lowell, Andover, and Fall River, declaring that they were forced to work from thirteen to fourteen hours a day in unhealthy working conditions. In response to the petitions, the state legislature created a special joint committee to investigate their working conditions, and the committee held a hearing from the petitioners from the city of Lowell and visited Lowell to examine the factories in 1845. Although the committee sympathized with their working conditions, they concluded that any further legislative action was not necessary at that point.³

While petitioning was the only political right for women to execute under the U.S. Constitution in the antebellum period because they had no right to vote, some women in Lowell seemingly stepped out of their "proper sphere" and became involved in partisan politics, especially after their tactics of petitioning the legislature failed. This paper explores how the state legislature made the decision in 1845 and how the factory workers responded to it.

While many historians had already studied the mill workers and the ten-hour movement in Lowell, they mainly based their works on the organ the *Voice of Industry*, and few works were based on local newspapers.⁴ Therefore, closely looking at contemporary local newspapers might shed light on the details of what really happened then.

According to the report of the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts General Court in 1845, the total number of names in the four petitions submitted to the legislature was 2,139, of which 1,151 were from Lowell, and a large proportion of Lowell petitioners were women. Others were 489 male citizens from Fall River, and the rest were from Andover, of which one half were women. One of two petitions from Lowell requested “a law providing that ten hours shall constitute a day’s work, and that no corporation or private citizen shall be allowed, except in cases of emergency, to employ one set of hands more than ten hours per day,” and the other requested “the enactment of a law making ten hours a day’s work, where no specific agreement is entered into between the parties.” The petitions from Andover and Fall River were asking for “the passage of a law to constitute ten hours a day’s work in *all corporations* created by the Legislature.”⁵

On February 13th, the special joint committee held a hearing from the petitioners from Lowell, and the petitioners were summoned to appear before the committee. Those who were summoned were John Q. A. Thayer, Gilman Gale, Herman Abbott, Elizabeth Rowe, Sarah Moulten, and Nancy R. Morse. For male witnesses, the petitioners whose names were on the top of the petition were summoned while female witnesses were not,⁶ and while all male witnesses appeared, two of the three women who were summoned gave no testimony and other five women testified instead. Those who testified were John Quincy Adams Thayer, Gilman Gale, Herman Abbott, Shubael P. Adams, and Isaac Cooper, and Sarah G. Bagley, Olive J. Clark, Eliza R. Hemmingway, Judith Payne, Celicia Phillips, and Elizabeth Rowe. While Thayer heard many complaints of the long hours from the workers and drafted

the petition, he had never worked in a cotton or woolen mill but worked in a big machine shop. Other male witnesses were not rank-and-file factory workers, either. Gale was a member of the city council and a provision-store keeper, testifying that the time allowed the factory workers for meals was short, which “he thought the greatest evil.” Abbott had worked in the Lawrence Corporation for thirteen years and worked in a room with forty-two girls. Although the report does not refer to his position in the corporation, considering the sexual division of labor in the mills, he was seemingly an overseer or held another supervising position in the mill. He testified that he had “never heard much complaint among the factory girls about the long hours” and “never heard the subject spoken of in the mills.” He even spoke of the girls who waited in front of the gate long before the working hour started. Adams and Cooper did not sign their names in the petition but were the members of the House of the Representatives from Lowell. Adams had worked in a machine shop with about 350 workers, and Cooper had “worked as an overseer in the Lawrence Cotton Mills for nine years.” Cooper testified that the women workers enjoyed their good health, and that of the girls he had known since 1837 only one girl left Lowell for home to die.⁷

