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ABSTRACT

This study will examine artisans and small producers in relation to their struggle against economic liberalism during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century in Guadalajara. The central thesis of this study is that the artisans of Guadalajara were able to defend their craft against competition from domestic factory production and foreign imports by maintaining their traditional craft community, on the one hand, and more intense reliance on family labor and kinship networks, on the other.

Even though economic liberalism brought changes to the established forms of production, artisans and small producers were able to adjust through technical change, craft and barrio solidarity, and family and kinship support. The late arrival of the railroad to Guadalajara gave the crafts time to strengthen their community in anticipation of the changes that the railroad would bring.
INTRODUCTION

ARTISANS AND THEIR HISTORIANS

The study of the petty bourgeoisie has had a marginal place in the history of labor. Historians have overlooked this social group and its role in the process of industrialization because they have focused on the formation of the working class, which they consider to be industrial workers. The petty bourgeoisie is defined as a social group dedicated to small-scale production based on manufacture relying on family work – “ownership and possession of the means of production coincide with the direct producer.”¹ This study will analyze artisan and urban small producers who manufactured goods and provided services. Included in this category are masters, journeymen, unorganized artisans, apprentices, and all small producers who shared the same economic circumstances during the nineteenth century.² This sector constituted a significant portion of Guadalajara’s economically active population throughout nineteenth century.³

The establishment of the first factories in 1840s transformed the economic dynamics of Guadalajara’s economy. In 1843, two textile factories began to produce yarn and thread for local shawl weavers and coarse cotton fabrics for popular consumption.⁴ Hand weavers of cotton cloth were the skilled workers most affected by this transformation. But for all artisans, the colonial guild monopoly was gone. Yet the traditional social and cultural customs and behaviors survived—marriage patterns, family organization, residence patterns that enabled artisans to better cope with the economic changes accompanying economic liberalism. The questions this study will ask are: How


² From now on, this work will refer indistinctly to petty bourgeoisie as artisans and small producers.

³ According to the census of 1842, 38 percent of the economically active population were artisanal occupations and in 1888, 37.3 percent.

⁴ La Prosperidad Jalisciense and La Escoba established in the suburbs of the city.
can one explain that despite foreign and national competition, artisans and small producers survived? What changes did the city’s artisans have to undergo as they faced the competition from domestic and foreign products? What were the mechanisms of adaptation that artisans and small producers used? How did the process of industrialization change the way small producers organized their production? How did they cope with those changes? The fact that artisans and small producers did not disappear, provides a clue that mechanisms must have existed that enabled those craftsmen to survive.

The study of artisans has been heavily influenced by Marxian scholars who lumped them into a capitalist class with shopkeepers, petty traders, and other small producers called, with a certain distain, the “petite bourgeoisie.” They were considered to be a system of production that needed to be displaced by commercial and then industrial capitalism, indeed, necessarily so if the formation of a working class were to occur. At best they were irrelevant (in the mind of the Left), at worse they were a class hostile to working class aspirations, and the popular association of the European petite bourgeoisie with right wing politics at the turn of the century and with the rise of fascism in the 1920s and 1930s, did little to encourage post-World War II scholarly interest in their history or culture. Other scholars saw the petite bourgeoisie’s traditional defense of private property as a significant ideological tenet propping up capitalist society, and hence to be seen as active enemies of the working class. Since they owned the means of productions, and since journeymen could aspire to master craftsmen and shop owners, artisans were not perceived as a part of the working class. Rather, the possibility of ownership reduced the potential class conflict between master and journeymen and, as a consequence, actively delaying in the development of a working class consciousness.

---

Further, labor historians tended to focus on large factories, as the place where the proletarianization of labor happened and where social conflict was most visible. From this point of view, artisans and small producers were simply an archaic social group and mode of production of little historical importance or interest, irrelevant to class struggle as envisioned by Marxist historians who were particularly influential in the field.

In the 1960s, however, the influential works of E.J. Hobsbawm, George Rudé and E.P. Thompson marked a new approach to labor history, among other things reminding their readers of the long association of the artisans with popular radicalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thompson, in particular, led a revisionist attack on the Marxist tradition of explaining social class in terms of economic determinism. Although Thompson did not reject Marxist historical materialism, he added cultural factors and human agency into the class struggle. The most relevant aspect of Thompson’s perspective was that the working class was not something that appeared spontaneously with the onset of commercial capitalism. Before a class can be formed, he contended, it must “experience” history, that is, experience exploitation, unemployment and deprivation. It is those experiences, along with the norms and values of their historical culture, which lead to class struggle and to class consciousness. The

---


7 Enrique Florescano, *De la colonia al imperio*, vol. 1 of *La clase obrera en la historia de México* (Mexico: Siglo XXI/Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales de la UNAM, 1980); Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, *Del estado liberal a los inicios de la dictadura porfirista*, vol. 2 of *La clase obrera en la historia de México* (Mexico: Siglo XXI/Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales de la UNAM, 1980).

identification of social antagonism is fundamental to the development of class and class-consciousness.⁹

It was Eric J. Hobsbawm’s work, however, that brought the nineteenth century British artisans back to center stage, particularly his work on “labor aristocracy,” describing the British nineteenth-century craftsmen that he considered made up about ten percent of the working class and were economically and culturally separated from the less well-off working class below. Other historians disputed the rather hard cultural distinction posed by Hobsbawm, and argued for a more sociological “community” approach stressing life style characteristics, an approach that most closely allies with the one I have taken in this study.¹⁰

Inevitably, the “new” Cultural History’s post-modern perspective also has affected labor history, adding new dimensions to old issues. William H. Sewell and Gareth Stedman Jones raised questions of language, as historians began to add the subjective experience of historical actors to the traditional material considerations, and to Thompson’s cultural views.¹¹

Other scholars have revisited various artisan issues—the social relationship of master craftsmen to small shopkeepers and of journeymen to masters, the political involvement of the petite bourgeoisie in nineteenth century socialist movements, the

---


¹⁰ The question of craftsmen as a “labor aristocracy” has an enormous historiography. One of the best summaries of the field (as it existed in the 1980s when the issue was most current) is Takao Matsumura, The Labor Aristocracy Revisited. The Victorian Flint Glass Makers 1850-80 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), 1-11. One of those historians arguing for a broader, sociological “community” approach was Geoffrey Crossick, whose work I have cited extensively in this study.

economic role of small production in twentieth century economy, and the relationship of small craft business with large scale industrial production.\textsuperscript{12} Among the artisan issues that attracted scholarly attention was the family. The demographic transition from a pre-industrial economy to a modern mode of production has been one of the most important questions that family historiography has attempted to answer. The traditional interpretation, inherited from early sociologists, was that the Industrial Revolution had destroyed the once-common extended, three generational household, leaving us with the modern, individualistic, nuclear family we know today.\textsuperscript{13} Pioneering work by Peter Laslett and Michael Anderson effectively destroyed that myth. Laslett’s work would come under attack later, but Michael Anderson’s classic 1971 study of nineteenth-century Lancashire showed conclusively that industrial workers actually lived in larger, more extended households than did pre-industrial, rural families.\textsuperscript{14} Nevertheless, those works tended to focus on the general aspect of this transition, paying less attention to the artisan family, except as a unit of production.\textsuperscript{15}

By the 1980s, however, the “New Social History’s” structuralist interests in artisans melded with earlier demographic interest in the family to ask questions that

\textsuperscript{12} For several important early revisionist works, see Geoffrey Crossick, ed. The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870-1914 (London: Croom Helm, 1976) and Shulamit Volkov, The Rise of Antimodernism in Germany. The Urban Master Artisans, 18973-1897 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978). Considerable work on artisans was published beginning in the late 1970s in British journals Social History, International Review of Social History and Past and Present.

\textsuperscript{13} Tamara K. Hareven, “The History of the Family and the Complexity of Social Change,” American Historical Review 96, no. 1 (1991), 96. Hareven’s article, though dated, is the best overview of the field up to that time, and is still useful.


\textsuperscript{15} For example, see François M. M. Hendrickx, “Economic Change and Demographic Continuity: The Demography of Borne and Wierden (The Netherlands) in the Period of Protoindustrialization and Factory Industry, 1800-1900,” The History of the Family 2, no. 4 (1997): 425-450.
combined the public world of the workshop and the private world of the family. Historians began to rework the popular assumption that family labor had always been the crux of the craft system. Josef Ehmer first raised doubts about this assumption in his important chapter on the artisan family in nineteenth-century Austria in Geoffrey Crossick and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt equally important book published in 1984. And in a later work clarified his argument that the traditional artisan family pattern involved apprenticing sons (and daughters) in other masters shops, or in sons “tramping” throughout the region as journeymen craftsmen, and that the family (wife, sons, daughters, kin networks) only became important as a “strategy” in those crafts already transformed by more “modern” production systems, in which master artisan became more bourgeois entrepreneurs than craftsmen.16 More closely following a structuralist approach, scholars such as Joan Scott and Shulamit Volkov found the “intensification” of family labor as a response to the clash between ready-made clothing (in the U.S. called “slops”) and traditional craft weavers, particularly the silk weavers, accelerated by the economic depression of the 1830s and continuing for several decades at least.17

Finally, work began by Tamara K. Hareven in 1982, and carried on by Enrique Camps and Juanjo Romero-Marín strongly supported the thesis that “an accelerated modernization process does not necessarily destroy community links that are mainly based on family ties.” 18 That thesis will also find support in my study, in which the


central core is the artisan family household, its culture and its response to economic and social changes in nineteenth century Guadalajara.

**Latin American Scholarship**

Latin American scholarship on artisans, shopkeepers and small producers has historically concentrated on the colonial era guilds, in part because the documentation and statistical resources are rich and plentiful, although the major historiographic source calls colonial artisans “the largest, least known urban group” of Spanish colonial America.\(^{19}\) For the most part, the scholarly opinion concerning Mexican colonial artisans is that the guilds had been in decline since the mid-eighteenth century, as commercial capitalists slowly took over the production process from master artisans, employing cheap journeymen labor and apprentices to dominate what Felipe Castro in his *La extinción de la artesanía gremial* considered an obsolete mode of production.\(^{20}\) One historian of nineteenth-century Mexico City’s artisans described that city’s artisans at mid-century as so “miserable” that they were “indistinguishable…from the unskilled workers, street peddlers, and servants that formed the remainder of Mexico City’s poor.”\(^{21}\) So did the authors of vol. 2 and vol. 3 of publisher Siglo XXI’s series on Mexican labor history, who maintained that by the late 1870s, most of Mexico’s artisans

---


were mainly illiterate wage earners (when they could find work), with no likelihood of
owning their own shop and with a social status no better than servants. According to
Mark Wasserman’s study of nineteenth century Mexico:

“Mid-century began the transition from artisan to factory production of
manufactured goods. The introduction of modern machinery, first in the textile
industry, reduced the need for skilled artisans and started a process of deskillling
the workforce.”

I argue, however, that my research on Guadalajara suggests that the various crafts
of that city underwent different processes during industrialization and that, contrary to the
general assumption, artisanal workshops did not disappear, nor were the city’s artisans
mainly illiterate wage earners. Indeed, as early as 1842, approximately three quarters of
the city’s tailors, blacksmiths, barbers and painters could read, and nearly half of the
carpenters, reboceros, hat makers and seamstresses, far higher than day laborers, factory
workers and non-artisan occupations (Appendix A: Table 1, Occupations by Ability to
Read 1838-1842).

It would be wrong, certainly, to hold that the city’s craftsmen were unaffected by
the economic changes of the century, or that most were better off than before. Indeed,
some were hurt by the changes, and a few crafts were devastated. What I argue is that
even though economic liberalism and industrialization brought changes to the established
forms of production, many if not most artisans and small producers adapted to those
chances, in part because of a strong artisan community, centered around barrio solidarity,
family and social networks and a culture that retained many of the characteristics from
earlier times. Artisans and small producers persisted in traditional behaviors, and these

22 Ciro F. S. Cardoso, Francisco G. Hermosillo, and Salvador Hernández, De la dictadura
porfirista a los tiempos libertarios, vol. 3 of La clase obrera en la historia de México
(México: Siglo XXI/Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales UNAM, 1980), 13; Juan
Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, Del estado liberal a los inicios de la dictadura
porfirista, vol. 2 of González, La clase obrera en la historia de México (México: Siglo

23 Mark Wasserman, Every Life and Politics in Nineteenth Century Mexico. Men, Women,
and War (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 140, 177.
traditional behaviors represented the roots of Guadalajara’s modern system of small producers.

Modern Guadalajara is known for the extensive number of small production units—small factories, artisan shops, and a large variety of craft-style small producers—frequently relying on family work and requiring relatively little investment. Referring to this phenomenon, Patricia Arias has called Guadalajara “the big city of small industry.”

The industrialization process in Guadalajara has meant the coexistence of large scale, modern forms of production with small scale, traditional enterprises. Although, the scope of my thesis is not contemporary Guadalajara, I contend that its reputation for small industry has its origins in the city’s artisan past.

More recent research on Mexico’s artisans is not as pessimistic as earlier scholars. Sonia Pérez Toledo found that after the disappearance of the *gremios* and *cofradías* as institutions during the first decades of nineteen century, the demise of the guild practices were gradual and other labor associations emerged as successors of these ancient systems of social organization, formed around municipal governments and local parish churches. Moreover, most inhabitants of Mexico City were poor and could not afford the newly available foreign imports. Therefore, most still bought goods produced by local artisans, trained in the traditional methods of production. In Zacatecas, the artisan mode of production coexisted with factories throughout the nineteenth century.


25 Looking up Guadalajara’s yellow pages, I found 193 carpenters shops, 195 tanneries, 216 blacksmiths workshops, 184 bakeries, and 47 tailors’ shops. And those numbers are far lower than the actual figures, since most small shops do not advertise city-wide but depend on their local neighbor patrons. For example, under “shoemaker” in the yellow pages were twenty-eight businesses whose description clearly indicates that they sell the raw material and tools for shoemaking, suggesting, in other words, that a large number of small shops need their services.

Research on artisans and guilds in colonial and nineteenth century has tended to focus on Mexico City. The work on Guadalajara has been limited, but useful. Rodney Anderson’s work on Guadalajara in 1821 argued that ethnicity had been superseded by class as the more important principle of social organization. Although my own work tends to agree with Anderson’s principle, it runs counter to his belief that commercial capitalism had undermined the city’s crafts by 1821. As stated, I believe that the demise of the artisan crafts has been greatly exaggerated, and my previous work supported this argument. By focusing on Guadalajara, this study will also fill a gap in the labor historiography since, until now, nearly all the studies related to the topic have used Mexico City as a case study.

The present study will explore two related issues involving Guadalajara’s artisans, concentrating on the era from 1842 to 1888, with a post-script look at artisans through 1907. First, it is the issue of organization. With the demise of the guilds as an institution, what rose to take their place? The first organization is a government-sponsored effort in 1843 in the form of a mutual aid society called the *Juntas de Fomento de Artesanos*. However, in this era of constant national and regional political turmoil, the weak legitimacy of governmental institutions forced artisans to create their own organizations to cope with the changing environment. Weak and often short-lived mutual aid societies and cooperative associations were formed to protect the economic interest of the artisans and to overcome the social and economic disadvantages that they faced in nineteenth-century Mexico.


These new associations filled the vacuum left by guilds and confraternities and replaced some of their functions. They followed associational patterns inherited from the old institutions whose earlier goals were to unite owners and workers, masters and journeymen in a single association. Therefore, at first, these associations gathered different social groups such as merchants, industrialists, and workers, often united initially against liberal free trade policies and, later, foreign capital. But later in the nineteenth century, the Mexican capitalists colluded with their foreign counterpart to break this pattern.\textsuperscript{29} Nationally, in the 1870s, more militant associations were formed, by industrial workers as well as artisans. Despite some initial militant stands, including a strike-riot against a large, local foreign-owned mill, Guadalajara’s artisans remained relatively un-radicalized during the decades from mid-century through to the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution in 1910.

This issue has a multi-layer explanation. Firstly, it seems that two apparently unrelated but complementary movements impacted Guadalajara’s artisans in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. One was the emergence of a bourgeoisie class of local and immigrant entrepreneurs who would come to infiltrate and eventually dominate the small productive sector of the economy.\textsuperscript{30} The other was the revitalization of the Catholic Church after its initial demoralization following the Liberal Party’s victory over the conservatives in 1860 and over the French by 1867. Having lost a good portion of its real estate wealth under the Liberal reforms of the Constitution of 1857 and much of its political influence with the demise of the Conservative Party, the Church regained its sense of mission during the long \textit{Pax Porfiriana} (1876-1910) by redefining its role in the modern world, particularly under the aegis of Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical \textit{Rerum Novarum} of 1891.\textsuperscript{31} Neither movement depended on the other, and indeed, occasionally

\textsuperscript{29} Silvia Lizama and Sergio Valerio Ulloa, “Redes empresariales en la región de Guadalajara durante el Porfiriato,” \textit{Secuencia}, no. 64 (206): 205-230.

\textsuperscript{30} Sergio Valerio Ulloa, \textit{Empresarios extranjeros en Guadalajara durante el Porfiriato} (Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2002).

seemed to reject or decry the other’s influence, but both combined with a vigorous and self conscious artisan culture/society to dilute and divert an angry artisan class, offering upward mobility for some, economic rewards for others and, for most, a renewed sense of identity and common culture that had been badly shaken by the economic and social confusion following the wars for Independence.

The political moderation of Guadalajara’s artisans was not because the artisans were well-off, or because they were better off materially than those below them, and therefore were content in their situation. Many crafts suffered great economic strain, particularly in the decade prior to the Revolution (and the different impact into the diverse crafts will be shown later in this study). And certainly there is evidence that many artisans were unhappy, particularly early, in the economic hard times of the 1850s. But nonetheless, as those first two factors (the rise of a local bourgeoisie and the resurgence of the Catholic Church) worked their way through the Porfirato, the artisans never developed an “oppositionist” culture, that is, the artisans tended to accept the local economic situation until they no longer could gain any benefits from it. Only after years of economic reversals do the city’s artisans (and other workers) actively join in the political opposition to Díaz. In a list of persons who supported the radical Mexican Liberal Party and were subscribers to their banded journal, Regeneración, of the seventeen noted as workers, only three were industrial workers. The rest were artisans. And certainly, in the decades following the Revolution, the city’s workers took a decidedly leftist political stance.

One objective of this study will be to explore the elements and nature of what I argue to be an artisan culture, sufficiently different from other groups within the city to

---


be, in one sense, a community. This artisan “culture,” if that is the right word, and perhaps, to an extent, a broader “Mexican” culture, has been, I believe, created over the centuries a pattern of social and economic survival built around both vertical and horizontal networks—what François-Xavier Guerra called “vínculos y sociabilidades colectivos” (“collective bonds and sociabilities”). Writing about early 20th century Guadalajara, Robert Curley wrote: “For the most part, this was not a society of individuals, but a society formed by clans, families, and groups.” The vertical networks were social relations of artisans with persons of inferior/superior social status, often their employers, or better off (sometimes distant) relatives. Perhaps the best known and possibly the most important were the linking of families through the compadrazgo, particularly useful for jobs, obtaining small loans, etc. The horizontal networks were even more important and a good bit of this study will be spent in attempting to construct the framework of those networks, or at least to point out the clues within the data that suggest the roles that the family, and particularly the household, play in the development, maintenance and process of those family and social networks.

---

34 There is very little work done on the nature of Mexican popular culture in the aftermath of the wars for Independence. However, one particularly important article proposing the existence of a multi-tiered Mexican urban society that include a distinguishable artisan sector is by the Argentine sociologist Torcuato S. Di Tella, “The Dangerous Classes in Early Nineteenth-Century Mexico,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 5, no. 1 (1973):79-105.


37 Co-godparenthood.

Ever since Peter Laslett proposed his theory that said, in essence, that the nuclear household had dominated Western family history since medieval times, scholars have debated the importance of the nuclear family relative to the larger household of kin, boarders, strangers and servants.\(^{39}\) If Laslett’s view had predominated, it would have meant that the family was the household, i.e., that persons outside the nuclear family were relatively rare, and so why study them? If that was a view of historical reality for Western Europe (Laslett’s real “world” despite his efforts to say otherwise\(^ {40}\)), and most historians now reject that thesis on a number of grounds, it certainly had little relevance for Latin America, including Mexico.