Women’s testimonies, by contrast, were all from the factory workers whose working experiences varied from 16 months to 8 and a half years. Bagley was an experienced weaver working for six years and a half in the Hamilton and two years in the Middlesex Corporations. She was one of the leaders of the ten-hour movement, as we will discuss later. Payne testified that she came to Lowell sixteen years previously and started working in the Merrimack Mills. After working one year and a half, however, she left there because of her ill health, and she had been sick most of time while she was out of work. Seven years previously she was back to work as a weaver in the Boott Mills and remained ever since—in total Payne worked in the factories for eight and a half years. Clark had worked as a spinner for five years in the Lawrence Corporation, and Phillips worked for four years. Hemmingway worked as a weaver for two years and nine months; 2 years in the Middlesex and 9 months in the Hamilton. Rowe worked as a weaver in the Lawrence for 16 months. Most of them complained about long working hours and short

mealtime, while the least-experienced, Rowe testified that she had heard very few of her co-workers complain about “the hours of labor being too long.”⁸

On Saturday the 1st of March some members of the special committee visited Lowell factories after a one-hour train ride from Boston. They observed “the general appearance of the operatives therein employed” and concluded that their working environment was quite good and they were good in health in general. The impressions of Lowell factories they derived from the visit was similar to that of Charles Dickens in his *American Notes* published a few years earlier.⁹ Although the committee admitted that the hours of labor per week in Britain were limited by the act of Parliament to 69, or 11 and a half hours per day, they pointed out that they could not compare the circumstances of Britain and Lowell easily because in Lowell a permanent working class never existed, child labor was rare, and factory workers were well-educated:

The one [in Britain] is a manufacturing population, in the *strict* sense of the word, the other [in Lowell] is not. There, the whole family go into the mills as soon as they have sufficient bodily strength to earn a penny. They never come out until they die. Very little attention is paid to their moral or physical culture, and, as has been proved by facts ascertained by commissioners appointed by Parliament, few can read or write, and unless they have attended Sabbath schools, few obtain any knowledge of the Bible or of the Christian religion.

In Lowell, but very few (in some mills none at all) enter into the factories under the *age of fifteen*. None under that age can be admitted, unless they bring a certificate from the school teacher, that he or she attended school at least three months during the preceding twelve.¹⁰

The committee also collected some statistics and reports from Lowell factories, and reached the conclusion unanimously “that legislation is not necessary at the present time” for the following reasons. First of all, the enactment “should be of a general nature” and “should apply to individuals or co-partnerships as well as the corporation” of which working conditions

varied. Therefore in their theory, they would not be able to regulate the working hours only for the corporations nor for every individual or organization in Massachusetts. Secondly, they believed that the factory system was not “more injurious to health than other kinds of indoor labor,” and no other states in the United States did restrict the working hours.¹¹ The third reason seems rather honest for those who were concerned about the Massachusetts economy:

It would be impossible to legislate to restrict the hours of labor, without affecting very materially the question of wages; and that is a matter which experience has taught us can be better regulated by the parties themselves than by the Legislature. Labor in Massachusetts is a very different commodity from what it is in foreign countries. Here labor is on an equality with capital, and indeed controls it, and so it ever will be while free education and free constitutions exist. And although we may find fault, and say, that labor works too many hours, and labor is too severely tasked, yet if we attempt by legislation to enter within orbit and interfere with its plans, we will be told to keep clear and to mind our own business. Labor is intelligent enough to make its own bargains, and look out for its own interest without any interference from us....¹²

Before reaching this conclusion, they expressed their sympathy with Lowell factory workers who requested shorter working hours. They admitted that there were abuses in factories and that the corporations should make improvements, while suggesting they would not like to interfere in the business themselves:

We think that it would be better if the hours for labor were less,—if more time was allowed for meals, if more attention was paid to ventilation and pure air in our manufactories, and work-shops, and many other matters. We acknowledge all this, but we say, the remedy is not with us.... Your committee, therefore, while they agree with the petitioners in their desire to lessen the burdens imposed upon labor, differ only as to the

means by which these burdens are sought to be removed.¹³

The chair of the special committee was William Schouler, a Whig representative from Lowell, the editor of a local newspaper, the *Lowell Courier*, and the proprietor of the *Lowell Offering*, a literary magazine edited by and written for female factory operatives. After the report was published, the factory workers started attacking Schouler in the labor paper, the *Voice of Industry*.

And this same editor [Schouler] is the tool sent by the Lowell Corporations to the Massachusetts Legislator, to uphold and foster those rotten hearted inhuman institutions; who can legislate and give them power to require *twelve or thirteen* hours labor of their operatives—and *this is all just*—but when seven or eight thousand operatives ask these priviledges taken away, or the number of hours reduced—“*this is a subject upon which we cannot legislate*”—and this man the conductor of a public journal which professes to protect the peoples [sic] rights—“a whig of 76!”¹⁴

Consequently, the *Lowell Offering* and its editor Harriet Farley became the targets of their attack. Sarah Bagley, who was one of the leaders of the ten-hour movement and a witness in the hearing, criticized Farley and the *Offering* in her speech at the workingmen’s meeting in Woburn on the Fourth of July in 1845, referring that “she had written article [sic] in the condition of the operatives [for the *Lowell Offering*], and their insertion had been invariably REFUSED!”¹⁵ A local Democratic paper, the *Lowell Advertiser* picked up Bagley’s statement,¹⁶ and after this news story was published, Farley started her refutation in the *Advertiser* that they had never received articles from Bagley that they refused to publish.¹⁷ Then, Bagley joined in the controversy,¹⁸ accusing that “the Offering had *never* been a medium of defence [sic] against oppressive rules for the operatives and that Farley was “a mouth-piece for the Corporations.”¹⁹ Farley and Bagley continued to send their correspondence to the editor of the *Advertiser* until early August.

Thomas Dublin analyzed two groups of factory workers that Bagley and Farley each represented, applying a tripartite typology of workers in the industrial revolution—traditionalists, loyalists, and rebels, and he classified Farley as loyalist and Bagley as rebel.²⁰ This typological analysis has been criticized,²¹ and it is time for us to reconsider them in a different context: their political orientation, Whig or Democrat. Since women were disfranchised in those days, this may sound a long way off the mark, but recent scholarship shows women as well as men were involved in partisan politics in the antebellum period even though women had no right to vote.²²

The factory workers' attack against Schouler developed into a Do-Not-Vote campaign against Schouler in the Massachusetts State legislative election in the fall of 1845. In the meeting of the New England Workingmen's Association, as a representative of the Female Labor Reform Association of Lowell, Sarah Bagley urged the male factory workers to take political action for their cause while she and her female colleagues promised to give them full support as women:

For the last half a century, it has been deemed a violation of woman's sphere to appear before the public as a speaker; but when our rights are trampled upon and we appeal in vain to legislators, what shall we do but appeal to the people? Shall not our voice be heard, and our rights acknowledged here; shall it be said against the daughters of New England, that they have no political rights and are not subject to legislative action? It is for the workingmen of this country to answer these questions—what shall we expect at your hands in future? ...

We do not expect to enter the field as soldiers in this great warfare; but we would like the heroines of the Revolution, be permitted to furnish the soldiers with a blanket or replenish their knapsack from our pantries.

We claim no exalted place in your deliberations, nor do we expect to be instrumental of any great revolutions, yet we would not sit idly down and fold our hands and refuse to do the little that we may and ought to. We expect to see the revolution commenced, recorded among the revolutions of the past, and the name of a Channing, Brisbane,

Rykeman, Repley, Owen, Walsh, and a host of others, recorded with that of Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington, on the pages of History.²³

The Democrats acted harmoniously with the factory workers, and the *Lowell Advertiser* carried an article attacking the report that Schouler compiled in September of 1845.

We do not understand how a man can say that “labor here is on an equality with capital, and indeed controls it,” after having just said “that there are abuses in the present system of labor; that it *should not be so severely TASKED* as it now is; that it would be better if the *hours for labor were less*—if more times was allowed for meals,” &c.; and also with the names of over two thousand laborers before him, while writing the sentence, asking the Legislature to interfere and protect them from [sic] the *abuses* of capital....