The role that the Mexican family, and household, plays in hard times is particularly well documented and well known in twenty-century society.\(^ {41}\) Studies


dedicated to Latin American artisan family, however, are few. By analyzing various aspects of the artisan’s household and family, this study has two objectives. One is to identify those elements of the artisan family and household that distinguished them from other occupational and social groups in the city. The other objective is to demonstrate that, in response to new economic pressures of the nineteenth century, that artisans developed strategies to cope with this changing socioeconomic environment. I will argue that during most of the remaining decades of the nineteenth century—with certain important exceptions—and until the railroads were finally extended to Guadalajara in 1888, which brought inevitable changes, along with Díaz regime’s 1890s economic...
policies, the city’s artisan family household remained remarkably constant, a key source of economic and cultural survival.

The emphasis on the artisan family household is deliberate. As Michael Scardaville pointed out, commenting upon the role of the household in the economic crises of the 1980s and 1990s, “that families best able to endure the chronic economic recessions of the late twentieth century had been those who took refuge in larger domestic units,” something that he maintained also characterized Mexico City at the end of the colonial era. Indeed, my previous work found a significant number of non-family members in the households of 1821. Other research has found an astonishing amount of movement on the part of the city’s residents. Although the artisans tend to be more stable as a group than other occupations, research has found that even their households were a beehive of mobility, as kin, children, friends, and strangers moved in and out of the household in a very short period of time, some within the city, others elsewhere. That mobility is common and well known for contemporary studies. People often return to the pueblo of their family’s origin, even if they, themselves, were born in the city. They would return for birthdays, for saint feast days and traditional celebrations like the fandangos. However, rarely is it seen in historical studies. The Guadalajara Census

43 Michael C. Scardaville, “Respuestas de la clase trabajadora durante el período colonial tardío en la Ciudad de México, una perspectiva doméstica o la familia pequeña no vive mejor,” in Manuel Miño Grijalva, ed. La Cuidad de México a fines de la colonia (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 2002).

44 Rivas, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 100-105.

Project data for 1821 and 1822 indicates that migrants tend to marry other migrants, often from the same home region, and other research has found evidence of the same pattern toward the end of the century as well.\textsuperscript{46} In other words, social networks existed that connect migrants, and migrant families, with the pueblos. Hardin’s research shows that the movement of kin, into and out of the household, again suggesting kinship networks. Even more evocative is Hardin’s findings that children of the head and spouse move into and out of the household at all ages, not just at a later age, again, suggesting that social and/or kinship networks exist that foster these children, or put them to work, or whatever.

Unfortunately, one of the difficulties of researching the household, is being able to reconstruct the social and kin relationships outside the physical confines of the residence itself.\textsuperscript{47} Individual census data on which this study depends presents a static picture of the household and family, frozen in time. It can provide clues to movement, to the existence of networks, but ultimately it is unable to recover the \textit{process} of household and family formation, and the inter-relationship between household and family, between family members and kin, even between the head of the household and its members. All that can be done with the data itself is to look for changes over time comparing census data, and to look for differences among categories of persons within each census, hoping that the comparison will provide clues to historical behavior. That is what I have attempted here, looking at artisans, their families and their households.

Neighborhood also played an important role in the construction of an artisan identity. Artisans tended to live with other artisans, usually of the same occupation. The question of social space is addressed. Where did artisans live? Where were the shops at which they worked? How did artisan residential patterns vary by craft? To what extent did master craftsmen and shop owners inhabit the same social space as their journeymen, and what impact might that have had on the construction of a separate artisan as opposed

\textsuperscript{46} Ellen McAuliffe Brennan, “Demographic and Social Patterns in Urban Mexico: Guadalajara, 1876-1910” (Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, 1978), 54.

\textsuperscript{47} One of the few efforts to look at family networks in an historical context is Linda L. Greenow, “Microgeographic Analysis as an Index to Family Structure and Networks,” Journal of Family History, 10 (1985), 272-281. See also Rosalva Loreto López, ed., \textit{Casas, viviendas y hogares en la historia de México} (México: El Colegio de México, 2001).
to a class identity?\textsuperscript{48} In what way can the utilization of urban space indicate the presence, or even the process, of an artisan community, an artisan culture? Even when the Church lost its urban holdings and therefore rents were more based on profits, artisans still stayed home. I contend that the local parish church was the glue of residential and barrio loyalty, social activity and networks. Perhaps that explains the influence of the Church in Guadalajara.

A general trend in recent studies recognizes that the craft system was not only an economic organization, but also carried out many different functions: social, cultural, and religious. Other relevant aspect of artisans’ experience is the correlation between residential patterns and artisanal production. The fact that artisans lived in the same place where they worked carried with it the assumption that their families —wife, children and other relatives— were active members of the masters’ workshops. Some scholars looked for evidence to prove it; the population censuses have been useful for this purpose. The affirmation that the production unit went beyond the workshop to the household as the fundamental unit of production is generally accepted. The artisanal system was not a contradictory outdated mode of production but rather a complementary part in a dynamic confluence of modern and traditional system of production.

Description of Sources

The primary sources that shaped chapters two and three are labor organizations’ statutes currently available in different archives.\textsuperscript{49} Also, local and national newspapers provided information about diverse activities of those associations.\textsuperscript{50} Chapters four and

\textsuperscript{48} The issue of urban space and class identity is treated in John Lear, “Mexico City: Space and Class in the Porfírian Capital (1884-1910),” \textit{Journal of Urban History} 22, no. 4 (1996): 454-492.

\textsuperscript{49} Most are located in the Biblioteca Pública del Estado de Jalisco, “Fondos Especiales, Misceláneas.” The rest are located in the Archivo Histórico de Jalisco.

\textsuperscript{50} Newspapers are located in the Biblioteca Pública del Estado de Jalisco, “Fondos Especiales.” \textit{El Universal}, \textit{El Continental}, and \textit{El Hijo del Trabajo} can be consulted via Internet at www.paperofrecord.com.
five on the artisan family and households, and their residential patterns utilizes five sets of census data: the population census manuscripts for Guadalajara for 1838 and 1842; a business census for 1880; an occupational database created from the population census of 1888; a sample of selected artisans’ households and families data taken from the 1888 census; and a sample of the city marriage register for 1877, 1888, 1900, and 1907.

The origins of the 1838-42 censuses are obscure. Only districts eight and nine have survived for 1838, but whether other districts were taken is not known. Perhaps they were taken as an aid to police surveillance of the city’s population, as indicated by a document from 1836. Three districts are available for 1842—districts 5, 6 and 7. No other census for 1842 is known except for the Federal District. However, it is likely that the census had been ordered by federal authorities to serve as a basis for the congressional elections of 1842. The census of 1888 survived nearly intact (missing only one out of ten districts). In addition, I will refer to the population census of 1821, as a previous reference point to compare and contrast the main data sources used for this

51 The document suggested that the police needed “exact information concerning all of its inhabitants, including their age, sex, marital status, occupation or way of earning a living.” AMG, CS/1836, paquete s/n, legajo 50. José Castillo Negrete, Septiembre 6 de 1836.

52 Well-known public figures and contemporary economist, Longinos Banda, noted that the population count for Jalisco had been ordered in 1839 to serve “for the purpose of the general congressional election of 1842.” See Banda, Estadística Jalisco. Formada con vista de los mejores datos oficiales y noticias ministradas por sujetos idóneos en los años de 1854 a 1863 (Guadalajara: Unidad Editorial, 1982), 42. The original book was published in 1873. Combining 1838 with 1842 is useful because the 1838 cuarteles, district eight and nine, are primarily working-class barrios. The manuscripts are located at Archivo Municipal de Guadalajara, caja 1173, legajo 91, expediente 39-40 and caja 1181, legajo 99, expediente 17, 25. There were nine city districts and a tenth rural district that was the indigenous village of Mezquitán on the outskirts of the city to the north. That population was not representative of the rest of the city and will not be included in this study. Overall, the population of the districts included in this database represents approximately 60 percent of the actual population. Also, district six and part of five are representative of the city’s wealthier families, and better off artisans, and are a surrogate for district one, two and three, whose manuscript censuses have not survived. Districts 8 and 9, and parts of 7 and 5 are representative of the less wealthy barrios.

53 Number five is the only missing district.
The 1880 business census supplies data on all the business officially registered in the city for that year. The 1888 data includes two datasets: a full count of all occupations, by age, and a sample of nine selected occupations—one unskilled (jornalero/day laborer), one professional (abogado/lawyer) and seven artisanal crafts.

To complete the demographic profiles of artisans for chapter four, I sampled 642

54 I used heavily 1821 census on my thesis “Roots of an Artisan Community, Guadalajara, Mexico, 1791-1842” (M.A. Thesis, Florida State University, 2005). The manuscripts are located at Archivo Municipal de Guadalajara, Padrones, 1821.

55 “Datos estadísticos sobre giros mercantiles e industriales 1880,” Archivo Municipal de Guadalajara, paquete 144, expediente 1.

56 The 1888 dataset is a statistical list of all occupied persons, by cuartel and by occupation, taken from the city population census of 1888. Seven of the city’s ten districts provided information on occupation (cuarteles 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). The source contains manuscript data on each individual in nine of the city’s ten districts and is located in the Archivo Histórico del Estado de Jalisco, Ramo Estadística, 1888-89, 4, Censo Estadístico. The third dataset is a sample taken from all of the city districts that provided information on occupation except district 10, a predominately ethnic and rural district that was unrepresentative of the city. The sample was constructed by a modified cluster sampling technique. Seven artisan/craft occupations were selected to represent the major crafts, with an effort to include crafts which were considered “strong” (carpenters and blacksmiths), crafts considered strong but under varying degrees of pressure from imports and factory-made goods (tailors and shawl weavers), or already proletarianized by such competition (hat makers), and crafts considered poorly remunerated but numerically significant with pockets of strength (shoemakers, bakers). In addition, lawyers were selected to represent the city’s professional occupations, and day laborers (jornaleros) to represent unskilled (but not industrial) workers. Next, one cuartel was chosen to record all the selected occupations (cuartel 2, which included both city center and city margins) in order to have a representative base line with which to compared data from the other districts. Next, all other districts were sampled by randomly selecting manuscript pages and recording all the data for the selected nine occupations found on those pages. The sampling process was continued until the number of cases for each occupation was considered sufficient for statistical analysis and the numbers for each occupation were roughly in proportion to the total of each occupation in the city at large. Hat makers (sombrereros), however, were over-sampled in an attempt to obtain a sufficiently large enough number of cases to be statistically significant. (Thirty three hatters were recorded, or approximately one-third of the total hatters listed in the 1888 population census.) Only households that had a head of household with the selected occupations were considered, but all persons with an occupation in the selected household were also recorded, whatever their occupation.
marriages from the Civil Registration for 1877, 1888, 1900, and 1907. Chapter six, residential patterns, will include aggregated occupation numbers from the 1895, 1900 and 1910 federal censuses, and various tax lists from the 1890s.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter one describes the economic situation of Guadalajara during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It depicts the early attempts of industrialization in 1840s and the subsequent industrial development during the Porfiriato. Chapter two examines the labor organizations that substituted the guilds and the confraternities from a local to a national level. Chapter three analyzes in detail the experiences of Guadalajara’s labor organizations as well as labor movements during nineteenth century. Chapter four describes demographic patterns, especially artisan family and household patterns. Those shared features identified them as a distinct social community in Guadalajara. However, even though the artisanate had characteristics that joined them as a group, specific patterns among different crafts can be distinguished. By analyzing marital status and household and family composition, this section demonstrates that artisans developed strategies to cope with the changing socioeconomic environment of nineteenth-century Guadalajara. Chapter five examines artisan residential patterns. The distribution of workshops and

57 From 1877, 152 marriages; 1888, 164 marriages; 1900, 145 marriages; and 1907, 181 marriages. The sample was taken from the Archivo del Registro Civil de Jalisco. Guadalajara, matrimonios 1877 (volume 327); Guadalajara, matrimonios 1888 (volumes 1197-1200); Guadalajara, matrimonios 1900 (two volumes, without number); and Guadalajara, matrimonios (three volumes, without number). I consulted this through the Family History Library, St. Lake City, Utah.

58 The information about tax lists is located at the Archivo del Congreso del Estado. “Cuotas que se deberán pagar los causantes del Derecho de Patente mercantil e industrial de la ciudad de Guadalajara, durante el ejercicio fiscal de 1 de julio de 1895 a 30 de junio de 1896 señales por el jurado revisor reunido por disposición de la Dirección General de Rentas en uso de la facultad que le concede el art. 72 del Decreto num. 615,” El Estado de Jalisco nos. 46 and 47, tomo 20, 1895; and “Cotización definitiva de los giros industriales que en seguida se expresan, correspondiente al año fiscal de 1899 a 1900, y que se publica en cumplimiento dispuesto en el artículo 79 del Reglamento de la Ley de Hacienda,” El Estado de Jalisco no. 99, tomo28, 1900. The manuscripts for the nacional censuses of 1895, 1900, and 1910 are located at the Archivo Histórico de Jalisco, Oficina de Concentración del Censo. “Censo General de habitantes de la ciudad de Guadalajara, 1895”; “Censo y División Territorial del Estado de Jalisco verificado en 1900,” and “Censo General de habitantes de la ciudad de Guadalajara, 1910.”
artisans in the urban space helps to understand the function of neighborhoods as an aspect of artisanal culture during the transition of Guadalajara from a preindustrial city to a “modern” industrialized urban center.
CHAPTER ONE
THE ECONOMY OF GUADALAJARA, 1840-1910

Founded in 1542, Guadalajara grew slowly during the first two centuries of its existence. From the mid-18th century onward, however, the city grew rapidly in both population and economic importance, particularly stimulated by the socioeconomic reforms introduced by the Bourbon monarchy beginning in 1759. Before those reforms, every commercial transaction took place through Veracruz in the Gulf of Mexico and Acapulco on the Pacific Coast, giving preference to the economic growth of Mexico City and surroundings towns. Also, Guadalajara had remained relatively secluded from the major commercial routes due to its geographical isolation in the central west of the country. Essentially, there were two major developments that changed that situation. The first one was the opening of San Blas harbor in 1774 in Nayarit on the Pacific coast, only 162 miles from Guadalajara. The port added even more to the city’s economy after 1813, when Acapulco lost its monopoly of the Asian trade as a result of the Insurgent control of the port. Official trade shifted to San Blas. The second and perhaps more important reform was the freedom of commerce granted to the colonies in 1778, allowing the city’s merchants to trade throughout the Spanish colonies and with Spain itself without having to go through Mexico City merchants. This new policy restructured the regional markets and, in Guadalajara, led to the development of a regional merchant oligarchy.

After Independence from Spain in 1821, economic cycles of improvement and decline characterized the nineteenth-century Mexican economy. The impact on regional economies varied. In some regions such as Guanajuato, the destruction of the war years led to urban flight and joblessness. John Tutino argues, however, that in the rural Bajío advances made by renters and small farmers during the war years led to a greater local


60 José María Murià, Sumario Histórico De Jalisco (Guadalajara, Mexico: Editorial Gráfica Nueva, 1996), 100.
popular economic participation and distribution. Conversely, in Michoacán, following the worse years of the Independence struggle, an economic recovery in the 1830s and 1840s gave an opportunity to local oligarchies to assume more active roles in the economy and politics. But wide-spread violence returned again in the late 1850s during the Wars of Reform, followed by the chaos of the French Intervention (1862-67). Beginning in 1876, however, the Porfirio Díaz administration by encouraging railroad expansion, which, along with laying the foundation of a bank system, brought an economic resurge.

![Figure 1.1 Population of Guadalajara, 1770-1910](image)


In spite of the nineteenth century economic ups and downs, Guadalajara saw a steady increase in its population thanks both to the natural growth of the population and to migration from the rural towns and villages, especially from the smaller urban centers in Jalisco and other areas in western Mexico.\(^{(64)}\) (Figure 1.1)

By 1900, Guadalajara had surpassed Puebla’s population to become the second largest city in Mexico, a place it still holds today. Guadalajara’s population increased 84 percent between 1877 and 1910, seeing its biggest increase during the last five years of the nineteenth century. In the same period, except for Monterrey, only Mexico City and Morelia saw an increase greater than 40 percent.\(^{(65)}\) Monterrey’s population increased some 461 percent, representing the demographic explosion accompanying the arrival of the railroads to the North.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>329,774</td>
<td>344,721</td>
<td>471,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>83,934</td>
<td>101,208</td>
<td>119,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>88,684</td>
<td>93,521</td>
<td>96,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>56,012</td>
<td>39,404</td>
<td>41,486</td>
<td>35,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>69,050</td>
<td>61,019</td>
<td>68,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>31,842</td>
<td>30,872</td>
<td>34,982</td>
<td>45,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mérida</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>36,935</td>
<td>43,630</td>
<td>62,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterrey</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>45,695</td>
<td>62,266</td>
<td>78,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.1 Populations of Diverse Cities of Mexico, 1877-1910\(^{(66)}\)*

---


As Guadalajara’s population grew, mirrored by the population growth through the region, so did the demand for food supplies and basic consumer goods. The increased city and hinterland demand for agricultural products and livestock not only sustained Guadalajara’s increasing population but also furthered the creation of a regional market. Significantly, this increase in production was not due to technological changes, but to an augmentation in the size of the units of production; in other words, the hacienda expanded at the expense of the smaller producers, usually the indigenous pueblos. The haciendados saw it as the most efficient way to get maximum benefits in short time with low investments, just as their forbears had done in the eighteenth century.67

In addition, Guadalajara housed a growing entrepreneur class who directly benefited from the commercialization of local products as well as from imported goods. Persons engaged in commerce grew from 11.9 percent in 1895 to 14 percent in 1900.68 They were entrepreneurs who had economic interests, not only in commerce but in an expanding manufacturer sector, particularly textiles, as well as in agriculture and banking.69 However, the city that in the twentieth century became known as the “large city of small industry” also included numerous small manufacturers and artisans who fulfilled the internal demand for services and goods of the general population. It will be those “small producers” who are the center of my attention in this study because their economic role is often overlooked in Mexican history. Ironically, supporters and detractors of the large (and often foreign) firms alike often assume that small producers


represent the older, pre-industrial “handicraft” economy, and therefore ignored or denied their relevance in the “modern” economy.  

The Industrial Revolution in Europe and United States also encouraged early attempts to modernize Mexican industry, particularly textiles. The most important effort that the national government undertook as a part of the modernization process was the foundation of the Banco de Avío in 1830. The purpose of the bank was to foster industrial growth by providing funds to entrepreneurs who proposed to introduce modern manufacturing technology. Instead of banning imported textiles that competed with national products, the government financed the bank with a special tax imposed on imported cotton textiles. It loaned over a million pesos in the twelve years between 1830 and 1842. Sixty-five percent of the loans went to modernize the cotton textile industry and the rest of the loans went to different enterprises such as woolen textile mills, ironworks, agricultural endeavors, silk works, etc. While the Banco de Avío constituted the first experiment in the financing of modern industry in Mexico, few of the financed industries survived to the end of the nineteenth century and the vast majority only lived for a short period of time. The Banco de Avío was most successful in the foundation and financing of industries in central Mexico; in Guadalajara, its impact was almost nil.

By independence in 1821, Guadalajara was a thriving metropolis of nearly 40 thousand and its continued growth ensured it as a potentially good market. Local

---


72 This special tax was the 40 percent ad valorem of the 10 percent tax over textiles.

73 Ibid., 122.

74 The official population total from the census of 1821 was 38,087. However, recent research by the Guadalajara Census Project encountered an enormous short-term turnover of the city’s population; perhaps as much as 30 percent annually. The migration of people into, and out of, the city meant that the market for consumer goods was, in fact, larger than the official total. Claudia Rivas Jiménez and Andrea Vicente, “Una ciudad en
entrepreneurs began to invest in the first factories to supply the growing population of the city. The capital they employed mainly came from commerce and eventually they invested, as well, in different economic activities such as mines and haciendas. In 1843, the city textile firms La Prosperidad Jalisciense and La Escoba, began to produce yarn and thread for the local reboceros and other types of coarse cotton fabrics for popular consumption. The next year, the paper mill El Batán was established, principally supplying cigarette paper, wrapping and writing paper. Two decades later, in the 1866, two other textile factories appeared—Río Blanco and La Experiencia. With the pax porfírina, new factories were established in the last decades of the nineteenth century. For instance in 1896 local businessmen founded La Compañía Industrial Manufacturera in an industrial colony called Río Grande, since it used the hydraulic power from the river of the same name.