If labor controls capital, how can capital abuse labor? Why do not laborers reform the abuses of which they complain, instead of applying for protection to a Legislature that tells them they are *abused*, but that the Legislature *can't help them!*²⁴

We can find several articles on the negative campaign against Schouler in the *Advertiser*, and at least the failure of the ten-hour petitions was utilized in the Democratic campaign quite effectively.

Citizens of Lowell, on Monday next you will be called upon to discharge a most important duty. The question is then to be decided whether the Democratic or Federal policy shall triumph in our beloved commonwealth. Whether business, that should be alike free and open to all, shall be swallowed up by corporate monopolies, regardless of the interests, wishes, and positive instructions of the people.—Whether the interests and wishes of the few only shall be respected, and those of the many wholly disregarded and set at defiance.

There is hardly a question that comes before our legislature, but that

in some degree, involves these considerations. It is for you to decide whether your servants shall be the servants of the people, or servants and tools of corporate wealth! ...

WORKINGMEN, do you remember the fate of YOUR PETITIONS!!

MEN in favor of railroads, independent of existing corporations, DO YOU REMEMBER THE FATE OF YOUR PETITIONS!!

Choose Democrats, and your interests and wishes will be respected.²⁵

The *Voice of Industry* reported the result of the election as follows:

The trial for Representatives in this city resulted in the choice of only five of nine to which we are entitled, viz: Leonard Huntress, Gilman N. Nichols, Cornelius W. Blanchard, Sidney Spanding, and Benjamin Wilde. Our neighbor Schouler, editor of the corporation organ of this city, received a very *polite* invitation by the voters of Lowell, to stay at home this winter, or at least not to go to Boston on their expense. Although we are no party politician, and have but little sympathy with much of the political gambling of the day, yet we feel a degree of satisfaction in the defeat of a man who has proved so false to the interests of the workingmen and women of Lowell. The course pursued by Mr. Schouler in the last Legislature was of the most vacillating character, and enough to destroy the confidence of any community.—The insulting manner he treated the petitions for a reduction of the hours of labor fresh from the hands of the hard working operatives, after acknowledging their claim, by telling them that *it is a subject upon which we cannot legislate*, but that they must wait for the *improvements in society* and an *increase of the more benevolent feelings of our natures* to accomplish the object—thereby acknowledging manufacturers to be unjust in their requirements and without humanity enough *at present*, to deal justly, and that he had not sufficient moral courage to urge the claims of the oppressed portion of his constituents should not soon be forgotten by the industrious portion of our citizens. We have no disposition to speak rashly of Mr. Schouler, but deem it our duty as an

advocate of the “peoples’ rights” to show his true standing in relation to capital and labor.²⁶

The *Advertiser* published the same result as follows, emphasizing the efforts of the factory workers:

The result of Lowell proves to be very much as we anticipated....

We told Col. Schouler he could not be selected, and are surprised that he should himself consent to run, or that his friends should consent to have him. They well knew that their party was divided upon the railroad question, and that the workingmen would not only give them “cold-shoulder” [sic], but exert themselves to their utmost to defeat a portion of one of the whig tickets.²⁷

The City of Lowell could have sent nine Representatives to the House, but only five candidates secured enough votes to be elected while there were four vacancies. According to the *Lowell Daily Courier*, all five Whig candidates won the election because of what was called “a Railroad Ticket” and they took the seats of the regular Whig candidates including Schouler.²⁸

As the *Lowell Advertiser* admitted, behind their defeat there was a question relating to the railroad rights and interests among the Whigs.²⁹ Furthermore, a faction of the Democrats called “Locofoco” gained a profit from the sidelines. Two weeks later, the by-election to fill the vacancies was held in Lowell, in which one Whig candidate George A. Butterfield was elected but Schouler and two other Whigs defeated, not securing the necessary number of the votes.³⁰ This meant three vacancies left in the House of Representatives.

While there were other factors within his party behind the defeat of Schouler,³¹ his political opponents emphasized women workers’ contribution to his defeat. The *Voice of Industry* published the resolution of the Lowell Female Labor Reform Association while it reported briefly the result of the election:

We are requested to publish the following Resolution, unanimously

adopted by the “Female Labor Reform Association” at their last meeting, as a token of respect and esteem for the service of Mr. Schouler, in behalf of the operatives of this city.

Resolved, That the member of this Association, tender their grateful acknowledgements to the voters of Lowell, for consigning Wm. Schouler, to the obscurity he so justly deserves, for treating so unjustly and ungentlemanly, the defense made by the delegates of the Association, before the special committee of the Legislature, to whom was referred petitions for the reduction of hours of labor, of which he was Chairman.³²

After the election, Schouler traveled to Europe in May of 1846. His colleague William Stevens Robinson, who took the editorship of his Lowell newspaper and was to be married to a former Lowell factory worker Harriet Jane Hanson,³³ wrote to him, notifying him of what the newspapers wrote about him with some clippings of the newspapers:

Dear Schouler, See what people say of you after you are gone! In the first place see what Miss Bagley of the Voice of Industry says:

Col. Schouler has left for a tour to Europe. We trust he will see Lord Ashley, and imbibe some of his Democracy on the “Ten Hour Bill.” It is very desirable that he should find out some means by which *Massachusetts can legislate for Labor* and protect the operative.

... Col. Schouler, of the Lowell Journal, sailing for Europe on the 21st.... It appears to us that all military heroes should be at home waiting orders in these times of war. The Col. goes for the old motto, “He that fights and runs away,

Is he left to fight another day.” *Essex Banner*....

The balance is decidedly in your favor. The Essex Banner is stupid, but perhaps the Voice’s notice may be useful....³⁴

How did this Do-Not-Vote campaign against Schouler work in their ten-hour movement? If Schouler had been really the ringleader who rejected the petitions, the factory workers would have triumphed, but he seemed only to act in concert with other Whig members of the committee. The tactics that the female factory workers used to persuade their male colleagues not to vote for Schouler was so effective that his political opponents—both the Democrats and the Whigs—also took the advantage from them. It was impossible, however, for the factory workers to get the ten-hour law passed then because the Whigs secured a majority in the state legislature and most of the manufacturing interest was important to most of them.

They kept submitting petitions to the legislature after this incident, but the ten-hour law was not legislated in Massachusetts until 1874. Meanwhile, the labor force shifted from native-born farmers' daughters to Irish immigrants, and most of the workers who were involved in the campaign left the factories and never came back. The labor protests passed on to immigrant workers of different generation.³⁵

Even though ten-hour law was not enacted until 1874, the ten-hour movement in the 1840s produced some fruit regarding working conditions. While short mealtimes were criticized in the House Report of 1845, Lowell corporations reduced their working hours through extending meal breaks in 1847, and in the same year in New Hampshire, the state legislature passed the ten-hour law.³⁶

Notes

- 1 In contrast, an episode in Pawtucket, Rhode Island suggested that most women there might not have thought themselves included in the invitation of the meeting addressed to the working men. Teresa Anne Murphy, *Ten Hours' Labor: Religion, Reform, and Gender in Early New England* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), 147–48; David R. Roediger and Philip S. Foner, *Our Own Time: A History of American Labor and the Working Day* (London: Verso, 1989), 43.
- 2 John R. Commons, et al., *History of Labour in the United States, Vol. 1* ([1918]; New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1966), 536–38; John R. Commons, et al., eds., *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society, Vol. 8: Labor Movement* (New