A crucial need in the region’s economy was a source of credit. During the colonial era, the church had provided much needed credit. Liberal laws passed under the republican government, however, restricted Church lending, leaving the credit functions in private hands. With relatively little government regulation or oversight, the providers of funds charged high interest rates, and were frequently accused of being little more than moneylenders, even usurers. For ordinary people, the options were even fewer. They

75 Jorge Durand, Los Obreros De Río Grande (Michoacán, Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1986), 50.

76 Also known as Atemajac.

77 Reboceros were artisans dedicated to weave shawls, a traditional female garment.

78 Murià, Sumario histórico de Jalisco, 264-265.

79 Durand, Los Obreros De Río Grande, 50.

80 Ibid., 55. The factory was confounded by the families Martínez Negrete y Fernández del Valle.

81 Some moneylenders lent money through the casas comerciales.
commonly obtained money by pawning their modest belongings at local pawnshops called *casas de empeño* or small grocery stores called *tendajones*.\(^\text{82}\)

Different entrepreneurial local groups stressed the importance of a bank system to overcome the general stagnation of the local economy. In 1877, *Las clases productoras*, a group of progressive local capitalists led by Mariano Bárcena and José López Portillo y Rojas, pointed out the necessity of the establishment of banks in order to promote the growth of the economy. However, this idea took a long time to become a reality.\(^\text{83}\) At the beginning of 1882, the state government approved the creation of the *Banco de Jalisco* by an association of a group of merchants.\(^\text{84}\) However, a new provisional governor, Pedro Landázuri, withdrew government support for the project, citing the federal constitution articles that banned the states from establishing “circulation and emission banks.”\(^\text{85}\) Also, the governor disliked the fact that the government could not supervise the bank’s activities as current statutes demanded.

The first bank to actually succeed in Guadalajara was founded in 1882 as a branch of the *Banco Nacional Mexicano*. Eventually it merged with the *Banco Mercantil Mexicano* and became the *Banco Nacional de México* in 1884, the first truly national banking enterprise in Mexico.\(^\text{86}\) This was followed by a branch of the *Banco de Londres y México* which was opened in 1889.

\(^{82}\) By 1887, there were 25 *casas de empeño* (pawn shops).

\(^{83}\) Olveda, *Los Bancos Noroccidentales De México*, 45

\(^{84}\) The merchants included the brothers Fernández del Valle Palomar, Manuel Cocuera, Nicolás Remus, Francisco Martínez Negrete, Antonio Álvarez del Castillo, Luciano Gómez, Juan Somallera and José María Verea.

\(^{85}\) “…los estatutos del banco entraban en contradicción con la Constitución general…que prohibía que en as entidades federativas se establecieran bancos de circulación y emisión” Olveda, *Los bancos noroccidentales De México*, 48.

\(^{86}\) Olveda, *Los bancos noroccidentales de México*, 49. Although, it was not possible to find evidence that supports my conclusion, I am included to believe that the capital was to be raised by a combination of public and private sources.
However, local industrialists continued to insist on the creation of a bank funded by local capital. Finally, in 1898, Banco de Jalisco was founded by the same group of entrepreneurs who made the proposal sixteen years early. The Cámara de Comercio de Guadalajara proposed a less successful initiative to finance small producers and artisans in 1890. The state government actually approved the creation of the Banco de Avío of Jalisco and named a governmental commission to work with the Cámara de Comercio to develop the agenda for the bank. It is not known whether or not the bank was actually established.

Therefore, during the period from 1870 to 1910, there were only three banks in Guadalajara and they loaned almost exclusively to businessmen. The general population still continued to use the casas comerciales for loans because the latter provided longer payback periods than commercial loans, although albeit at a higher interest rate. Banks generally loaned money for six months only.

In order to provide a source of credit for ordinary individuals not eligible for a bank loan, the state government created the Monte de Piedad in 1887. According to the statutes, the objective was to help the middle class and the proletarians, as they were victims of loan sharks. During the first year of operations, the Monte de Piedad provided loans up to 15 pesos, depending on the value of the security. The next year however, after public agitation, that value was increased to 50 pesos (for jewelry), as the original sum was considered insufficient to cover real emergencies of the middle class.

The interest rate for the borrowed money was 1 percent compounded monthly; on the

87 Olveda, Los bancos noroccidentales de México, 58.
88 AHJ, F-9-890, GUA-206. The governor named Hilario Romero Gil, Juan Matute, Narciso Corcuera, and Francisco Martínez Gallardo as members of the commission.
89 Jaime Olveda, “Banca y banqueros de Guadalajara,” in La Banca regional en México (1870-1930) (Mexico: El Colegio de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), 54. Casas comerciales were commercial establishments that imported and exported goods. However, they also made small loans as a side business.
90 BPJ, Misceláneas 751:7, Hilario Romero Gil, Memoria presentada en la sesión del 14 de enero de 1890 sobre el Monte de Piedad y la Caja de Ahorro (Guadalajara, Mexico, 1890), 4.
average, the *Monte de Piedad* provided service to 400 hundred persons daily.\(^9^1\) Additionally, the state government created in 1887 a *Caja de Ahorros* for the less fortunate city residents, such as artisans and domestic servants, who were able to deposit from 50 cents to 100 pesos every week or month and received a 6 percent annual interest on their deposit. From its foundation, the *Caja de Ahorros* annually increased the number of depositors and the amount of money invested. By January 1892, 730 persons had deposited a total of 64,553 pesos.\(^9^2\)

However, despite federal governmental efforts to encourage national economic development, certain fundamental problems obstructed government policy until well into the 1870s. According to historian, John Coatsworth, there were two fundamental obstacles to the economic growth after independence that marked the underdevelopment of the Mexican economy. First, the rugged topography of the country and the scarcity of navigable rivers made the exchange of commodities and people very difficult and costly, in contrast to United States where the extended plains and river systems provided easier routes of communication. Moreover, even when the railroad technology was available, the cost of the construction needed to overcome the mountainous terrain was exorbitant.\(^9^3\)

The second element that prevented economic growth, according to Coatsworth, was the “inefficient economic organization” characterized by a highly politicized institutional environment that hindered open competition.\(^9^4\) Every economic enterprise was subject to the use of “kinship networks, political influence and family prestige to gain privileged access to subsidized credit, to aid various stratagems for recruiting labor, to collect debts or enforce contracts, to evade taxes or circumvent the courts, and to

---

\(^9^1\) Ibid., 11-18.

\(^9^2\) BPJ, Misceláneas 751:7, Hilarión Romero Gil, *Memoria presentada en la sesión del 14 de enero de 1892 sobre el Monte de Piedad y la Caja de Ahorro*, 14.


\(^9^4\) Ibid., 92.
defend or assert titles to land." Small producers and craftsmen, of course, rarely had access to those networks, making their own economic advancement, and transition to more modern forms of production, as a class, even more difficult and problematic. Politically, nineteenth-century Mexican constant succession of administrations and frequent confrontations between liberals and conservatives, created an obstacle to rational economic policy until Porfirio Díaz imposed his *Pax Porfiriana* in the last quarter of the century and implemented liberal economic policies. None-the-less, prior to the Porfiriato, Liberals took certain steps to pave the way for a modern economy.

In 1856, the Liberal party took a major step in developing a modern economy with the promulgation of the *Ley Lerdo de Tejada* (*Ley de desamortización de bienes de manos muertas*) in 1856. The purpose of the law was twofold—to reduce the power of the Catholic Church as the main financier of the opposition Conservative Party and to serve as a source for sorely needed government revenue. This bill forced every civil and ecclesiastical corporation to sell their property. In case of rented property, the tenants had the opportunity to buy it; if they did not have the means to do so the property would be auctioned to the public. The government received 5 percent commission in the sale of the property as well as revenue from taxes on that property, now that it was in the hands of private owners. The physiognomy of the cities changed dramatically with the secularization of the property.

In Guadalajara, the commercial elite took advantage of the law and bought whole blocks of urban property formerly owned by the Church. Also, the city’s elite began to accumulate rural property to which they had been denied before. The indigenous

---

95 Ibid., 94. In the debate over whether nineteenth century Mexico was feudal or capitalist, Coatsworth does not consider Mexico feudal, per se, but rather that it was feudal at the "superstructure level," where the elites interfered with market competition and the development of a rational economy.


communities were the most affected; they lost ancestral lands that they had owned for centuries since they could not afford to buy them. Because of the land disputes between the new landowners and the indigenous communities, the government attempted to protect the indigenous towns by changing the terms of the law. However, during the four years that the Ley Lerdo functioned, the Indians underwent a process of pauperization that led many to migrate to the cities in search of work.  

Finally, in 1857, the liberal-dominated Mexican Congress incorporated the Ley Lerdo into the new national constitution. The constitution of 1857 reflected the liberal thought, emphasizing individual guarantees such as education, individual property rights and freedom of commerce. Although, the Constitution of 1857 articulated the basic rights of the population, it did little to encourage economic growth. Indeed, the civil war that followed (War of the Reform, 1858-60) created even greater chaos. In the midst of the civil war, the besieged Liberal government ordered the expropriation of all Church lands and property, and sold them often at huge discounts to enterprising private entrepreneurs in order to finance their armies. Therefore, although the Ley Lerdo had envisioned a land of small holders as the backbone of a federal republic, instead the land, for the most part, passed into the hands of a new Liberal order. The liberation of the clergy and communal property had an immediate social and economic impact.

Meanwhile, the abolition of the tax on goods entering each state called alcabalas, (usually referred to as a “dry tariff”) as stipulated in the constitution, was postponed until later. The scarcity of resources, forced the authorities to continue with the alcabalas, since they were the main resource of revenue for municipal and state government. Even then, the tax officers had a hard time trying to collect the taxes as the residents of Guadalajara managed to evade them or asked for exemption. To make matters even

---


99 Alcabalas were internal customs between jurisdictions (states and cities) and were part of the colonial fiscal organization.

more confusing, every state had the right to decide whether to enforce or abolish the tax. Hence, as happened, one state could abolish them while other states continued to enforce them. After some frustrated attempts to abolish the *alcabalas* in Jalisco, the government decided to gradually suppress this type of tax, allowing free commerce for specific products such as the tequila, coffee, and cotton.\textsuperscript{101} It was not until 1896, however, that José Ives Limantour, Secretary of *Hacienda* (Treasury Department), abolished the tax simultaneously for the whole country, eradicating one of the oldest obstacles to the formation of a national market.

One potential source of capital, that of foreign investment, remained relatively scarce until the peaceful years of the Porfiriato. The vast majority of the commerce with foreign countries was with Europe, principally Great Britain, and the United States. Foreign trade became the major source of government revenue through taxation on silver, henequen and sugar exports. Despite the emphasis on the export economy, economic historian, Stephen Haber, maintains that the Porfiriato, in fact, was “the first wave of large-scale industrialization.” Big industries were established in the principal cities all around the country, and mass production techniques were used to produced steel, beer, cement, cotton textiles, paper, glass, dynamite, soap, and cigarettes to fulfill the expanding national market.\textsuperscript{102} However, these large-scaled enterprises encountered specific situations that limited their development. They depended totally on imported technology; in addition, they sold their products only in the domestic market because their production costs were too high to compete internationally with the most industrialized countries.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{101} Jesús Leandro Camarena, “Memoria que el ejecutivo del estado libre y soberano de Jalisco, presentó a la legislatura, 1879,” Ibid., 572.


\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 4.
After a period of financial stability, Díaz’s regime faced a major problem with the international change from silver to the gold standard between the years of 1902 and 1905. It is generally held that Porfirio Díaz set the bases for the industrialization of the country; he fostered national manufacturing industries by tackling the old impediments inherited from the colonial times and those rising from the social instability of the post-independence era. Certainly, the building of the railroad system changed the country at every level. In 1876, there were only 640.3 kilometers of railroads; by 1910 there were 19,280.3 kilometers, with the largest increase taking place from 1880 to 1884. The traditional interpretation of the Porfiriato regime, in general, and the railroad system, in particular, is that foreign trade dominated the economy, as it had in the colonial era. Although, this interpretation rightly emphasizes the role of foreign trade, it does not take into account the fact that the railroad impacted every part of Mexico except for the Yucatán peninsula. Moreover, new interpretations based on different evidence show that the railroad system impacted positively on the regional economies by enabling them to interact in the exchange of goods and people. The growth of population sustained the development of an internal market, and in spite of socio-political events at national level during the turbulent decades of the nineteenth century, cities such as Guadalajara grew in size and complexity as the material conditions evolved and changed.

Despite the tendency in other regions of the country to emphasize export crops such as sugar, tobacco, and cotton, in Jalisco maize and bean continued to be the most important staple crops. The contemporary economist, Longinos Bárcena, pointed out

---


105 Ibid., 630.


107 Longinos Banda, Estadística de Jalisco: formada con vista de los mejores datos oficiales y noticias ministradas por sujetos idóneos en los años de 1854 a 1863 (Guadalajara, Jalisco, México: Gobierno de Jalisco, Secretaría General, Unidad Editorial, 1873), 143-150; Mariano Bárcena, Ensayo estadístico del estado de Jalisco: referente a los datos necesarios para procurar el adelanto de la agricultura y la aclimatación de nuevas plantas industriales (Guadalajara, Jalisco, México: Gobierno de Jalisco,
some of the reasons for this situation. Maize, beans, and chiles constituted the basic food crop for the vast majority of the population; thus, by cultivating them, farmers were insured of a secure local market. Even haciendas dedicated a portion of their land to the cultivation of maize, since they paid part of their workers’ wages in maize, called the ración; only few haciendas paid only cash wages.\textsuperscript{108} The substitution of goods for cash wages was not only limited to rural wages. It was not uncommon in some manufactures for workers to be paid partly in kind. For instance, in some rebozo workshops masters paid journeymen in thread, often to the detriment of the artisan’s net wage earnings.\textsuperscript{109}

The late arrival of the railroad to Guadalajara (1888) is another factor in the high cost of moving local products beyond the regional market. Until the arrival of the railroad in 1888, Guadalajara’s relative isolation resulted in slower changes to the traditional economy. Before the railway, the communication and exchange of commodities relied on wagons and stagecoaches. Lacking all-weather roads, however, the rainy season from May to September made the transit of carriages almost impossible.\textsuperscript{110}

With the arrival of the railroad, local textile industry production improved. In particular, imported raw cotton from Texas tended to replace higher cost locally grown cotton. Despite the improvement, railway service was far from perfect. For instance, in 1892 Fernández del Valle Brothers requested the assistance of the government to force the railroad company to speed the arrival of raw cotton from Texas to Guadalajara, which had been shipped a month before; railroad officials could not explain what had happened to the freight nor where it was.\textsuperscript{111}

\begin{flushleft}
Secretaría General, Unidad Editorial, 1888), 413. According to Bárcena, by 1888, almost 84 percent of the agricultural production in Jalisco was maize and bean.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{108} Bárcena, \textit{Ensayo estadístico del estado de Jalisco}, 405.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{109} AHJ, F-9-869, GUA/855.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{110} Bárcena, \textit{Ensayo estadístico del estado de Jalisco}, 406.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{111} AHJ, F-9-892, GUA/205. The manuscript describes the penuries of two thousand families.
\end{flushleft}
The late arrival of the railroad to Guadalajara appears to have contributed to the slow growth of the region’s industrial sector. The first factories of Guadalajara appeared in the early 1840s yet forty years later, Guadalajara still had only a modest industrial sector of only nine industrial establishments that possessed features of size and mode of production that characterized modern factories.\(^{112}\) The biggest investment was concentrated on the textiles industries, but in a most modest way, there were other types of manufacturers, including the persistent artisans and independent manufacturers.\(^{113}\) Indeed, the late arrival of the railroad to Guadalajara undoubted enabled the artisan community to grow stronger than other regions of Mexico, where foreign imports and competitive local products arrived much cheaper via the railroad.

Accurate data on the overall growth of the city’s economy is problematic, although indications are that, like elsewhere in Mexico, the last half decade of the nineteenth century were very good years for economic growth, and likely a modest improvement in the standard of living for many Mexicans, particularly urban ones. The early sources of data were compiled by local economist and statistician, Longinos Banda. His data for 1849 and 1854 will serve as the beginning benchmark. He painstakingly gathered the data from official documents and from his own survey of the city. His industrial categories mirror roughly the occupational breakdown of the 1838-1842 occupational data used in this study, taken from the population censuses of those years (Table 1.4).

From the 1849-54 data, it can be appreciated that the manufacturing sector is dominated by artisan crafts. In both years, the manufacturing sector encompassed a little over one-third of the number of firms counted. Services and petty trades account for nearly half of all firms, while the professions and commercial establishments makeup barely ten percent of the total firms. The total value produced by those firms is another matter of course, but that data is unavailable.

\(^{112}\) Olveda, *Los bancos noroccidentales de México*, 43. Three were textiles factories, one was a paper factory, and five were cigar factories; the rest were small firms or independent artisans.

Table 1.2 Industries in Guadalajara, 1849-1895\textsuperscript{114}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions/Commerce</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trades</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Artisan Crafts</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Industrial/Sweating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Petty Trades</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for 1880 and 1895 are drawn from different sources—in both cases government data meant to serve as a basis for revenue gathering. The data for 1880 is drawn from an extraordinary business census of 1880 in which every licensed commercial and industrial establishment in the city is listed by address, owner’s name and type of establishment. The 1895 data is from a list published by state government of all registered industrial and commercial firms in the city who theoretically owe taxes to the city.\textsuperscript{115} Even firms that did not owe taxes as a result of their modest size (less than one hundred pesos in capital) were listed.

\textsuperscript{114} The 1842, 1849, and 1854 data come from Banda, \textit{Estadística de Jalisco}, 336; AHM, Paquete 144, expediente 1: "Datos estadísticos sobre giros mercantiles e industriales que existen en la ciudad, 1880;" AHJ, ES-9-889, "Boleta para recoger los datos sobre establecimientos mercantiles. Municipalidad de Guadalajara, 1889;" Estado de Jalisco "Cuotas que deberán pagar los causantes del Derecho de Patente mercantil e industrial de la ciudad de Guadalajara, durante el ejercicio fiscal de 1 de julio de 1895 a 30 de junio de 1896," \textit{El Estado de Jalisco} num. 46 and 47, tomo 20, 1895; AHJ, uncatalogued, "Estadística Industrial, 1907, Municipalidad de Guadalajara".

\textsuperscript{115} The taxes that the industrial and commercial establishments paid were called \textit{patente industrial} and \textit{patente mercantil}. This \textit{patente mercantil} was part of the new policy that allowed to the government to receive direct revenue from producers and merchant in substitution for the indirect tax called alcabalas, discussed earlier. See Félix Barrón, \textit{Informe leído en el Salón de Sesiones del Congreso del Estado de Jalisco, 1871}, Aída Urzúa Orozco and Gilberto Hernández Z., eds., \textit{Jalisco, Testimonio de sus gobernantes, 1826-1989} (Guadalajara, Mexico: Gobierno de Jalisco, Secretaría General, Unidad Editorial, 1987), 571.
On the surface, it would appear that commercial establishments virtually exploded in the decade and a half since 1880, while construction and transportation were curiously dormant, and services/petty trades virtually disappeared. The latter would be particularly surprising if the economy was surging to support such an increase in commerce. Manufacturing remained relatively stable (from 1880 to 1895), with both the craft sector and the industrial sector posting modest gains. Of all the figures, I suspect that the closest to reality would be the manufacturing sector, although the crafts were likely understated, perhaps by a good bit.

First, clearly one cannot rely on the absolute numbers because they were collected by different means, with different purposes in mind. In 1880, the city was celebrating its economy as a means to attract investment and improve the city’s image in the world. In 1895, the city was compiling a list for tax purposes. Moreover, the proportions within each year need to be cautiously considered. Even small commercial establishments are easy to count, as they must remain in one place for the convenience of their customers. Small-scale construction crews, cottage industries, and, especially, services and petty trades are more mobile, and more easily hid. Hence, the huge increase in the portion of professional/commercial establishments and the equally large decline in services/petty trades is likely more a product of the collection system than it was a reflection of real change.

On the surface, the substantial decline in the manufacturing sector from 1849 and 1854 (over one-third) to 1880 and 1895 (barely one quarter) might be seen as the decline in the number of artisan shops, presumably as larger, industrial firms take over their markets. However, there is evidence to suggest a more subtle and complex economic transformation. Traditionally, artisans received orders directly from their customers and then produced the goods in their own shops. In the years after mid-century, however, poorer masters and journeymen were less likely to own their own shop and, instead, often worked out of their homes in growing cottage industries, either producing on their own or working on consignment for merchants. Carlos Ílades uncovered this pattern for the
tailors of Mexico City, and a contemporary foreign observer noted the same for Guadalajara: “…in the suburbs of the city, and in the seemingly deserted streets, many of the lower classes are engaged in their own houses, where they exercise trades of various kind, and manufactured many articles of commerce.”

Moreover, the census figures disguise the mobility that it is known to have taken place, as artisans and other workers respond to the seasonal demand for labor in the countryside, and to the periodic demands for workers in various urban occupations—particularly in construction and commerce. Indeed, foreign industrialists in particular complained of the difficulty of retaining workers during the sowing and harvesting seasons.

Further evidence of this pattern can be seen from the occupational data gathered from the censuses of 1888, 1895 and 1900 (Table 1.3 and 1.4). Here the data is partial, but a far more reliable indicator of economic change than a listing of firms. In 1838-42 and 1888, whole districts are missing, and, no doubt, individuals went uncounted in those districts that did provide information. However, the districts that did provide data were generally the same in both eras, and individuals missed would also have been similar in both eras—the transient and the unskilled, neither of which are particularly important for the purposes of this study.

Unlike the counting for firms, the occupational structure indicates a significant increase in the construction trades from 1895 to 1900, both absolutely and relatively


117 Cincinnatus, Travels on the Western Slope of the Mexican Cordillera (San Francisco: Whitton, Towne & Co., 1857), 223.

118 Riojas López, Las intransitables vías del desarrollo, 253-254.


120 Because data from 1838-42 and 1888 are partial data, the tables must be read as percentages, not absolute numbers.
speaking, something that is known to be true during those years. The slight decline in manufacturing jobs appears, interestingly, to be due solely to a decline in industrial jobs, because artisan crafts actually increased in numbers and percentage.

Table 1.3 Increase in Crafts, 1838-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1838-1842</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>Increase 1895-1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   (%)</td>
<td>N   (%)</td>
<td>N    (%)</td>
<td>N   (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>84 3.5</td>
<td>288 7.6</td>
<td>855 7.1</td>
<td>813 6.6</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>50 2.1</td>
<td>60 1.6</td>
<td>107 0.9</td>
<td>191 1.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>77 3.2</td>
<td>191 5.1</td>
<td>456 3.8</td>
<td>491 4.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetmakers</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>2 0.1</td>
<td>9 0.1</td>
<td>5 0.0</td>
<td>-44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/coach makers</td>
<td>239 9.9</td>
<td>523 13.9</td>
<td>1,440 11.9</td>
<td>1,648 13.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire works makers</td>
<td>6 0.2</td>
<td>11 0.3</td>
<td>30 0.2</td>
<td>54 0.4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilders</td>
<td>1 0.0</td>
<td>14 0.4</td>
<td>38 0.3</td>
<td>10 0.1</td>
<td>-73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>95 3.9</td>
<td>107 2.8</td>
<td>608 5.0</td>
<td>288 2.4</td>
<td>-52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>190 7.9</td>
<td>156 4.1</td>
<td>456 3.8</td>
<td>428 3.5</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>185 7.7</td>
<td>318 8.4</td>
<td>1,323 11.0</td>
<td>2,908 23.8</td>
<td>119.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>26 1.1</td>
<td>90 2.4</td>
<td>188 1.6</td>
<td>401 3.3</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>303 12.5</td>
<td>591 15.7</td>
<td>815 6.8</td>
<td>975 8.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>474 19.6</td>
<td>766 20.3</td>
<td>1,768 14.7</td>
<td>2,030 16.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>38 1.6</td>
<td>65 1.7</td>
<td>105 0.9</td>
<td>118 1.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>195 8.1</td>
<td>370 9.8</td>
<td>831 6.9</td>
<td>865 7.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>32 0.8</td>
<td>92 0.8</td>
<td>102 0.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax makers/Candle makers/Match makers</td>
<td>29 1.2</td>
<td>43 1.1</td>
<td>193 1.6</td>
<td>94 0.8</td>
<td>-51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Weavers</td>
<td>423 17.5</td>
<td>148 3.9</td>
<td>2,744 22.8</td>
<td>806 6.6</td>
<td>-70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total 1838-1842 (%)             | 100.0    | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0              |
| Total Population 1888-1890 (%)  | 23,085   | 38,048| 83,934| 101,208 | 20.6               |

| Total Population 1890-1900 (%)  | 12,058 100.0 | 12,227 100.0 | 12,227 100.0 | 1.4 |

Looking at individual crafts, it is clear that the decline in industrial jobs was largely attributable to the decline in weavers, listed here as a craft but considered an industrial/sweating job in table 1.4. This mirrors trends nationally, as weavers employed in modern plants increased, but the large decline in hand weavers far outnumbered that

121 Cuarteles 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (2, 5, 6, 7 from 1842; and 8 and 9 from 38).

122 Total count of cuarteles 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9.
increase. Shawl weavers, on the other hand, increased in number and percentage, from 1895 to 1900, helped in good measure by the preference of Mexican women for rebozos made in the traditional way. They were down from their percentage in 1888, however, but that decline, and others like it such as the shoemakers, can be traced in large measure to the great increase in numbers of the masons, in particular, a reflection of the growth of the city during the boom years of 1895-1900. The only significant decline among craftsmen (between 1895 and 1900) in both numbers and percentage were the hat makers (sombrereros), whose craft had been almost totally proletarianized by local hat-making factories. Hat makers working for the factories would have been mainly called “operarios,” or “obreros,” not sombrereros. So on the surface, the 1890s appear to be good years for the city’s artisans, if the numbers tell any story. The portion of semi-skilled and unskilled workers actually decline from 1895 to 1900; the portion of the workforce made up of day laborers, for example, declined from 16.3 percent of all employed persons in 1888 to 12.5 percent in 1895. Whether this statistical improvement actually reflected a material improvement is another question. For artisans, the following chapters will attempt to show a surprisingly traditional craft community, anchored by a strong sense of job identity and, particularly, by a family and kinship networks that had evolved over decades to meet the economic challenges of the new era.
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123 Rodney D. Anderson, Outcasts in Their Own Land. Mexican Industrial Workers, 1906-1910 (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1976), 38-42. Nationally, in the census of 1895, manufacturing made up only 11.5 percent of the labor force due to the dominance of agriculture (66.5 percent); Donald B. Keesing, “Structural Change Early in Development: Mexico’s Changing Industrial and Occupational Structure from 1895 to 1950,” Journal of Economic History 29:4 (December 1969), 716-38. Considering only manufacturing jobs, however, textiles and clothing jobs made up 38.9 percent, compared to Guadalajara’s 29.6 percent; ibid., 726. However, Keesing placed two-thirds of the carpenters in construction, rather than manufacturing where, as I believe, they should belong, reducing the numbers in manufacturing; ibid., 727. Keesing considers, rightly I believe, that the majority of the workers classified in manufacturing in 1895 were traditional craftsmen or artisans, not industrial workers.
Table 1.4 Occupational Structure of Guadalajara, 1838-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1838-1842 (1)</th>
<th></th>
<th>1895</th>
<th></th>
<th>1900</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N   (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N   (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Commercial</td>
<td>1,168 16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,266 21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,724 21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trades</td>
<td>480 6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,077 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,842 12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Trades</td>
<td>144 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>390 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>604 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,791 39.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,501 37.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,715 32.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Artisan Crafts/Trades</td>
<td>2,150 30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,077 27.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,048 28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Industrial/Sweating Trades</td>
<td>641 9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,424 10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,667 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Trades/ Petty Trades</td>
<td>1,701 24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,398 30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,849 24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>814 11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,484 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,135 8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,098 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,116 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,869 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,085 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,934 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>101,208 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, after decades of relative economic stagnation, the period from 1877 to 1910 witnessed an era of economic expansion, particularly in the 1890s, and then, after the downturn in the international economy from 1900 through 1901, and from 1902 through 1906. The Díaz regime provided the social stability necessary for national and foreign investments and encouraged the creation and expansion of national and international markets by constructing the railroad system and abolishing the internal customs (alcabalas). Foreign and national capitalists invested in key sectors of the economy: railroads, mining, banking, industry, and provided new urban services such as electric power and urban transportation (tramways). However, the manufacturing sector grew only slowly in the 1870s and 1880s, usually in direct proportion to the railroad development that connected Mexico’s regions.

---


125 Ibid., 432.

The first years of the railroad in Guadalajara brought in a mixture of results. Merchants and industrialists profited from the change while artisans and small producers were often hard pressed. Later on, in 1893, the international fall of silver’s prices dragged the economy into a crisis. Amazingly, the economy recovered and experienced a significant growth from 1894 to 1906, and the occupational figures generally reflect that growth. The impact on individuals is more difficult to determine, however, particularly after inflation sets in during the first decade of the twentieth-century, and after the recession of 1907-08, precipitated by a crisis in international trade, caused widespread unemployment and economic distress. Those years, and the political crisis that led to the cataclysmic Mexican Revolution, is beyond the scope of this study.
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CHAPTER TWO
LABOR ASSOCIATIONS

This chapter, and the one that follows, will examine the course of labor organizations in Guadalajara, and where relevant, in the rest of Mexico, as artisans, petty merchants and shopkeepers (and at times politicians) sought to replace the colonial gremios and cofradías in the decades after Independence from Spain in 1821, and respond to the many trials and tribulations that Independence would bring. This chapter will emphasize the events and movements in the rest of Mexico, although referring to Guadalajara where useful. Chapter three will concentrate on labor associations of Guadalajara in the second half of the nineteenth century, mentioning the rest of Mexico where relevant. The fall into disuse of the guild system was gradual, but new “labor” organizations emerged created by artisans and small producers themselves. The relationship between artisans, shopkeepers, merchants and, later, industrial workers, was complex and resists easy analysis.

Gremios and Cofradías

During much of the colonial era, corporate guilds (gremios) dominated much of the city’s economy. They determined production quotas, apprenticeship regulations, entry into the crafts, etc. Toward the end of the colonial era, however, the Spanish government had moved to limit the guilds power and to open trade to competition along the lines of early liberal economic thought. On June 8 of 1813, in Spain, the Cortes de Cádiz decreed the abolition of the guilds and on January 7 of 1814, this decree was published in Mexico by Viceroy Calleja. But there is a curious ambivalence about the

---

implementation of the decree, and it is necessary to deconstruct the evidence with care.\footnote{For the history and the ultimate fate of México City’s gremios, see Sonia Pérez Toledo, “Artesanos y gremios de la ciudad de México: una desaparición formal y una continuidad real, 1780-1842,” in \textit{Ciudad de México: Instituciones, actores sociales y conflicto político, 1774-1931}, ed. Carlos Íllades and Ariel Rodríguez Kuri (México: Colegio de Michoacán/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 1996), 240.}

First of all, the guild’s “abolition” did not revoke the privileges of the members, but only opened the crafts to anyone who desired to practice them: “Every Spaniard can practice any craft without presenting a master exam before the respective guild.”\footnote{AMG, GS, 1813, paquete 29, legajo 167.} Indeed, in Guadalajara, the city government continued to confirm guild elections through 1820. Eventually, however, in the years after Independence, the city authorities less and less enforced guild regulations until the organizations themselves no longer existed.

In addition, the confraternities linked to trades also underwent a transformation. The church sponsored the confraternities, a complementary part of the guilds. They constituted mutual associations composed by artisans of the same craft, having basically a double mission: to foment the catholic values among the community and help artisans during time of distress. Although they were terminated by colonial law, they continued to function until the mid-nineteenth century.\footnote{Manuel Carrera Stampa, \textit{Los gremios mexicanos. La organización gremial en Nueva España 1521-1861} (Mexico: EDIAPSA, 1954), 126} Finally, in 1856, the \textit{Ley de desarmotización de bienes de la Iglesia y corporaciones} forced the \textit{cofradías} to sell their collectively-owned properties, and thereby abolishing the last vestiges of artisan corporate protection and material support.\footnote{Carlos Íllades, \textit{Hacia la república del trabajo: la organización artesanal en la ciudad de México, 1853-1876} (Mexico: EL Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Históricos: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, 1996), 76. In Mexico City, the confraternity of silversmiths received 79,973.12 pesos for the sale of twelve properties.}

Although the same hierarchy of master, journeymen and apprentice continued to function, the traditional protection that journeymen and apprentices enjoyed under the guild organization disappeared, leaving them at the mercy of master’s abuses and the
uncertainties of the now deregulated “liberal” economy. Once regulated by guilds, apprenticeship contracts became an issue of private negotiations between the owner of the workshop and the parent or guardian of the young man. Masters and owners of shops could pay to their workers whatever they decided according to their own interest, or dismiss artisans without cause, especially during times of economic decline.

Even though it varied from region to region, the first decades of Mexico’s independence were characterized by economic disorganization and a general contraction of markets. Both national and regional political disputes retarded the development of regional markets, in part because each subsisted independently from the other. Because most artisans subsisted on local consumer demand, they were particularly vulnerable to market downturns. Even small reductions of demand for their product caused unemployment and economic hardship. Moreover, the industrialization of European and North American textile industry resulted in cheap foreign imports competing with, and in some cases, displacing traditional obrajero production throughout Mexico. Adding to the misfortunes of the hand weavers was the introduction into Mexico of mechanized textile production in the 1830s and 1840s.

Once the dominant craft occupation in Guadalajara, by 1842 obrajeros had declined to less than one thousand; by 1888 they had disappeared almost completely. Foreign competition (including wide-spread contraband) not only affected artisans, of course, but local merchants who marketed artisan production, and small producers as well. It should be no surprise, therefore, that the first “labor” organizations were often composed of merchants, masters, and journeymen artisans.

———


134 Ibid.


136 Weaving declined gradually throughout the nineteenth century. In 1821 they were 1,146 weavers, in 1842 423, by 1888 only 146 weavers. By 1895, weavers disappeared as occupational category in the census of the same year.
Protests and Protectionism 1830s to 1840s

After independence, Mexico, as many other Latin American countries, developed protectionist policies to reduce trade deficits, raise revenues and encourage domestic manufacturing. The post-Independence weakness of the economy caused by “the decline of the mining production, the unchecked influx of imports, the hemorrhage of specie overseas, [and] the growing trade imbalance” encouraged “protectionist sentiments” among merchants, industrialists, and artisans equally. In 1848, the owners of the textile factories of the Atemajac and La Escoba requested to the state governor to stop the introduction of yarn through San Blas harbor. According to them, since 1841 the commercialization of foreign yarn had been damaging “la industria naciente” (the newfound industry) in Jalisco. In summary, they requested government protection from the importation of yarn that competed with the one produced in their factories.

A year later, in 1849, a group of Guadalajara master tailors denounced the illegal introduction of fifty thousand pieces of finished clothes (“ropa hecha”) that had been advertised in Mexico City’s newspapers. They felt threatened by the possibility that a portion of this finished clothes would end in Guadalajara’s markets, ruining their local businesses and families. They condemned the people who introduced the merchandise as antipatriotic since it destroyed the national manufactures. The governor took the side of the tailors and assured them that the authorities would check the origin of any batch of
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137 Ibid., 217.

138 Representación que los empresarios de hilados y tejidos de Guadalajara, hacen al Supremo Gobierno del Estado pidiéndole que impida la importación de hilaza extranjera. (Guadalajara: Imprenta de Manuel Brambila, 1848) 3.

139 Representación que los maestros sastres de esta capital elevan al E. S. Gobernador del Estado, pidiendo se ejecuten las leyes prohibitivas, en cuanto a la ropa hecha, y contestación del mismo Escmo. Señor sobre este punto (Guadalajara: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1849).

140 Nineteen tailor masters signed the petition and, in accordance with their calculation, between three to four hundred tailor journeymen would lose their jobs.
finished clothes that entered through Jalisco customs. These early attempts of organizations were responding to the introduction of foreign products that directly competed with local manufactures.

**Junta de Fomento de Artesanos**

In what was a harbinger of future patterns of labor associations, two competing artisan groups appeared in México City in 1843. Sponsored by the federal government, a group of artisans created the *Junta de Fomento de Artesanos* (Board for the Development of Artisans) whose stated goals were to increase and improve the production of Mexican artisans in response to the “invasion” of foreign commodities, in part by raising the educational level of the workers through the creation of elementary and vocational schools. In addition, the association sought to improve the morals of the workers through religion. The *Junta* offered loans, health care, educational services, and life insurance to help orphaned children. In a self-conscious imitation of the British Lancasterian system of adult education, the *Junta* established an adult night school for its members. In addition, the *Junta* founded *El Semanario Artístico*, a newspaper used to propagate its ideas among the working class.

Although, the *Junta* can be seen as continuation of the guild system, there were fundamental differences between those two associations. Unlike the guilds, every member of the working class could be part of the *Junta*, including apprentices, journeymen, masters, and factory workers without trade distinction. More fundamentally, membership was not compulsory as in the guilds. In essence, the *Junta* was a voluntary organization that promoted national values instead of loyalty to a corporate group. The timing of its founding proved its undoing. The looming conflict

141 Ibid., 12.


with the United States absorbed the bulk of federal resources and by the beginning of that war in 1846, the Junta had ceased to exist.\footnote{Juan Felipe Leal, \textit{Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910} (Mexico: El Caballito, 1991), 14.}

**Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios\footnote{Sonia Pérez Toledo, “Una organización alternativa de artesanos: la Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, 1843-1844,” \textit{Signos Históricos}, no. 9 (2003): 80.}**

Simultaneously to, and in competition with, the \textit{Junta}, other Mexico City artisans founded the \textit{Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios} (Arts and Trades Mexican Protecting Association) in 1843. Through their weekly newspaper, the \textit{El Aprendiz}, the Society supported the principles of association among the city’s working class. Although both organizations shared some of the same concerns about vocational education and the moralization of the working class, the \textit{Sociedad Mexicana} was an independent organization created by a group of independent artisans as an alternative to the government association.\footnote{Andrés Cuevas y Terán, Santiago Villanueva, Luis María Aguilar, and Joaquín Yánez appeared as the board of the association.} Moreover, the \textit{El Aprendiz} addressed issues of production and distribution that the \textit{Junta de Fomento} had not considered. For instance, it supported detailed regulations of artisans’ work, specifying, for example, the protection of the customers by guaranteeing that if contracted jobs were not completed by an artisan, the customer could choose other member of the \textit{sociedad} to finish the work. As with the \textit{Junta}, the \textit{Sociedad Mexicana} also fell prey to the turbulence of the era and lasted only a couple of years before disappearing.

**Mutualism, Militancy and Artisan Organizations, 1840s-1890s**

Despite the political chaos that followed the “War of the North American Invasion (1846-48)” (as it is known in Mexico), culminating in the War of the Reform between the Liberals and the Conservatives (1858-60) and then the French Invasion and the ill-fated “Empire” of Maximillian of Austria (1862-67), Mexican artisans struggled to
create associations that would replace their now defunct and illegal guilds. In an era of increasing ascendency of liberal economic ideas hostile to working-class organization, Mexico’s artisans were often faced with two organizational choices—mutualist and cooperative societies that were acceptable to the political authorities, or more politically radical alternatives, which were not. European ideologies about social reforms arrived with the colonization policies that the government promoted as a way to overcome the economic and social backwardness of Mexico. Although, the colonization program did not succeed as the government expected, the influence of socialist and anarchist ideologies were brought with some migrants. Plotino Rhodakanaty arrived in 1861 and, as a socialist, taught the principles of that ideology to members of the working class, especially the artisans, in the Escuela Libre (Free School) in Chalco. Eventually, the government expelled Rhodakanaky. However, many of his pupils participated in the creation of the Gran Círculo de Obreros de México in 1872 and in the publication of “El Socialista,” a newspaper that spread new ideas about education, cooperation, and the emancipation of the working class.

Mutual aid associations were another type of working class associations. They shared certain features in common. They were civil associations and their members belonged to the same local networks. They were often neighbors, and practiced the same trade or profession, usually went to the same parish, and often were part of the same extended kinship. They were, however, bound by strict legal requirements. Every association had to have a government-approved formal constitution that detailed the functioning of the association (name of the association, purposes, admission requirements, rights and duties of the members, and constitution of the administrative board and its functions). Although they were also, by statute, prohibited from political participation, some associations even went so far as to incorporate their apolitical
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147 Small town nearby to Mexico City.