- York: Russell & Russell, 1958), 81–84, 91–113; Philip S. Foner, ed., *The Factory Girls* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977), 99–100; Thomas Dublin, *Women at Work: The Transformation of Work and Community in Lowell, Massachusetts, 1826–1860* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 108–14; Murphy, *Ten Hours' Labor*, 131–32; David A. Zonderman, *Aspirations and Anxieties: New England Workers and the Mechanized Factory System, 1815–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 242–47. The LFLRA set their preamble and constitution in 1846, and the members were required to work “actively for reform in the present system of labor,” and were prohibited to take “hostile measures” such as strikes “until all pacific measures prove abortive.” Foner, ed., *The Factory Girls*, 104–106.
- 3 House Document No. 50, *Documents Printed by Order of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, During the Session of the General Court, A.D. 1845* (Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, State Printer, 1845).
 - 4 Dublin, *Women at Work*; Foner, ed., *The Factory Girls*; Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); William F. Hartford, *Money, Morals, and Politics: Massachusetts in the Age of the Boston Associates* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001).
 - 5 House Document No. 50, 1–7. While the special committee report referred to only four petitions, in the same box there were another petitions submitted in 1845 requesting shorter working hours from Worcester and Lynn. House Documents of 1845, Box 252, 1587, Massachusetts Archives, Boston.
 - 6 An Order from Special Committee on the Ten Hour System, 1587/6; The Petition of 301 Citizens of Lowell for a Reduction of the Hours of Labor, House of Representatives, 1845, 1587/8, House Documents of 1845, Box 252, Massachusetts Archives.
 - 7 House Document No. 50, 2–7.
 - 8 *Ibid.*, 2, 6–7.
 - 9 *Ibid.*, 2–8; Charles Dickens, *American Notes* ([1842]; Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1961), 84–88.
 - 10 House Document No. 50, 10.
 - 11 *Ibid.*, 11–16.
 - 12 *Ibid.*, 16.
 - 13 *Ibid.*, 16–17.
 - 14 *Voice of Industry*, 12 June 1845. When this criticism was published, the newspaper was published in Fitchburg, Massachusetts and the editor was William F. Young. In November of 1845, the paper became the organ of the New England Workingmen's Association published in Lowell, and Sarah Bagley joined its editorial staff.

- 15 Reform, "Great Workingmen's Mass Meeting in Woburn," the *Lowell Advertiser*, 8 July 1845.
- 16 *Lowell Advertiser*, 10 July 1845.
- 17 *Lowell Advertiser*, 15 July 1845.
- 18 *Lowell Advertiser*, 26 July 1845.
- 19 *Lowell Advertiser*, 7 August 1845.
- 20 Dublin, *Women at Work*, 122–26; Paul Faler and Alan Dawley, "Working-Class Culture and Politics in the Industrial Revolution: Sources of Loyalism and Rebellion," *Journal of Social History* 9 (June 1975).
- 21 Freidrich Langer, "Class, Culture, and Class Consciousness in Antebellum Lynn: A Critique of Alan Dawley and Paul Faler," *Social History* 6(1981); Sean Wilentz, "On Class and Politics in Jacksonian America," *Reviews in American History* (December 1982); Sean Wilentz, "The Rise of the American Working Class, 1776–1877: A Survey," in J. Carroll Moody and Alice Kessler-Harris, eds., *Perspectives on American Labor History* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1989), 97.
- 22 Alison M. Parker and Stephanie Cole, eds., *Women and the Unstable State in Nineteenth-Century America* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000); Rosemarie Zagari, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Carol Lasser and Stacey Robertson, eds., *Antebellum Women: Private, Public, and Partisan* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2010); Ronald J. Zboray, and Mary Saracino Zboray, *Voices Without Votes: Women and Politics in Antebellum New England* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2010).
- 23 "New England Workingmen's Association," *Voice of Industry*, 5 June 1845.
- 24 "Col. Schouler's Report," *Lowell Advertiser*, 2 September 1845.
- 25 "Last Call!" *Lowell Advertiser*, 8 November 1845.
- 26 "The Election of Lowell," *Voice of Industry*, 14 November 1845.
- 27 "Election of Lowell," *Lowell Advertiser*, 10 November 1845.
- 28 "The Election in This City," *Lowell Daily Courier*, 11 November 1845.
- 29 "Election of Lowell," *Lowell Advertiser*, 10 November 1845.
- 30 "The Election Yesterday," *Lowell Daily Courier*, 25 November 1845.
- 31 A Whig named William Livingston attacked Schouler on the railroad question for which Livingston petitioned to the General Court, and this seemed to split the vote. *Lowell Daily Courier*, 19 November 1845.
- 32 The *Voice of Industry* reported the result of the election as follows: "The Election on Monday resulted in the choice of George A. Butterfield, and the defeat of other Whig candidates, among whom was Col. Schouler, the gallant defender of Corporation