149 Leal, Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910, 15.
position within their constitution, probably as a sign to the authorities that they would not cause any political problem.\textsuperscript{150} The \textit{Círculo Católico de Obreros Sociedad Alcalde} in Guadalajara stipulated that it would not encourage strikes because they “respect the right of freedom of contract,” a sacred liberal economic tenet.\textsuperscript{151}

Mutual aid societies generally provided three services to their members: help during sickness and unemployment, the payment of a sum to bury members who died, and monetary help for the widows and their children. A clear difference between guilds and\textit{ cofradías}, on the one hand, and the mutual aid societies on the other, was the latter’s lack of a hierarchy. Mutual assistance would be provided to its members without distinction during time of need, and in matters of adult education and\textit{ caja de ahorros} (worker savings banks). Frequently, contemporary sources justified mutual aid associations as support for the family, often with a story of an artisan who died in extreme poverty leaving behind his wife and small children without any patrimony or a way to make a living. For instance, in 1879 in Guadalajara, the Sociedad\textit{ de Socorros Mutuos de Artesanos} was established by the artisan Félix Provincia, who was moved to action upon witnessing the death of an impoverished artisan.\textsuperscript{152}

Most such associations consisted of an assembly of all members and an elected board of directors that administrated the society’s funds and reported regularly to the assembly on such tasks as confirming that the members were actually sick, providing medical assistance, and visiting the sick members, and, of course, providing the money that would cover the above expenses.\textsuperscript{153}

The economic reality facing mutual aid associations, however, was quite different. Throughout most of the last half of the nineteenth century, high fees, an unstable economy and a mobile work force undermined most association’s economic

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{151} BPJ, \textit{Reglamento del Círculo Católico}, 7.

\textsuperscript{152} José Villa Gordoa, \textit{Guía y álbum de Guadalajara para los viajeros. Apuntes sobre la historia de la ciudad, su situación, clima, aspecto, habitantes, edificios, etc.} (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tip. José M. Yguíniz, 1888), 84.

integrity. For example, in 1886, a small group of Guadalajara clerks and retail sales persons established the *Sociedad Mutualista de Dependientes*. Its motto was “Todos para uno y uno para todos,” (All for one and one for all) but its members had to pay two pesos for inscription and fifty cents monthly to be considered an active member, far beyond what an average artisan earned.\(^{154}\) The average wage in manufacturing during the Porfiriato (1877-1910) in Jalisco was .41 cents per day.\(^{155}\) If a member stopped contributing, he lost the benefits of the association and lost the money that he already had contributed to.\(^{156}\) Certainly, the high fees and the necessity of maintaining a steady income restricted mutual aid society’s membership to well-off artisans and small producers.\(^{157}\) In order to obtain more stable funding, some mutual aid associations solicited donations from politicians, affluent entrepreneurs, even military officers in return for honorary membership.\(^{158}\) Most mutual aid societies formally forbid political involvement, of course, but they often discussed political issues in their assemblies and debated what position they should take toward them.\(^{159}\) Inevitably, politics and patronage practices often compromised the association’s independence and discredited mutualism in general, particularly among the more industrialized sector of the working class, especially those dedicated to the textile production and mining.\(^{160}\) Yet, likely far more important than the restricted nature of mutual aid societies, the ideological and political

\(^{154}\) *Sociedad Mutualista de Dependientes* (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tipografía J. Guadalupe Montenegro, 1886), 1-3.


\(^{159}\) Leal, *Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910*, 32.

\(^{160}\) Ibid., 20.
opposition of Mexican Liberalism served to discourage labor organizations based on industry or class.

Workers, Artisans, and the Constitution of 1857

Nineteenth-century Mexico witnessed constant succession of administrations and frequent confrontations between liberals and conservatives until the last quarter of the century with the arrival of Porfirio Díaz at the presidency and the imposition of liberal economic policies. Liberals wanted to get the economic benefits from the *laissez-faire* and to restructure the political system. Conservatives sought the continuation of the same social and political organization as during colonial times. The church actively supported conservatives as they shared most of the same principles and felt in its privileges were in jeopardy.

In 1856, the Liberal Party had proposed the so-called “Ley Lerdo” (*Ley de desamortización de bienes de manos muertas*) named after the Minister of the Economy that had proposed the legislation. The bill would have forced every civil and ecclesiastical corporation to sell any property held in common. Finally, in 1857, the liberals passed *Ley Lerdo* as an article in the constitution of 1857. The Conservatives, and the Church, refused to accept the constitution and a bloody civil war followed (1858-60). Needing funds to finance the war, the Liberals in July of 1859 decreed that Church property would now be confiscated, sold at auction (at vastly discounted prices) and the state would get the profits. In Guadalajara, the commercial elite took advantage of this and bought whole blocks of urban property.\(^{161}\)

The Constitution of 1857 also affected workers. Article 5 declared the freedom of each individual to sell his or her labor but had not formally forbidden strikes nor prevented workers from organizing.\(^{162}\) However, since the constitution did not specify
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\(^{162}\) México, *Constitución Federal de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos sancionada y jurada por el Congreso General Constituyente el día 5 de febrero de 1857*, 25-26. Article 5th.
any further workers’ rights, the Federal District’s Penal Code (1871) banned in its article any association of workers that “impede the free exercise of industry or labor.” Jalisco, as other states, followed this initiative and included a similar legislation. Despite the legal and political opposition working class organization did, in fact, take place.

**Labor Militancy, 1870-1876.**

*Gran Círculo de Obreros de México (GCO)*

The 1870s—significantly years of political turmoil—were also years of great labor unrest. In 1870, a small group of labor activists founded the *Gran Círculo de Obreros de México* comprised of mutual aid societies in Central Mexico. Inspired by the International Working Men’s Association (IWMA) created in 1864 in London, and by the experience of the Paris Commune in 1871, a group of artisans began the dissemination of socialist ideas through newspapers such as *El Socialista.* Mutual aid societies, they argued, were limited by the scarce resources of most artisans and jornaleros (day laborers). Cooperatives, while theoretically useful, were also limited by most Mexican workers’ poverty. Also, they frequently published material from the IWMA. The GCO promoted and encouraged the creation of affiliated workers’ associations around the country. By 1875, there were twenty-eight Mexican branches of the GCO, mostly in Central Mexico and the Federal District, and predominantly in the textile industry. The vast majority of the associations were mutual aid societies; of the twenty-eight
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165 Leal, *Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910,* 22. Despite of having the same name, this newspaper was a different project from the one published in Guadalajara during early 1849.

166 Ibid., 27.
members, only one was a cooperative. Although similar to its British counterpart, the GCO discouraged strikes as counter-productive, strikes were common in the 1870s, particularly in textiles and in mining.\footnote{Anderson, \textit{Outcasts in Their Own Land}, 81-82.}

Strikes, however, occasionally did take place in artisan shops. In 1872, Mexico City tailors went on strike in several establishments. More significant was the Mexico City hatters strike in 1875.\footnote{Paco Ignacio Taibo II, ed., \textit{La huelga de los sombreros, México 1875} (Mexico: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1980), 9.} Aided financially by the GCO and supported by its paper \textit{El Socialista}, the \textit{Huelga de los Sombrereros} received national support from merchants and shopkeepers as well as numerous artisan groups. Even intellectuals donated money to support the strikers.\footnote{Guillermo Prieto volunteered as workers’ mediator before the workshops’ owners. He was known as the poet of the common people.} Although the strike began over an attempt by a large Mexico City workshop owner to reduce his journeymen’s wages, it was supported by master hatters and journeymen in many smaller shops who suffered competition from what were essentially “sweatshop” factories. Eventually some forty shops were closed throughout the city, either struck by their workers or closed in sympathy to the strikers. The strike lasted from April to July when the intervention of the municipal government forced the owners to accept the workers’ petition stipulating fixed wages according to the skill level of the operator and the difficulty of the job.\footnote{Ibid., 18.} The hatters’ strike of 1875 was to be a rare example of a successful artisan strike ended by a favorable government intervention, and an even rarer example of a strike that pitted workers, journeymen, masters and small shop owners on one side versus merchant capitalists on the other.\footnote{Ibid., 17.}

Although, the \textit{Gran Círculo de Obreros} sought to advance workers’ conditions during the strike, its position was more about reconciling the working class and the
capitalists than militant labor action. The GCO stressed the importance of labor organization for workers’ protection and mutual help, but as a moderate position of collaboration among social classes in support of harmony between capital and labor. Moreover, artisans and workers for the most part did not yet perceive the contradiction of their situation—that capitalism divided into classes those who sell their labor and those who own the means of production. The mutual associations made no distinction between worker and artisans (obreros and artesanos). These associations attempted to satisfy the basic needs of the working classes without differentiating between the interests of artisan shop owners (i.e. who owned the means of production) and those artisans who worked for them (who may or may not have owned their own tools). Their petitions were related only to economic improvement and did not question the contradiction between the interests of capital and the interests of labor.

In other words, the first mutual associations accepted and respected the existence of both workers and capitalists; they looked for the harmony among all members of the society since, they believed, that all classes were necessary to the construction of a new republic. As long as artisans believed it was possible to become entrepreneurs and open their own small workshops, they felt no need to confront capitalism as a class. However, as their material conditions deteriorated more, the discourse of some labor associations turned radical.

Inevitably, perhaps, the GCO began to have internal disagreements. On one side, the organization’s leadership supported the reelection of Lerdo de Tejada in 1876. On the other side, groups of workers rejected the leadership’s political aspirations and
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172 Ibid., 9.
175 Barragán, Ortíz, and Rosales, “El mutualismo en México, siglo XIX,” page number
withdrew from the organization. Despite the disagreements, the GCO leadership and its followers supported publicly the reelection of Lerdo de Tejada. In March 1876, the *Círculo* organized the *Primer Congreso Obrero Permanente* in Mexico City. Thirty-five delegates from all around Mexico met to create a “united front for the Mexican worker.”\(^{177}\)

Unfortunately for the GCO, Porfirio Díaz refused to accept Lerdo de Tejada’s victory and successfully overthrew the government in 1876. Despite the efforts of the GCO and the Second Workers Congress to negotiate with the new administration, its influence waned and closed by the federal government in 1883.\(^{178}\) It would not be until a generation later, in 1906, that another national labor association rose to attempt to organize Mexican workers. By then the economic and political climate had changed dramatically. Meanwhile, in other regions of the country, artisans and workers attempted to deal with local problems through various means. The next chapter will focus on artisans and their organizations, movements and strikes in Guadalajara.
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\(^{177}\) Anderson, *Outcasts in Their Own Land*, 82-83.

CHAPTER THREE

ARTISAN ASSOCIATIONS AND MOVEMENTS OF GUADALAJARA,
1850-1888

As elsewhere in Mexico, the textile industry was the first industry to mechanize production with the founding of the mills *La Prosperidad Jalisciense* and *La Escoba* in 1843. At Independence in 1821, the city’s textile production was dominated by handweavers (*obrajeros*), for the most part operating out of their own homes. With the exception of servants, the weavers were the most numerous of the city’s workers—over three times the numbers of the shoemakers, for example, their closest craft competitor.

That year (1821) was the apogee of the hand weavers. With the coming of independence (1821) and the resulting economic liberalism, both legal and contraband foreign cloth imports flooded the region, along with competition from *manta* woven in the newly established textile mills in Puebla, and finally, in the 1840s, from the city’s own mills. In 1832, in an alliance that would characterize much (but not all) of the artisan protests to follow, master craftsmen and journeymen united to urge a boycott of imported British cloth.\(^{179}\) By 1842, the city’s artisan craft structure had been considerably altered, as indicated in table 3.1. As happened elsewhere in Mexico, by the 1840s the hand weavers were hard pressed, and soon they would disappear altogether. While they are still significant in 1842—at nearly a fourth of the listed crafts (17.6%) compared to nearly half (40.4%) in 1821—most were already textile operatives, and here called *obrajeros* only out of tradition.

Table 3.1 Crafts by Year 1821-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1838-1842</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Weavers</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/coach makers</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax makers/ Candle makers/ Match makers</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, one craft of the textile sector actually grew in the decades after independence—that of the *reboceros*, the shawl weavers. In 1821 they had been a minor part of the *obrajeros* guild, but by the 1840s they were second only to the shoemakers, and slightly larger than the *obrajeros*. Their survival and growth is an interesting

---

180 As discussed earlier, these figures come from a full count of all employed persons from cuarteles (districts) 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (5, 6, and 7 from 1842; and 8 and 9 from 1838). The manuscripts for districts 1, 2 and 3 are missing. If any comparison is made to other type of data (e.g. number of shops), then the latter will be limited to the districts for which employment figures are available.

181 Only one manuscript is missing for 1888; however, only cuarteles 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 gave employment statistics and are included here.

182 By 1895, weavers disappeared (*obrajeros*), and a different category emerged—*tejedores*. There were 2,744 in 1895 and 806 *tejedores* in 1900 (615 were women). It may be that the remaining weavers were placed in the *tejedor* category in 1895, but only textile mill weavers included in that category in 1900. Other categorical changes may also account for the discrepancies.
commentary of the juxtaposition of culture and craft production. Just as the hand
weavers, the shawl weavers were mainly family workshops in which the entire family
participated in production. The rebozo was a traditional garment worn by the vast
majority of Mexican women. The material used in rebozo production was determined by
class and conditioned by feminine preference for traditional styles. While the popular
classes wore shawls made of cotton and calico, the upper class preferred the ones made
from silk. Both types were made locally in family shops and sold not only in the city but
in other markets in the west and north of Mexico.

In 1844, a French entrepreneur, Carlos Tarel, arrived in Guadalajara and opened a
shawl workshop investing in a new technique (“rebozo de seda de doble vista,” meaning
that the shawl had the different appearance on both sides) developed by a local shawl
weaver name Víctor Munguía. Three years later, in 1847, Munguía obtained the patent
for the new technique, granted by the Junta de Industria. In 1849, Munguía reached an
agreement with Carlos Tarel, Juan María Muñoz and José Portillo giving them the right
to produce the double sided shawl in Guadalajara. That same year, Tarel, in conjunction
with four other French investors, expanded his business by buying up other workshops
and concentrating the artisans in a single establishment. The use of machinery allowed
a dramatic reduction on the production time of a shawl from two days to only one day,

---

183 Most shops were located in the north of the city in a neighborhood called El Santuario,
after the Parish Church. The issue of location and urban space will be discussed in a later


185 Jaime Olveda, “El monopolio rebocero Guadalajara-Zamora,” Relaciones II, no. 8

186 Víctor Munguía was a native of Zamora, Michoacán. Carlos Tarel heard of
Munguía’s invention during a San Juan de los Lagos industrial fair and hired the best
Munguía’s journeyman for 200 pesos. Ibid., 96. The Munguía family prospered,
however, and by 1880 owned several textile shops and stores in the city.

thereby increasing worker productivity but reducing the number of workers needed to man the machines. On April 17, 1850, just after the first machines were introduced to Rebozos de Seda Tarel y Cía factory, the owners attempted to reduce the wages of their nearly 500 workers. The workers refused to accept the wage reduction, and all walked out on strike. However, some artisans returned to work the next day. At the end of the working day, the artisans who had continued the strike were waiting for the strikebreakers with poles and stones. Two of the owners tried to protect them, but violence erupted. Contemporary reports claimed that nearly two thousand people supported the artisans with cries of “Death to the Americans and the rich! Burn the factory!”

Finally, city authorities called in local units of the state militia to end the violence and disperse the crowd. It is not known if the owners maintained the wage reductions, or if any of the rioters suffered legal consequences for their actions. However, the press reported that one of the “instigators” had confessed, and asked the forgiveness of the owners and to be allowed to return to his job. The owners accepted the apologies with the only condition that he had to confess his misbehavior before the authorities. The 1850 Tarel Riot, as it came to be called, is among the first of a long and bloody history of Mexican labor conflicts. The labor historian Jorge Basurto has called the strike and subsequent riot the first modern labor movement in Mexican history.

---

188 After the new rates, a journeyman would earn only .18 cents daily. In contrast to other factories, this wage was very low. For instance, in 1845 the paper mill paid its workers .50 cents a day. Ibid., 98.

189 El Universal, 1 May 1850.

190 “Mueran los gringos y los ricos, fuego al establecimiento,” El Universal, 1 May 1850. Since the owners were French, perhaps the term gringos at the time meant all or any foreigners. According to the Diccionario de la Lengua Española de la Lengua, “gringo” means “extranjero, especialmente de habla inglesa, y en general hablante de una lengua que no sea la española.”

191 El Universal, 1 May 1850.

Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara

Although the details of its founding are vague, weeks prior to the Tarel Riot, artisans under the leadership of Vicente Ortigosa and Sotero Prieto formed the first artisan association in Guadalajara and one of the oldest in the country, the Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara. According to contemporary documentation, Ortigosa and Prieto, along with 803 artisans in attendance, formed the Junta General de Artesanos and approved the creation of the company. Both Prieto and Ortigosa were followers of the French social philosopher Charles Fourier, a proponent of a communal form of socialism. Prieto, now a Mexican merchant, had participated in the creation of one of the first Fourian communal groups in Spain in 1837. A decade later, he organized socialist groups in Tampico and, sometime before the Tarel Riot, had helped form the artisan Compañía. Briefly, in early 1849, the newspaper El Socialista was published in Guadalajara but had ceased publishing by the end of February of that year.

In any case, the worker activities sufficiently alarmed the editor of the local paper, El Universal, that two weeks before the riot the paper had denounced Vicente Ortigosa’s speech before the Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara, charging that it was full of Proudhonian socialism, a charge that Ortigosa had denied in the speech itself. The

193 Vicente Ortigosa, Reglamento de la compañía de artesanos de Guadalajara (Guadalajara, Mexico: Imprenta Manuel Brambila, 1850), 29-35.

194 Charles Fourier was a French socialist philosopher who believed that social harmony was possibly through the creation of small self-sustaining communal groups. Carlos Íllades, “De los gremios a las sociedades de socorros mutuos: el artesanado mexicano, 1814-1853,” Historia Social, no. 8 (1990): 83.


196 El Universal, 7 April 1850. The speech had been made on February 25, 1850. Mutualism is a variant of anarchism inspired by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. Its basic ideas are the disintegration of the government, equality in the property and freedom of credit. The ideal society is the one constituted by mutual associations of small producers.
paper’s editor expressed doubts that such “disolventes” discourse could flourish among Mexican workers, since their social conditions were not as harsh as the ones in Europe:

“…en México, donde con tanta profusión derramó el Criador [sic] sus bendiciones, donde una fatiga insignificante basta para que la tierra produzca tan abundantes frutos, donde casi puede decirse que los pobres viven sin trabajar.”

The editor went on to denounce the negative impact that those doctrines would have on the social order since these ideas discredit every one of the social institutions such as religion, property, family and state:

”…es muy peligroso infundir en el pueblo la idea de que todo hasta ahora ha sido malo, absurdo, todo desconcertado, todo contrario a la naturaleza y a las necesidades del hombre; es muy peligroso decirle que no hay ley que no hay sido desatino, ni legislador que no haya sido tirano; es muy peligroso hacerle entender que la repartición actual de la riqueza no es justa, y que será justa, cuando se dé al trabajo una organización que ahora no tiene, y que es imposible.”

After the riot, El Universal did not openly blame the Compañía de Artesanos for the disturbances but it emphasized the fact that the riot had occurred in the same city where this artisan association was established and where El Socialista had spread the ideas of social equality and fair distribution of wealth. The paper charged that “socialist” and “communist” doctrines had “poisoned the heart of our peaceful workers,” resulting in the Tarel Riot.

Ortigosa continued to actively participate in local politics as an outspoken proponent of working class associations. As late as 1859, he was still promoting the Compañía de Artesanos. In a speech on February 25, 1859, Ortigosa explained his view

---

197 The poor almost could live without working because of the abundance of the earth. Ibid.

198 Ibid.

199 Ibid., 1 May 1850.

200 El Universal, 1 May 1850.

201 Víctor Ortigosa was part of the well-off class of Guadalajara. He studied in Germany and France. Also, he participated in Maximiliano’s State Council. Héctor Oscar González, “Dos proyectos de sociedades de artesanos: Guadalajara, 1850,” Relaciones III, no. 10 (1982): 105.
of the principles of working class associations. According to Ortigosa, the organization of the workers was the only way to create a “society that would benefit the majority of the population”\textsuperscript{202} since all the previous and contemporary known forms of government had been unable to improve the conditions of the vast majority of the population, but only favored small sections of the society. Ortigosa rejected the communist ideal in which everybody is equal, and instead called for a fair distribution of wealth according to the product of one’s capital, talent and work. He specifically rejected any socialist notion of class conflict and favored harmony among all social classes.\textsuperscript{203}

In his view, artisan cooperatives such as his projected \textit{La Compañía} would be an effective means to promote working class (and here he clearly means artisan) interests. In Ortigosa’s proposal, the company initially would need to be capitalized with at least 70,000 pesos, although it would begin to function as collecting 30,000 pesos. The associates could buy shares with a value of ten pesos, a hundred pesos or a thousand pesos. Significantly, any person could buy shares of the company, whether or not they were artisans. The company would provide credit to the artisans—who usually only had access to credit through loan sharks—to buy raw materials or anything else related to the production of his trade. Every share provided the right to receive a credit for half the value of the share.\textsuperscript{204}

Besides providing credit to its members, the central function of the company would be to maintain a retail store where the member’s products would be sold to the public.\textsuperscript{205} The day-to-day activities of the company would be carried on by the appointed officers of the \textit{Compañía} and a Board of Directors. The general policies of the company were to be decided at a general assembly to be held every six months. All one-hundred-pesos shareholder and the one-thousand-pesos shareholder were eligible to attend the assemblies and vote. Every ten-pesos shareholders would choose a representative to attend the assembly and vote on their behalf.

\textsuperscript{202} Ortigosa, \textit{Reglamento de la compañía de artesanos de Guadalajara}, 5.

\textsuperscript{203} Ibid., 8-11.

\textsuperscript{204} Ibid., 13.

\textsuperscript{205} Ibid., 17-24.
The Cooperative Movement is well defined historically and well documented, although historians argue about its essential nature. It began in the United States in the 1830s in response to the difficulties of ordinary artisans obtaining capital and/or credit to operate their craft, and to the increasing competition from shops owned by merchant capitalists who contracted out jobs and took a portion of the sales value in (what many artisans believed to be unearned) profit. By selling directly to the consumers, artisans would receive the full value of their labor, and thereby arrest the decline in artisanship that was apparent in the early days of the Industrial Revolution.

Historians disagree as to the underlying motives of the movement, whether it was propelled by the individualist, essentially capitalist sentiment of the era or reflected a genuine, if naïve, collective urge to return to a mythical past where craftsmen ruled production. Its appeal was to small shop owners and master craftsmen as well as aspiring journeymen, but had little to offer the already proletarianized unskilled workers in the mills, mines, and refineries. Ortigosa’s version differs from the earlier norm only in that non-artisans would be eligible for membership, an uncommon suggestion elsewhere but perhaps a reflection of Mexican artisans’ insecure economic and political position.

In any case, the history is clear. Numerous cooperative shops appeared in the mid 1830s in the U.S. but the prolonged economic crisis in the U.S. (and Europe) from 1837 through the 40s killed the momentum of the movement. Cooperatives appeared sporadically in the U.S., and more commonly in Europe, throughout the nineteenth century but increasingly, except for certain specialized crafts in specific countries, the movement had few answers to what was an progressively more industrialized work force.206

As for Guadalajara, no further mention of the Company can be found. Certainly, after the Tarel Riot of April 1850, official attention turned decidedly against any working class associations. In 1851, the Jalisco state government decreed that every confraternity

---

or association had to be approved by civil and ecclesiastic authorities before it would be officially recognized. The authorities scanned the associations’ statutes looking for “subversive” elements that could jeopardize the public or social order.\textsuperscript{207}

The impact of government scrutiny was immediate. In 1853, when a group of the city’s artisans petitioned the government to establish a society to protect and encourage the craft industries of Guadalajara, they explicitly proclaimed their apolitical position: “We do not want to change the social organization as some other citizens attempted not long ago,” an obvious reference to the Tarel Riot and perhaps to the Company of Guadalajara Artisans.\textsuperscript{208} Similarly to the earlier Company of Guadalajara Artisans, the association (the \textit{Sociedad de Artesanos}) would buy the production of local artisans at a “fair price” and resell them to local consumers.\textsuperscript{209} The remaining (unsold) products were to be bought by the association and put in a raffle sponsored by the government. Every member was obligated to buy a raffle ticket, the number of tickets depending on the number of shares they owned in the company. The shares were offered for sixteen pesos, fifty pesos, five hundred pesos and a thousand pesos. In addition, the artisan’s petition proposed that the association would create a pawnshop to the members and the public. With one third of the pawnshop’s profits, they would help poor artisans and orphans, and create a fund for the establishment of a school for artisans.\textsuperscript{210}

Unfortunately, the surviving documentation does not list the names of the original artisans who made the petition so a comparison with the list of the members of the now discredited \textit{Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara} cannot be made. Clearly, however, the new group did not want to be associated with the violence of 1850. Whether or not Ortigosa was involved, of course, it cannot be known. However, aspects of the petition certainly were close to those proposed by Ortigosa in his speech of 1859. The difference

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{207} AHJ, G-10-851, Jal/1780. Decreto No. 212, 29 de septiembre de 1851.
\item \textsuperscript{208} AHJ, G-16-853, GUA/188.
\item \textsuperscript{209} The association would take only a medio real (six cents) for every peso of the commodity price. Six percent was a traditional guild figure governing a “fair” profit or retail mark up of a craft product produced under contract.
\item \textsuperscript{210} AHJ, G-16-853, GUA/188.
\end{itemize}
is, however, that while the Company of Guadalajara Artisans were clearly a cooperative movement, the Society of Artisans contained elements of both cooperatism and mutual aid—funds provided for poor artisans, their orphans, etc. It is unknown if the government granted the permission for its creation. Since no further reference to the Society of Artisans can be found it is likely that the state government was not about to sanction an association of artisans so soon after the Tarel violence. In any case, the state government was just going to undergo a drastic alteration, as the next several decades were years of political chaos, economic crisis, and war.

**Club Popular de Artesanos**

Sometime prior to 1867 but clearly during the Maximilian era the *Club Popular de Artesanos* was founded. Evidently, it was a growing concern in 1867 because sometime just prior to, or shortly after, the return of the Liberals in 1867, three Guadalajara artisans—Vicente Munguía, Néstor S. Vargas, and Francisco Gómez Serrano—proposed to the members of the *Club Popular de Artesanos* that they should sponsor a cooperative to make candles.211 Perhaps significantly, the proposed cooperative would be titled the *Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara*, the very same name of the 1850 cooperative that had been dissolved in the aftermath of the Tarel Riot. Club members approved the proposal on November 3, 1867.212 The candle “factory” would require a minimum capital start up of a thousand pesos to be obtained by a voluntary fee of from six centavos (half a real) to one peso per week for four months from up to four thousand “affiliates.”213 One of the co-founders, Nestor Vargas, had

---

211 There is not evidence about the occupation of Vargas, and Gómez. However, Vicente Munguía is the rebocero mentioned earlier, and may have been involved in this enterprise as a business venture.

212 Néstor Vargas, *Club Popular de Artesanos. Proyecto de Reglamento de la Compañía de artesanos de Guadalajara* (Guadalajara, Mexico: Imprenta Rodríguez, 1867), 4.

213 AHJ, F-9-867, Néstor Vargas, *Discurso pronunciado por el C. Néstor Vargas, á nombre de la comisión encargada de formar el reglamento de la nueva compañía* (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tipografía de J. M: Brambila, 1868), 2-5.
earlier argued that the “civilization of a nation depends on the advancement of the material and intellectual works.” By the creation of a cooperative, they would improve the situation of artisans and at the same time, help in the construction of Mexican society. Again, the discourse visibly indicates that the objective of the cooperative movement in Mexico was to improve the position of the artisans as an integral part of Mexican society, not as a separate economic or social class.

The candle factory project did not prove a success and the following year Néstor Vargas along with three colleagues presented a new project for the creation of a tobacco factory to be administered by the Club Popular. The former enterprise, Vargas admitted, did not provide sufficient profits to justify the enterprise. The tobacco factory, he argued, constituted a better business deal than the candle factory but would require a minimum of 18,000 pesos to be collected from six hundred or more “associates” to start up the factory. Unlike the rather small minimum weekly contribution of six centavos in the earlier project, this one would require a minimum of fifty cents (or four reales) over a period of fifteen months. Further emphasizing the non-exclusive nature of the project, the membership would be open to the public.

Meanwhile, almost two decades after the violent rebocero Tarel Riot in 1850, the city’s reboceros again demanded a solution to their continued economic difficulties. In earlier decades, Guadalajara’s famed rebozo shops had not only supplied the local market but had been popular in places such as Zamora in Michoacán, León in Guanajuato and other Bajío towns. Now those towns had their own shawl manufacturers. Adding to the competition were an “invasion” of foreign products that were cheaper (and some said better quality) than Guadalajara’s own products. In response to their complaints, the

---

214 Ibid., 2.

215 AHJ, F-9-867, Néstor Vargas, Reglamento de la compañía de artesanos para el establecimiento de una fábrica de tabacos (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tipografía de J. M. Brambila, 1868), 6. The three colleagues were Francisco Serrano, Antonio Maciel and Bártolo Lechuga. Vargas broadened the appeal for “associates” to include women as well as men, and even children if their fathers or guardians guaranteed the payment of the weekly fees.

216 AHJ, F-9-869, GUA/855.
state government commissioned a group of notable citizens to find a solution to the situation of the “artesanos de rebocería y obra de lana.” The committee consisted of José Palomar (textile factory owner), Antonio Álvarez del Castillo (merchant and treasurer of the Círculo Mercantil), Atanasio Zaragoza, Vicente Munguía (successful rebocero, factory owner, and member of the Club Popular de Artesanos),¹ and Néstor Vargas who acted as a secretary (secretary of the Club Popular de Artesanos). Munguía ran a local rebozo shop and was a successful businessman who, along with Vargas, was active in the Club Popular de Artesanos.²¹⁷ They convoked a session on September 12, 1868, attended by 217 local merchants, artisans, and masters of workshops. Among the artisans, the names of Marcelino González Olivares, Marcelino Morfín and Jesús García were recorded.²¹⁸

As might be expected from the diverse nature of the audience, the topics discussed were not confined to the rebocero’s complaints:

“No solo los artesanos son presa de la miseria, los son todas las clases de la sociedad; cada cual se lamenta en su línea: el rico porque el capital disminuye; el comerciante porque no hay consumidores, y tiene necesidad de vender sus efectos a menor precio; el artesano porque su trabajo no es compensado tal como se debe, en fin la miseria es pública.”²¹⁹

The city authorities, in calling the meeting, had called for “harmony between artisans and merchants.” The merchants attending, however, declared that it was not an issue of “harmony” between classes; it was a problem of poor government administration. In a classic expression of Mexican middle class concerns and prejudices, merchants in attendance condemned the backwardness of the country (“sumido en la barbarie”/immersed in savagery), and condescended to blame the government for the working classes’ ignorance, immorality and laziness:

²¹⁷ For a detailed description of Munguía’s business enterprises, see Olveda, “El monopolio rebocero Guadalajara-Zamora.” Munguía died in May, 1877. See El Hijo del Trabajo, 13 mayo 1877 for his obituary.


²¹⁹ “The rich complain about having less capital, the merchants complain about no having enough consumers, and artisans complain because their work does not receive its real value.” Ibid.
“… el mal es general, su origen primitivo, se encuentra en el atraso social de nuestro país, en el poco […] hacia el trabajo, en la poca o ninguna moralización y educación del pueblo…”

Certainly resenting the patronizing tone of the merchants’ comments, Jesús García undoubtly spoke for many artisans in attendance when he demanded the government act on more specific measures that would help the city’s artisans. For example, he condemned the local custom in which masters, instead of paying their journeymen in cash, would offer yarn instead, usually worthless on the market than the masters claimed damaging the journeymen and poor artisans. During the evening, someone proposed that the city government create a technical school with “voluntary” contributions from the city’s wealthiest residents. García suggested that the term “voluntary” should be changed to “que se mande expresamente, que las personas acomodadas sumistren recursos para la fundación de esa escuela”

García’s words were recorded but clearly were not what either the merchants or the government wished to hear. Of course, the rich could not be forced to cooperate, and the merchants in attendance agreed with the government’s explicit stand that it could not interfere in issues concerning freedom of industry or labor contracts, a Liberal cornerstone enshrined in the Constitution of 1857.

García’s recommendations were ignored. The meeting closed with a modest four-point proposal. The citizen’s committee would ask the government to improve security on the state’s highways, to reduce property taxes on commercial and industrial establishments, to abolish taxes on raw materials while increasing taxes on foreign finished goods, and to create a technical school with the voluntary help of the well-off citizens. Except for the last point, the state government approved the proposal on December 10, 1868.

The liberal government claimed that it was constitutionally forbidden from interfering with economic relations between merchants and the reboceros, as those were

220 AHJ, F-9-869, GUA/855.

221 Ibid.

222 Ibid.
contracts between individuals. Although the government had “approved” the proposal to lower taxes, in fact little or nothing was done. Tax reduction would require the restructuring of the entire fiscal system because local governments depended on property taxes as their only source of revenue. Moreover, the widely hated alcabalas (so-called “dry tariffs” on goods “imported” into the state) were state taxes and, therefore, beyond the control of the local administration. And, of course, schools cost money and the city government claimed not to have the funds for a school for one particular social group—the artisans.

Given the merchants’ uncompromising attitudes and the unwillingness of the government to act, it is not surprising that the city’s artisans moved beyond accommodation. In April 1870, in a significant departure from the non-political nature of Guadalajara’s earlier cooperative movement, the new president of the Club Popular, Aurelio Ortega, invited the artisans to identify themselves with the working class. Manual labor, he declared, was the noblest activity and the working class was the only productive class. Bureaucrats, the military, landowners and industrialists depended on the work of artisans and laborers. Hence forth, socialism, Ortega implied, would be the club’s creed and objective.223

It is likely no coincidence that while Ortega’s was declaring for socialism, in Mexico City the anarchist Santiago Villanueva and followers were founding the Gran Círculo de Obreros de México. Villanueva had organized a successful strike at the La Fama Montañesa textile mill in the Federal District in July of 1868, and had been active in the five month long textile strike and lockout that followed. Although Villanueva’s untimely death in 1872 led to a more moderate leadership of the GCOM, the radicals continued to support militant working class actions in their organizations and organs through the early 1880s, when a government crackdown effectively ended the socialist movement in Mexico until the twentieth century.224

223 José María Murià, Sumario histórico de Jalisco (Guadalajara, Mexico: Editorial Gráfica Nueva, 1996), 348-349.

It is at this historic juncture, unfortunately, that the documentation breaks down. While one may assume that Guadalajara’s artisans were acting under the influence of the better-known socialists of the Federal District, there is no evidence to support that fact. Indeed, the only evidence of the influence of the GCOM in Guadalajara is the affiliation of the mutualist *Sociedad el Banco Libre* to the GCOM in 1874. Beyond that, the documentation is silent. However, it is just as reasonable to consider that Guadalajara’s “radicalism” is local in origins. The early establishment of artisan associations in the city in 1850, the Tarel Riot, and the continued evidence of artisan organizational activities through the 1850s and 1860s indicate ongoing artisan activities. Certainly, the *reboceros’* demands of 1868 show that the issues of 1850 had not gone away. It is true that most associations until Ortega’s bold stand in 1870 were cooperatist and/or mutualist in their formal constitutions and proposals. Yet, this may well have reflected the political and economic realities of the times as much as it did any inherent conservative nature of the associations. And notably in the political uncertainties of the 1867-68, and again in the 1870s, Guadalajara’s artisans revealed both an active and an oppositionist sentiment that belied the usual “received cultural accommodationist” interpretation of Guadalajara’s historical political stand. Nonetheless, the establishment of political stability under the popular but conservative mantle of Porfirio Díaz on the national level was reciprocated by a return to accommodationist politics in Guadalajara as well.

Two apparently unrelated, but complementary, political movements impacted Guadalajara’s artisans in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. One is the emergence of a bourgeoisie class of local and immigrant entrepreneurs who would come to infiltrate and eventually dominate the small producer sector of the economy. The other is the revitalization of the Catholic Church after its initial demoralization following the Liberal victory over the conservatives in 1860 and later over the French by 1867. Having lost a good portion of its real estate wealth along with its discredited political spear carriers, the Conservative Party, the Church regained its sense of mission by redefining its role in the modern world during the long Pax Porfiriana—Porfirio Díaz’s personalized but effective dictatorship from the 1870s to 1910. Neither movement depended on the other, and indeed, occasionally seemed to reject or decry the other’s influence, but both, combined with a vigorous and self conscious artisan culture, to dilute and divert an angry artisan
“class” by offering upward mobility for some, economic rewards for others and for most a renewed sense of identity and common culture that had been badly shaken by the economic and social confusion following the wars for Independence.

Guadalajara, 1870s-1888

Yet, in the 1860s and in early 1870s in Guadalajara, the political position of the city’s artisans was far from clear. On the one hand, Jesús García’s comments in 1867 clearly represented journeymen artisans vs. masters, and Ortega’s call to socialism the most radical position yet among the city’s associations. On the other hand, the potentially very different economic interests of merchants, shop owners, master artisans, and their journeymen had become blurred by the inclusive nature of their associations, and by a strong artisan “culture” that stressed its corporate roots. And unlike the case among many European artisans, Guadalajara’s masters and journeymen inhabited the same physical space (see chapter five), and through patron/client relationships, religious association through barrio Parish churches, and, at times, marriage ties, often the same social space as well.

The relationship between culture and the economy, however, is often complementary. In Europe, by the beginning of the forth quarter of the nineteenth century, the industrial revolution had already soured the relationship between master and journeymen. But in Guadalajara, craftsmen were still nearly as important in the labor force in 1895 (27.4 percent; table 1.4) as they had been in 1842 (30.3 percent), and small producers remained central to the economy through the end of the nineteenth century. For example, in 1900, at the peak of Mexico’s late 19th century economic surge, while

---


226 Carlos Alba Vega, “La industrialización en Jalisco: Evolución y perspectivas,” in Guillermo de la Peña and Agustín Escobar Latapí, eds., *Cambio regional, mercado de trabajo y vida obrera en Jalisco* (Guadalajara: Colegio de Jalisco, 1986), 108. In the 1888 census (see appendix AA, Table 5.4), the artisans made up 37.4 percent of the total male working population.
Veracruz’s ten textile mills employed nearly five thousand workers, Jalisco’s eight mills employed only about a third of that figure.\(^{227}\) Even as late as 1907, the industrial census of that year showed that small shops employing fifteen or fewer journeymen accounted for 30 percent of all sales in Guadalajara, and Anderson contends that if all the informal and independent producers were counted, that figure would be at least 40 percent, and an even greater portion of locally consumed goods.\(^{228}\)

A crucial economic reason why artisan production was still important is that the railroad arrived in Guadalajara only in 1888, a decade and a half later than in Mexico City. In other words, artisan culture remained strong, in part, because, despite economic difficulties, the artisanal production was still crucial to the city’s economy. Therefore, with few mills in the region, the common enemy for most artisans still appeared to be shadowy foreign producers, merchant capitalist sweatshop owners, and the larger factories of central Mexico.\(^{229}\) Argentine social historian Torcuato S. Di Tella identified what he termed a “dangerous class” of Mexican small shop owners, master artisans, and menestrales (journeymen working in artisan shops) belong to two of five urban social “levels” competing with Mexico’s elite.\(^{230}\) Di Tella maintained:

“By contrast [with the elite], the artisans, small shopkeepers, lower clerks…might at first sight appear indistinguishable from the impoverished masses, but this is


not how they regarded themselves. Their life was marked by insecurity, not by permanent misery, as was the case of the lower groups.”\textsuperscript{231}

Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg viewed the rise of artisan activism in the 1870s as a form of “social populism,” reflecting the interests and ideals of Mexican shop-owning master craftsmen.\textsuperscript{232} During the 1875 hatters strike in Mexico City, many of the city’s small, independent master hatters supported the strike by journeymen hatters of the larger, essentially “sweatshops” owned by the city’s merchant elites. This issue is far from settled; however, as the most recent scholar of that era, Carlos Íllades, contends that, at least in Mexico City, many trades were polarized during the labor upheavals of the 1870s.\textsuperscript{233} In Guadalajara, the 1870s and 1880s would clarify the political direction of the city’s craftsmen.

**La Sociedad de las Clases Productoras**

From the disintegration of *Club Popular de Artesanos* (created in 1867) emerged in November 1877 *Las Clases Productoras* formed by a group of prominent local merchants and artisan shop owners, a branch of the national organization of the same name.\textsuperscript{234} There is little information related to the transition from one organization to the other. It is known that the direct precedent of *Las Clases Productoras* was an association

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 104.