rights—will the man take the hint.” *Voice of Industry*, 28 November 1845.

- 33 Mrs. W. S. Robinson [Harriet Jane Hanson Robinson], ed., “Warrington” *Pen-Portraits: A Collection of Personal and Political Reminiscences from 1848 to 1876, from the Writings of William S. Robinson* (Boston: Rand, Avery, and Company, 1877), 25–32.
- 34 William Stevens Robinson to William Schouler, 25 May 1846, William Schouler Papers, Box 1, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
- 35 Petition of Alisa Dexter and 690 Other Female Operatives of Lowell..., 8 Jan. 1853, House of Representatives, 3757/33, House Documents of 1853, Massachusetts Archives. For the transformation of Lowell, see Dublin, *Women at Work*, 132–207.
- 36 Commons, *History of Labour, Vol. I*, 541; Commons, *A Documentary History, Vol. 8*, 83–84, 188–99; Zonderman, *Aspirations and Anxiety*, 248–52.

This paper is part of a project supported by grants-in-aid from Aichi Prefectural University in the academic year of 2012, which allowed the author to conduct research in the United States as a visiting scholar at Harvard University History Department. She thanks all the persons concerned.

10時間労働運動と1845年マサチューセッツ州議会選挙

久田 由佳子

1840年代、マサチューセッツ州議会には10時間労働法制定を求める多くの請願書が送られた。マサチューセッツにおける10時間労働運動の始まりである。請願書の多くは、ローウェルやアンドーヴァーといった町の綿工場で一日13時間以上働く女工たちの手によるもので、州法によって設立が認められた企業における労働時間を10時間に制限することを求めている。こうした請願書を受けて、マサチューセッツ州議会の上下両院合同特別委員会は公聴会を開き、とりわけ工場労働者人口の多いローウェルを視察した。しかしその結果は、10時間労働法は現時点では不要という、労働者たちの期待を裏切るものであった。その根拠は、労働時間を規制する州法はすべての職業や個人に適用されるべきものであり、当地の労働条件は、労働法が施行されているイギリスと比べても悪くはないという趣旨であった。この委員会の報告書が公開されると、10時間労働運動の指導者の女工たちは、この報告を作成したホイッグ党のローウェル選出下院議員ウィリアム・スクーラーを来たる州議会選挙で再選させないよう仲間の男性労働者を説得し、落選運動を展開した。この運動は、スクーラーの政敵にも利用され、スクーラーは落選した。当時、女性には参政権が認められていなかったため、政治は男性の領域に属するものと考えられがちだが、近年の研究では、参政権がない女性たちも政党政治に対して深い関心を示していたことが明らかになっている。本稿では、当時の新聞記事を用いながら、女工たちがどのような説得を行ったのかを明らかにするとともに、スクーラーの落選運動の背景にあった当時のマサチューセッツ州政治の動向も探る。

なお本稿は、平成23-26年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究(A)「19世紀前半のアメリカ合衆国における市民編成原理の研究」(研究代表者 遠藤泰生 東京大学大学院・総合文化研究科教授)、および平成24年度愛知県立大学学長特別教員研究費(ハーヴァード大学歴史学部客員研究員)の研究成果の一部である。