\textsuperscript{234} Mariano Bárcena, *Estudio presentado a la Secretaría de Fomento* (Mexico: Tipografía. de Sinforoso Banda, 1880), 1.
called Sociedad de Artes Unidas which was constituted by members of the Club Popular de Artesanos.\footnote{Carlos Ílades, “Organización y formas de resistencia artesanales: los sastres de la ciudad de México, 1864-1873,” in Cincuenta años de historia en México (Mexico: Colegio de México, 1991), 323-340.}

The national organization was clearly business-oriented, formed in Mexico City, as it was, to combat “the wild communism” of the workers’ circles.\footnote{El Artesano, 18 May 1879.} Mexico City had seen growing agitation, and organization in the 1870s, including some fifteen strikes, mainly in the textile mills but including a major hatters’ strike in 1875. Although a minority were radicals under the influence of Spanish anarchism, the majority of the leaders and members of the Gran Círculo de Obreros Libres, rarely supported militant action (although they had supported the hatters’ strike in 1875, as did a number of prominent Mexican figures such as economist Guillermo Prieto and intellectual Ignacio Manuel Altamirano). Increasing the GCOL, and the Labor Congress that it spawned, discouraged support for strikes, and eventually cooperated with the Díaz regime in limiting labor conflict.\footnote{David Walker, “Porfirian Labor Politics: Working Class Organizations in México City and Porfirio Díaz, 1876-1902,” The Americas 37, no. 3 (1981): 261-274.}

Nonetheless, the turmoil of the 1870s had alarmed many masters as well as local merchants, and Las Clases Productoras was formed as a result. However, the Guadalajara branch was less exclusive, and ideologically more ambiguous. At its inception in 1877, the Guadalajara branch of Las Clases Productoras represented a union of merchants, small factory owners and the city’s artisans.\footnote{El Hijo del Trabajo, 7 November 1880.} Building on the earlier such cross-class alliances, the initial members of the association were shopkeepers, small factory owners, master artisans, journeymen and even laborers (jornaleros). Nearly half the directors were identified by their craft title—wheelwright, carpenter, rebocero, etc.
Others were engineers, pharmacists, agricultures, etc. As local producers (masters, small shop owners, and journeymen alike) they saw their interests jeopardized by competitors from elsewhere in Mexico, often from Mexico City’s merchant capitalists (and a few local ones of their own) whose sweatshop production was Guadalajara’s major competition prior to the arrival of the railroads in 1888.

Initially, the organizations stated objectives were to protect and encourage local industry and internal markets, to bring the nation’s railroad system to Guadalajara, and to reestablish “harmony” between social classes. One of its founding directors, Francisco Bañuelos, went so far as to declare that the working class (“la clase obrera”) and the producer class (“clase productora”) were one and the same. Although one could argue that journeymen artisans’ economic interest did not lie with the masters and shop owners, in Guadalajara (and perhaps, to a lesser extent, in Mexico City), the class differences did not appear as sharp as they often were in Europe because, in fact, they were not.

For one thing, the political failures of the European revolutions of 1848 pushed many artisans, shopkeepers and petty bourgeoisie in general to fear the working class, and become instead a stalwart defender of private property. Nothing so stark took place in Mexico (although, as Di Tella, notes, there was some fear early after Independence of the “dangerous classes.”) Further, besides the economic and cultural factors mentioned earlier, one should also note that factory competition was not as significant in Mexico as it was in contemporary Europe (and would not be so for at least another generation). Also, Guadalajara’s artisan households were often a mixture of producer, petty capitalist, merchant and laborer. Many journeymen artisans worked in shops when they could get steady work, and on their own when they could not, so they
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239 Gastón García Cantú, El socialismo en México, 291, note 24. The term agricultor was meant to designate a “scientific” farmer, as opposed to a hacendado.

240 Quoted in Gastón García Cantú, El socialismo en México, 218. Bañuelos was a follower of the French socialist Fourier and a correspondent for the Mexico City newspaper El Socialista, a spokesman for the moderate wing of the GCOL.

were both journeymen and masters. And often their wives and children were petty merchants and dealers, as well, to supplement family income, but also muddying the ideological waters. (In the sample for 1888, except for shoemaking, being a “comerciante” was the most numerous job for sons of artisans outside of following in their father’s footsteps in the craft.) And, of course, many artisans also sold their own production, so were both producers and merchants. Under all those circumstances, it is not surprising that the city’s craftsmen sought solutions involving a variety of socio-economic groups. Moreover, a certain amount of local pride played a role.

The Society held its first exhibition of the city’s proud manufacturers in 1878, a resounding success according to the reports of the time. An array of different products was exhibited: textiles (yarns, mantas, shawls, etc.), paper products, pottery, tobacco goods, fine carpentry work, shoes, etc. The names of the factory owners appeared next to the products. Well known local businessmen were featured, such as José Palomar (textile and paper factory owner), José F. Olasagarre (pottery factory owner), and even though he had died the year before, the well known master rebocero, Vicente Munguía’s fine silk shawls.

The society confidently expressed pride in the nation’s artisans and capitalists who, despite of the government’s poor performance, were able to show the nation’s industrial progress. To continue such progress, the local press suggested, the public should do its patriotic duty and prefer national products over foreign commodities.

The Society’s Second Industrial Exhibition in 1880 was an even greater success. All manufacturing sectors had a place in the exposition, bringing together products from factories all around Mexico. A variety of products represented the most advanced manufacturing production in Mexico: glass, leather goods, wood work, jewel, finished garments, hat, cigarettes, etc. In textile production, local mills such as La Escoba,

---

242 Crossick notes the European tendency of economic crisis to actually increase the number of independent artisans who cannot find steady work in either shops or factories; Crossick, “Shopkeepers, Master Artisans and the Historian,” 13.

243 Juan Panadero, 5 December 1878.

244 El Hijo del Trabajo, 22 December 1878.
Atemajac, and La Experiencia presented their best manufactured goods. Also, diverse factories from Tepic, Durango, Mexico, Puebla, and Texcoco were present. Some of the same family names that appeared in the Exhibition of 1878 reappeared in 1880. In order to provide a statistical background for the Exhibition, the local government undertook the most extensive survey of local businesses, shops and factories ever undertaken in Guadalajara. More than two thousand firms were represented (including 600 artisan shops), with the precise address, the business owner’s name, year founded, and type of business. There were 325 food-making and processing businesses, 38 glass and ceramic shops, 204 clothing makers, 85 wood working shops, etc.

Table 3.2 Local Businesses by Economic Activity, 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail commerce, trade, and finance</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food making and processing</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban services/petty trades</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing industry</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous industries</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood industries</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal working/engineering</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile manufacturing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic and glassware</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical crafts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous skilled trades and crafts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction trades and materials</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather and hides</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/paper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

245 AHM, paquete 144, expediente 1. “Datos estadísticos sobre giros mercantiles e industriales 1880.”

246 Ibid.
Most artisan shops were individually owned, with few individuals owning more than one shop. Among the 82 wood working shops, for example, only six owners owned more than one shop, and only one owned more than two. Of the 2,066 shop owners identified by name, only an estimated ten percent owned more than one shop, and these more mostly in the retail trade.\(^{247}\) Guadalajara in 1880 was very much the “large city of small shops” that a modern scholar would call contemporary Guadalajara.\(^{248}\) Relative to size, Guadalajara would never again see such widespread ownership.

In its inception, Las Clases Productoras had declared itself apolitical. Various of the society’s leaders, however, such as José López Portillo y Rojas (great grandfather of Mexico’s president from 1976-82) and Mariano Bárcena were known for their active involvement in political issues. Not surprisingly, therefore, the federal, state, and municipal governments paid for some 65 percent of the costs associated with the second exhibition.\(^{249}\)

The political financing of the exhibition came with its own strings attached. In the election of the Society’s president and vice present in 1881, a disgruntled minority claimed that the candidates (Lino Martínez and Francisco Ramírez Monroy) favored by the city authorities won the election through fraud.\(^{250}\) While it is unclear from contemporary accounts if the motives for the political intervention were personal or issue-driven, the impact of the incident led to a critical turning point in the future direction of the city’s economic leadership.

The two defeated candidates, Lázaro Pérez and Antonio Álvarez del Castillo, left the association together with at least 56 other members. In 1883, Pérez and Álvarez del Castillo participated in the creation of the Círculo Mercantil, which would go on to

\(^{247}\) This is an estimate only. Many common names owned shops and it was not always possible to tell if they were the same person or not.

\(^{248}\) Patricia Arias, ed., *Guadalajara, la gran ciudad de la pequeña empresa* (México: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1985).

\(^{249}\) The president gave 2,000 pesos, the governor 700 pesos, and the municipal authorities 200 pesos. Ibid., 83.

\(^{250}\) *El Hijo del Trabajo*, 13 November 1883.
represent the city’s dominant commercial and financial interests.\textsuperscript{251} Although it continued to function (sustaining, for example, a night school for workers of some 30 to 40 students), and continued to publish a small monthly newsletter,\textsuperscript{252} by the end of the decade the \textit{La Sociedad de las Clases Productoras} had faded in importance, its most important members founding the \textit{Cámara de Comercio} (Chamber of Commerce).\textsuperscript{253}

Over the two decades from 1880 to 1900, Guadalajara’s economy changed fundamentally. For one thing, foreign capitalists arrived in the city in large numbers, and many enticed local entrepreneurs to participate in their enterprises.\textsuperscript{254} What had once been seen as common interests eventually became a divide separating both national and foreign businessmen on one side, and many artisan shop owners, their journeymen and the city’s growing population of day laborers on the other side.\textsuperscript{255}

\textbf{Círculo Mercantil de Guadalajara and Cámara de Comercio de Guadalajara}

In December of 1883, the dissident members from \textit{Las Clases Productoras}, led by Antonio Álvarez del Castillo founded the \textit{Círculo Mercantil de Guadalajara}. Unlike the original purpose of their former association, this organization’s stated purpose was to encourage commercial activity in Guadalajara and defend mercantile interests. And unlike the \textit{Clases Productoras}, and despite of, or perhaps because of, the experience in the fraudulent elections of 1881, they boldly proposed to attempt to influence commercial and fiscal legislation, to encourage the establishment of banks, railroads and commercial

\textsuperscript{251} Néstor G. Arce, \textit{Estatutos y reglamento de la sociedad "Círculo Mercantil de Guadalajara"} (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tipografía M. Pérez Lete, 1883), 11.

\textsuperscript{252} Villa Gordoa, \textit{Guía y album de Guadalajara}, 84.

\textsuperscript{253} Murià, \textit{Sumario histórico de Jalisco}, 350

\textsuperscript{254} The census of 1900 listed 739 “resident” foreigners (511 males, 228 females), 257 from the United States, the most of one country. France was next at 180. BPJ, \textit{Censo y División Territorial del Estado del Jalisco Verificados en 1900}, (Mexico: Secretaría de Fomento, 1905).

\textsuperscript{255} Ibid., 349
schools. In addition, the board of the association would function as an arbiter between members involved in commercial disputes. Each member’s business must have a minimum capital of one thousand pesos, although the monthly dues were set at a modest one to three pesos.\textsuperscript{256}

Eventually, the same members of the \textit{Círculo Mercantil} decided to organize a Chamber of Commerce similar to the ones already working in many other cities of Mexico.\textsuperscript{257} In June 20, 1888, thirty-seven local merchants and industrialists founded the Chamber of Commerce. Juan Somellera, owner of a shop located at Calle del Carmen, no. 49, and a doctor, was appointed as the president of the new association. The assembly selected five members to serve on the Board of Directors.\textsuperscript{258} By April of 1889, the chamber had established a newspaper, \textit{El Mercurio Occidental}, that soon became \textit{La Gaceta Mercantil} in August of the same year.\textsuperscript{259} The purposes of this organization were to protect the interest not only of the merchant class, but also the interest of industrialists. They promoted technical advances, denounced abuses from the government, etc.\textsuperscript{260}

**Artisans and the Catholic Church**

Meanwhile, the city’s Catholic Church was undergoing a transformation of its own. Having lost much of its earlier political influence during La Reforma (1855-1876), the Church regained much of its lost prestige during the Porfirian years (1876-1910). Its involvement with what was called the “social matter” came about as a result of the Papal encyclical \textit{Rerum Novarum} in 1891. Pope Leon XII warned the faithful of the disastrous

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{256} Arce, \textit{Estatutos y reglamento de la sociedad "Círculo Mercantil de Guadalajara"}, 2-11. In the event of bankruptcy, however, the member would be immediately expelled.
  \item \textsuperscript{257} Víctor Hugo Lomelí, \textit{Guadalajara, historia de una vocación} (Guadalajara: Cámara Nacional de Comercio de Guadalajara, 1988), 46.
  \item \textsuperscript{258} Juan Fernández del Valle (owner of \textit{Río Blanco} and \textit{La Escoba}), Eduardo Collignon (shop owner and Banker), and Gabriel Castaños (engineer who designed the water system in Guadalajara) constituted the first board. Ibid., 47.
  \item \textsuperscript{259} Ibid., 48-49.
  \item \textsuperscript{260} Ibid., 54.
\end{itemize}
influence of socialist, anarchist, and liberal doctrines alike. He exhorted capitalists to be charitable toward their workers and the workers to join Christian organizations. Despite the rather moderate tone, this venture into the realm of social activism brought attacks from Mexico’s liberal press, calling it “white socialism.”

Although the 1857 constitution banned the participation of the church in politics, Porfirio Díaz’s administration initiated reconciliation between the church and the state. With the tacit consent of the federal government, the Catholic Church launched programs at all levels in an attempt to regain its influence among the working class, especially by founding Catholic workers’ organizations. This was particularly true in the more conservative areas of Mexico such as Puebla and, particularly, Guadalajara, where the church had always had broad and deep support among the people.

The latter can be seen as early as 1869, when, with the support of the local Church authorities, the printer Dionisio Rodríguez founded the Sociedad Católica de la Nación Mexicana. The timing was no accident. Socialist agitation was growing in Mexico under the aegis of Santiago Villanueva’s Gran Círculo de Obreros de México. In Guadalajara, the Club Popular de Artesanos was organized, and although it was a mutualist/cooperative association, the reboceros’ demands had raised fears of a more militant tendency among the city’s numerous working classes. The Sociedad Católica offered the same services as did a workers’ mutual aid society but also included Catholic indoctrination. By 1879, this association expanded beyond Guadalajara, to some thirty-five branches in various Mexican states. When, in 1874, the Mexico City’s Gran Círculo de Obreros extended its influence throughout Mexico, the Guadalajara Bishop
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261 The nineteenth-century liberalism acted against the Catholic Church.


263 Leal, Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910, 75-76.

264 Leal, Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910, 75-76. He was a printer.

265 Ibid., 76.
countered by creating a Catholic version called the Círculo de Obreros Jalisciences. Its motto “Amemos al prójimo como a nosotros mismos” (Love your fellow man as if he were yourself) indicated that the necessity of charity and mutual help. Another Catholic workers organization, the Sociedad Socorros Mutuos Hija del Trabajo, was founded in 1879 as a workers mutual aid society. One of its members, Agustín G. Navarro publically praised the philanthropic actions of the association, whose patron saint was Señor de la Penitencia. The society’s motto was “Unión, fraternidad y trabajo” (“Unity, fraternity, and work”). Its members paid a weekly fee of six cents (a total of 24 cents per month). The fees were used to cover member expenses incurred during illness and to provide funeral benefits in case of death. As in other mutual aid associations, they invited honorary members from among the city’s elites, including three doctors, two lawyers, five pharmacists, a priest and two teachers. It was a relatively small society. Even counting the honorary members, the total members were only 78 affiliates.

In 1884, the church founded yet another workers’ association, the Círculo Católico de Obreros Sociedad Alcalde. The statutes of the association were approved by Archbishop Miguel de la Peña on March 13, 1884, declaring that “he did not find any

266 Murià, Sumario histórico de Jalisco, 349.


268 Ibid., 9-11.

269 The association was named after the Dominican fray Antonio Alcalde who worked in Guadalajara from 1771 to 1793. He founded the S. Miguel de Belén Hospital for the poor and the University, also created the Beaterío to attend women in distress. The foundation of the Sociedad Alcalde was in 1884. According to the contemporary newspapers in January 6th, 1895 the association would celebrate eleven years since its foundation (El Continental, 30 December 1894). By January 3rd, 1897, Sociedad Alcalde commemorated its thirteenth anniversary (El Continental, 3 January 1897). The anniversary of the association was celebrated every January.
reprehensible subject” in the statutes of the association. It is significant that all workers’ associations in Guadalajara had to be approved both by the municipal and ecclesiastical authorities. Such a requirement was clearly unconstitutional and is a good indication of the close relationship between Church and State.

As was common for most Catholic associations, the members met every Sunday at 4 p.m. in Calle de la Escuela de Artes no. 107. Although its official membership is not known, in 1888 one source noted that it had a “large numbers of members.” Besides the mutual aid to its members and the obligatory “moral education of the working class,” the Sociedad Alcalde encouraged Catholic beliefs and provided its members “honest leisure activities on Sundays and holidays.” Its patron saints were Jesus, Joseph and Mary and its motto was “Religion, charity and work.” Masses were celebrated every Sunday and holidays, and all (secular) sessions began and ended with prayers. Sociedad Alcalde embraced three different types of members: active, honorary, and protective. The honorary members were not part of the working class, of course, but were expected to contribute donations to the society’s treasury. Active members paid six cents weekly and had the right to participate in all activities and sessions of the association, and, of course, to receive the stated benefits.

Political discussions were categorically banned at all society functions and engaging in, or support of, strikes were specifically forbidden. All members were obliged to take turns visiting sick fellows and all were to attend the funeral of deceased members. To be an active member, the applicant had to be between sixteen and sixty years old, to be a Catholic, and not have a chronic disease. In addition, the applicant had


271 José Villa Gordoa, Guía y album de Guadalajara para los viajeros. Apuntes sobre la historia de la ciudad, su situación, clima, aspecto, habitantes, edificios, etc. (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tip. José M. Yguiniz, 1888), 84-85.
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273 Reglamento del Círculo Católico de Obreros Católico llamado Sociedad Alcalde (Guadalajara, Mexico: Imprenta T. Ramírez, 1895), 5.
to be nominated by a member and be approved by the board. All active members were to pay their weekly fee of six cents, and if in arrears by more than one month, the member had two weeks to cover his debt. If the debt was not paid, he would be excluded from the list of active members, losing all the money which he had contributed. The board consisted of a non-salaried president, vice-president, an ecclesiastical counselor, a treasurer, a fee collector, a secretary, an auxiliary secretary, and two inspectors. The election of the board was held every year on January 1st.\(^\text{274}\) Although there is not further information about women participation in this organization, it is known that at the second year of its foundation, a *Círculo de Señoras Sociedad Alcalde* was constituted and it celebrated in joint with the *Sociedad Alcalde* every festivity.\(^\text{275}\)

The *Sociedad Alcalde* became one of the most active of all Catholic workers’ organization in the city. For example, after a disastrous railroad accident in nearby Zapopan in early 1894, in which many people died, the association organized a social benefit for the victims.\(^\text{276}\) The extent of its influence is also seen in the fact that the association published its own newspaper called *El Obrero Católico*.\(^\text{277}\) In 1902, the *Sociedad Alcalde* reorganized and changed its statutes and name to *Sociedad de Obreros Católicos*.\(^\text{278}\)

Other similar Catholic labor organizations were created by the City’s Catholic authorities, such as the *Sociedad de Artistas, Artesanos y Obreros del Espíritu Santo* in 1894 and the *Asociación Guadalupana de Artesanos y Obreros Católicos* in 1903. The latter, by 1906, included two thousand affiliates and was likely the largest worker organization in the city. For example, after a disastrous railroad accident in nearby Zapopan in early 1894, in which many people died, the association organized a social benefit for the victims.\(^\text{276}\) The extent of its influence is also seen in the fact that the association published its own newspaper called *El Obrero Católico*.\(^\text{277}\) In 1902, the *Sociedad Alcalde* reorganized and changed its statutes and name to *Sociedad de Obreros Católicos*.\(^\text{278}\)

Other similar Catholic labor organizations were created by the City’s Catholic authorities, such as the *Sociedad de Artistas, Artesanos y Obreros del Espíritu Santo* in 1894 and the *Asociación Guadalupana de Artesanos y Obreros Católicos* in 1903. The latter, by 1906, included two thousand affiliates and was likely the largest worker organization in the city. For example, after a disastrous railroad accident in nearby Zapopan in early 1894, in which many people died, the association organized a social benefit for the victims.\(^\text{276}\) The extent of its influence is also seen in the fact that the association published its own newspaper called *El Obrero Católico*.\(^\text{277}\) In 1902, the *Sociedad Alcalde* reorganized and changed its statutes and name to *Sociedad de Obreros Católicos*.\(^\text{278}\)

---

\(^{274}\) Ibid., 7-12.

\(^{275}\) *El Continental*, 30 December 1894, 2 January 1897.

\(^{276}\) *El Continental*, 24 March 1894.

\(^{277}\) *El Continental*, 8 March 1896.

\(^{278}\) Leal, *Del mutualismo al sindicalismo en México: 1843-1910*, 77.
organization in the city. All these groups supported additional activities such as publishing Catholic newspapers and sending members to the national Catholic congresses. In total, there were four catholic congresses: Puebla (1903), Morelia (1904), Guadalajara (1906), and Oaxaca (1909). The topics were basically the principles of the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, the creation of catholic labor organizations, the intensification of charity, the fight against improper leisure activities such as alcohol and popular entertainment considered immoral for the church.

Catholic labor organizations distinguished themselves for other types of labor societies by its position about the “social matter.” While some organizations began to radicalize their discourses toward a more egalitarian society, openly confronting the capitalist class, Catholic associations specifically disavowed class conflict. Instead, they supported “harmony” between social classes. Improvement of working class conditions was to take place through mutual collaboration between workers and their employers and through traditional Christian charity. Nonetheless, in 1906 the Catholic congress in Guadalajara in 1906 concluded that charity and mutual help were insufficient to meet the problem of currently depressed salaries, a condition that threatened the “harmony between social classes.” Even inside the conservative catholic labor organizations, one could find nuances of social radicalism. But by the 1909 congress in Oaxaca, the church had moderated its position and a conservative, “mutualist” approach had returned to its actions. It is hard to account for the change, but clearly the Mexican Catholic Church was uncomfortable with the more militant stand. At the start of the 1909 Oaxaca congress, the archbishops and bishops of the Church had issued a letter to the delegates,

---
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282 Anderson, *Outcasts in Their Own Land*, 188.
reminding them that the congress was not a legislative session and they were there only to study the social problems of their society from a Christian religious perspective.\textsuperscript{283}

Although it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand fully the influence of the Catholic Church on the city’s artisans, it surely must have been substantial. The Parish churches had once been the center of the colonial artisan \textit{gremios} activities, and the artisans had belonged to their own craft Church cofradías—the Church’s lay fraternities. Artisans took part in the celebrations, and, even after the abolition of the gremios, the former guild members marched in processions under guild banners. Individual craftsmen continued to take part in \textit{cofradías} activities after Independence, and maintained former guild functions such as celebration of patron saints day, marching in other Church functions such as Corpus Christi, and providing charity to widows and orphans, and other former guild charity activities.\textsuperscript{284} Even when the \textit{cofradías} in general went into decline during the Reform era (1856-76), their charity functions were taken up by mutual aid societies, and by other Catholic associations. Therefore, the city’s artisans had a long tradition that linked their craft to the Catholic Church. It was, in that sense, part of their craft culture, and their craft community. Hence, the message of charity, of moderation and class cooperation, that the \textit{Rerum Novarum} enunciated in 1891 simply reinforced values, and practices, already in place.

In conclusion, a constant discourse shared by those associations was the exaltation of work, the only way available for the working class to improve their social and economic conditions. Nearly all the nineteenth century’s labor associations stressed the importance of moral and cultural values. Some mutual aid societies were Christian and others secular, but both exalted the value of honest work and the honorable way to earn a living. Some other labor organizations were the combination of mutual aid association and cooperative in order to help artisans to open a workshop or continue working.


In spite of the political neutrality expressed in all of the associations’ statutes (which usually had to be approved by the ecclesiastical and state authorities), during discourses and celebrations their members were clear about their political goals. They were in favor of their right to look for improvement in their lives. Often, they mentioned the exploitation of the capitalist class and the government’s disdain to help them. The political orientations of those organizations have been interpreted in different ways. One view suggests that they were influenced by anarchist doctrine, especially that of Proudhon. Other interpretations suggest that socialist ideas had the strongest impact on artisans’ ideological perspectives. These external ideologies were useful to define common problems among artisans; however, they were not mechanically adopted but rather, they were adapted to the particular circumstances of Mexican artisans. They knew perfectly well what the problems were that affected them, and often took initiative to resolve them.

Certainly, Guadalajara’s artisans underwent many difficulties during the nineteenth-century, but what is clear is that they did not disintegrate as a class. Even in Mexico City, where the process of industrialization was more accelerated, artisans continued to survive, and some to prosper. In Guadalajara, the survival of the city’s artisans is not an accident. It relates to the factors raised in this chapter, and to those that will be raised in the next several chapters—how an artisan community, and culture, changed, adapted and persevered, even through difficult times.


286 Ibid., 93. Sordo’s evidence points that in 1850, there were one artisanal establishment for every inhabitant while in 1921, the ratio was 1 to 167.
CHAPTER FOUR
ARTISAN FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

This chapter describes the common demographic patterns that the city’s artisans shared among themselves, as well as those patterns that distinguished differences between the crafts. It is my thesis that those common traits that artisans’ shared with each other are clues to the existence of an artisan community whose political and collective characteristics I have described in earlier chapters. Despite ethnic and racial differences, the colonial era guild system arose out of common productive necessities that transcended individual crafts, and fostered a sense of common interests and craft identity that survived the destruction of the institutional guild framework by colonial and then republican liberal economic policies. Merchant capitalists, foreign imports, domestic competition, contraband products and, later in the century, foreign capital undermined certain crafts, forced changes in others, but also led to collective efforts to fight for a common, or at least a craft, survival.

Unlike much of central and southern Mexico, where indigenous roots remained strong, except for pockets of resistance, western Mexican indigenous peoples were largely hispanicized by Independence. As I maintained in my previous study, economic and demographic characteristics tended to form around social distinctions (if not precisely class factors) rather than ethnic or racial origins. Although liberal policies outlawing racial identification in public documents make ethnicity a mute analysis in this study, social and status differences will be explored. Besides craft identify, family and kinship networks were a crucial aspect of the city’s artisan community, and this chapter will explore those public and private sphere characteristics. The next chapter will examine urban space as a further element of artisan culture and a craft community. As a field, family history has grown dramatically in the last decades. As suggested in the

introduction to this study, however, in recent years the Latin American family in general and the artisan family in particular have received scant attention. Scholars in other regions and other fields have clearly pointed out the issues that need investigating. Anthropologist William Goode maintained that the family was, in fact, an active force in industrialization, and challenged historians to prove it.²⁸⁸ Pioneer family historian Tamara Hareven put the relevant question this way:

“...under what circumstances was the family more able to control its destiny and to affect the larger social processes, and under what circumstances did the family succumb to declining markets, changing modes of production, business cycles, and other external forces?”²⁸⁹

Latin American labor historians have produced significant, and conceptually important, works on labor history, but with certain exceptions they have ignored the nineteenth century, have been uninterested in artisans per se, and certainly not in the family at all.²⁹⁰ One would think that the trend toward cultural history would strengthen interest in the family but that has not been the case, perhaps because family history is perceived to be closely associated with demographic history, and therefore too quantitative to be interesting.²⁹¹

²⁹¹ Although not family history per se, José C. Moya’s book on Spanish immigrants to Argentina is an exception to the wide-spread rejection of quantitative methods among historians. His “Cousins and Strangers” is an exceptional combination of micro and
It is the purpose of this chapter to describe the artisan family household and to analyze to what extent the artisan family could be seen as an active, important strategy in and of itself in both the way the city’s craftsmen maintained a traditional lifestyle, and the way they coped with the developing economic pressures of the nineteenth century. I will argue that, despite differences within the craft community, significant and identifiable elements of their familial experience distinguished them from other social groups within the city, and that the family household remained a key source of economic and cultural survival, at least until the full impact of the changes brought by the Díaz regime was felt in the first decade of the twentieth century.

This chapter utilizes three sets of census data: the population census manuscripts for Guadalajara for 1838 and 1842; an occupational database created from the population census of 1888; and a sample of selected artisan’s household and family data taken from the same census. Occasional reference will also be made to a census of Guadalajara businesses done in 1880. The censuses of 1838 and 1842 will be treated as one database since the entire census manuscripts for each year have not survived, but those districts that did survive complement each other.292 The census of 1888 survived nearly intact macro history with unapologetic use of quantitative methodology. José C. Moya, Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

292 From 1838, cuarteles 8 and 9 are available; and from 1842, cuarteles 5, 6, and 7. In all, the five districts (out of nine) comprise approximately 60 percent of the city’s population as of 1848. (A tenth district was added sometime between 1824 and 1842. It was the indigenous village of Mezquitán located on the outskirts of the city to the north. Its’ population is not representative of the rest of the city and will not be included in this study). Cuartel 8 and 9 were primarily working class districts, with large numbers of the city’s poor and a significant portion of the city’s migrants. Cuartel 5 and to a certain extent, cuartel 7, are a mixture of classes and occupations. Cuartel 7 had only 1.5% of its population called don or doña, but some 22.9 percent literate. Cuartel 5 had 20.2 percent don or doña, and 34.4 percent literate. Cuartel six is more representative of the city’s wealthier families and better off professionals, artisans and petty traders. Its rate of literacy was 44.3 percent and some 41.2 percent rated the don or doña. In all, these districts appear to be reasonably representative of the city’s population. The database itself consists of 21,758 cases, and 99 variables. The population is 44.9 percent male and 55.1 percent female. (The 1848 division was 46.1 percent male; 53.9 percent female.) Besides the twenty some thousand individuals, the database also is organized into 4,971 families and 4,013 households. Persons with jobs are 7,348. In all, this is an
(missing only one out of ten districts) and will be extensively used in this and the following chapter. In addition, I will refer to the population census of 1821, as a previous reference point to compare and contrast the main data sources used for this study. Finally, a dataset will be utilized comprised of a sample of the data contained in the civil registration of marriage licenses for the years 1877, 1888, 1900, and 1907.

Marital Status and Artisans

From contemporary scholarship and from historical studies of Mexican elite, it is common knowledge that “marriage naturally played a crucial part” in the social organization of the family. While one might assume that marriage is an obvious

---

293 For a detailed discussion of the 1888 datasets used in this chapter, see note 56 of the Introduction. The first database is a list of all occupied persons, by age cohorts, position in the household (either member or head of the household), sex and occupation. No names, family or household variables are available. However, a modified cluster sample was taken of seven artisan heads of household, plus day laborers (jornalero) and lawyers. Only households with a head of household with the selected occupations were considered, but all persons with an occupation in the selected household were also recorded, whatever their occupation. In addition, information was taken on the family structure, number of persons in the household, age and sex of the individual, age of all male children of the head and the number of female children. Shop ownership, if known, was also listed. (Names of all heads of household were compared to the names of shop owners listed in the 1880 business census.)

294 Archivo del Registro Civil de Jalisco. Guadalajara, matrimonios 1877 (volume 327); Guadalajara, matrimonios 1888 (volumes 1197-1200); Guadalajara, matrimonios 1900 (two volumes, without number); and Guadalajara, matrimonios 1907 (three volumes, without number).

component of most artisans’ life, the traditional interpretation was that journeymen artisans remained single for many years until they could gain both the experience and the capital to form their own shop, get married and raise a family. Indeed, it was commonly thought that those artisans who married young often lost the opportunity to open their own shop. In this view, the family was crucial to the shop-owning artisan because the spouse and most children would be active participants in the productive activities of the shop. Recent scholarship, however, suggests that in the pre-industrial society artisans sons often left the family to work or apprentice with other artisans, and that the participation of the artisan’s family in the productive process was the result of changes brought on by commercial capitalism and the rise of the industrial economy.

Yet, the Mexican experience appears to be different from both the classic view and from the more recent scholarship as well. González Ángulo’s study of Mexico City in 1811 found that marriage was, in fact, a common and perhaps crucial aspect of the artisan life style. In a previous study of Guadalajara’s artisans utilizing data from the census of 1821, I also found that artisans tended to be married in overwhelming portions—69.7 percent of all guild artisans were married; González Ángulo found that 72.5 percent of all artisans were married in Mexico City in 1811.

---


However, I also found that the rate varied between the crafts, and among individuals within crafts. Higher status crafts, and higher status individuals within all crafts, tended to be single in higher portions than in lower status crafts, and among lower status individuals within their own craft, perhaps willing and financially able to wait for a suitable marriage, a trait that Silvia Arrom found among higher status women in Mexico City.\footnote{Silvia Arrom, \textit{The Women of Mexico City, 1790-1857} (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985), 152. Status was determined by the presence or absence of the hidalguía, the honorific don or doña. See Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community, table 4.3, p. 91.} For lower status individuals and crafts, the family represented a chance to expand social networks, and for spouse’s and children’s labor to reduce the cost of production.\footnote{The data for 1838-42 was not then available to study the artisan family. Ibid.} The question is, to what extent did this end of the colonial era pattern extend to the following decades of the nineteenth century?

The marital status data on table 4.1 for 1838-42 indicate that artisans marry in approximately the same portion as they did in 1821 (68.3 percent compared to 69.7 percent in 1821). Also, in comparison, they fall between landowners, merchants and unskilled workers, who marry at even higher rates, and the elite and servants, who marry at even lower rates.

The category of landowners mainly constituted small landholders (labradores): their family represented the indispensable assistance for cultivating the land, accounting for their higher rate of marriage. For the merchants, the family was crucial for social networks. Among the groups marrying in less proportions than the artisans were the elite (56 percent), and servants (27.5 percent), obviously for vastly different reasons. As Silvia Arrom found in her study mentioned above, members of the elite could afford to postpone marriage until a suitable marriage could be arranged. On the other hand, servants constituted a young group, 32 percent were 19 years old or younger, who were unlikely to be married both because of their age and because of their occupation—most were live-in servants. (Appendix B: Table 4.1 Male Workers by Occupation and Marital Status, 1838-1842)
The sample for 1888 is limited to nine occupations, seven major artisan crafts and two non-artisan for comparison purposes. Lawyers (abogados) are a surrogate for professionals and day laborers (jornaleros) for unskilled workers. The average for all artisan occupations was 65.5 percent, close to the 68.3 percent average for 1838-42. Table 4.5 provides the comparative data for 1838-42 and 1888 with, as expected, the lawyers were low, and the day laborers were high. Now compare the individual marriage figures between 1838-42 and 1888. With one puzzling exception, they are almost identical in ranking from high to low in portions married and only several percentage points off from each other, despite the passage of nearly half a century. The average married of the nine occupations were 65.8 percent in 1838-42 and 65.9 percent in 1888.

Leaving the question of the exception of the carpenters and wheelwrights for the moment, what might account for the differences between the crafts? Again, it appears to be the status level and economic health of the trade. For example, those artisans marrying below the overall average of 65.9 percent in 1838-42 (carpenters/wheelwrights, tailors, hatters, and blacksmiths) were, except for the hat makers, among the six highest portions of craftsmen to receive the honorary “don” from the census takers in 1838-42.\(^{301}\) The relatively low percentage of hat makers who were married may represent their real prospects rather than a choice (only two of the 93 hatters received the don). Of those artisans who married above or at the artisan average in 1838-42 (bakers, shawl weavers, shoemakers) were among the lowest status crafts.\(^{302}\)

\(^{301}\) In order they were: painters (21.3 %), silversmiths (25.7%), tailors (25.5%), barbers (21.3%), carpenters/wheelwrights (14.2%), blacksmiths (11.9%). Seamstresses were 16.1% and merchants at 32.3%. A further measurement of the same tendency can be seen in the rate of literacy provided for each person in the census of 1842. In a survey of twenty individual occupations, including fifteen artisans plus day laborers, professionals, industrial workers (operarios/obreros), merchants and seamstresses, in fifteen out of the twenty occupations (and eleven of the fifteen crafts), those persons who were able to read were, on the average, more likely to not be married, than those persons who were illiterate. And those crafts with the highest rate of literacy (painters, 76.1%; barbers, 74.4%; tailors, 71.1%; silversmiths, 63.0%; blacksmiths, 60.0%; carpenters/wheelwrights, 55.4%) mirrored closely the hidalguía status rating.

\(^{302}\) Bakers (2.5%), shawl weavers (3.0%), shoemakers (4.7%). Only the hat makers (2.4%) and the masons (1.9%), of the major crafts, were lower.
What of the carpenter/wheelwright exception? Can it be a faulty sample? First of all, the actual age cohorts for all occupied persons in the census of 1888 are known. Comparing the sample with the actual age cohorts, one finds that the ages 40 and over accounted for 36.1 percent of the sample and only 26.1 percent of the full count, and the youngest age cohort (0 to 19) is off as well—4.3 percent in the sample and 21.5 percent in the full count. So perhaps carpenters married in greater portions in the 1888 sample because they were older than in 1838-42 data, and, therefore, had greater opportunities (and resources) to get married.

The reason for the difference between the full count in 1888 and the sample is the principle behind how the sample was taken. Given the limited time and resources available to conduct the sample, and given that the actual age cohorts were known, it was decided to sample all occupied members of a household only when the head of household was one of the nine selected occupations. Therefore young carpenters, for example, were sampled only when they lived in the household headed by one of the nine occupations. As expected, therefore, the average age of all occupied persons in the 1888 sample is higher than in the full count. (In 1838-42 the average mean age of carpenter/wheelwrights was 29.5; in 1888 it was 34.3.) The age differences are true for all occupations in the sample. For tailors, for example, the age cohort for 40 and over was 38.1 percent in the sample and only 23.3 percent in the full count for that year. The significant point, however, is that, despite their older age on the average, tailors continued to follow the marital pattern observed in 1838-42, as did all the other crafts as well. For whatever the reasons, carpenters did not. The reasons may still be an unknown product of the sample, or it may be an actual result of environmental changes of which there is no evidence. In this sense, it is a reminder that the numbers (like any historical document) are only clues of what was happening in history, not history itself.

Yet, despite the carpenter anomaly, the overall patterns seem clear. Even within the various occupations, one can see the difference that social status made. Dividing the major categories into those who received the don and those who did not, it can be perceived that in every category, the percentage of married individuals is higher among
the ones who did not have the “don.” What it seems to indicate is that higher status provided a freedom to postpone marriage, the chance to look for a more socially desirable mate or saving for a shop or any other type of investment. The data from 1821 showed similar behavior among individual of higher social status. (Appendix C: Table 4.2 Male workers by Marital Status and Social Status, 1838-42)

Looking at the different crafts by social status, one can see the same pattern. The individuals who hold *hidalgía* had a lower likelihood of being married. Contrary, individuals occupied in a low status craft married in greater portions (Appendix D: Table 4.3 Male Artisans by Marital Status and Social Status, 1838-42).

Age at Marriage

The issue of what portion of any occupational group marries is related to when individuals in those groups actually get married. It has been already suggested that among the elites, postponing marriage was a common strategy to find the most advantageous partner for their children. In Guadalajara, one can corroborate this very practice. Nonetheless, for the rest of the population marriage constituted almost a universal experience, except for servants who also shows the higher age at marriage (27.3 in 1821 and 30.5 in 1838-42).

Comparing artisans to the other occupational groups, it appears that they married at younger age than either merchants or elite. The ages at first marriage changed through time. The ages for 1821 and 1838-42 years were calculated using census information, while the mean age for 1877-1907 are the real ages extracted from the marriage.

---

303 For the historiographic argument defending the use of the honorific title of *hidalgía* as a consistent means to differentiate between higher and lower status individuals, see Rodney D. Anderson “Race and Social Stratification: A Comparison of Working-Class Spaniards, Indians, and Castas in Guadalajara, Mexico in 1821,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (1988): 216-17.
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licenses. The data suggests that by 1838-42 artisans married earlier than the elites or merchants (and, of course, servants), but later than unskilled workers and small landowners. None-the-less, by late in the nineteenth century, artisans married younger than any other occupational group. Why the change, and what does this mean for individual artisan crafts? But before those questions can be answered, one must look closer at individual crafts. (Appendix E: Table 4.4 Male Workers by Occupation and Age at Marriage, 1821-1907).

First, as before, if one looks closer into individual crafts, the proportions of married artisans are greater for lower social status crafts (masons, leather craftsmen, stone masons, hand weavers, and bakers), while in higher status occupations the proportions of married artisans is relatively smaller in both periods (Appendix F: Table 4.5 Male Artisans by Craft and Marital Status, 1838-42, 1888).

Looking at the data for age at first marriage by individual crafts complements the general conclusion of the previous table—that high status artisans were less likely to be married than low status artisans because they married older than the low status artisans (blacksmiths, for example, at 28.4 years while shoemakers married at 22.8 years). But for the sample of the marriage registry from 1877 through 1907, there were some exceptions. Hand weavers, bakers, and hatters average mean age at first marriage is higher than tailors, carpenters or blacksmiths. There are several explanations for this. For one thing, it may be that for some low status crafts the status itself and its lack of opportunities made it difficult to attract a mate. More likely, however, the anomaly lies with the sample itself. Hand weavers, hatters and bakers were particularly under-represented in the sample compared to the full count of the earlier years. For example, if one looks at shoemakers, masons or shawl weavers, their age at first marriage is lower than the higher status crafts, and close to their earlier average. Other data confirms the


307 Only three hatters, three hand weavers, and nine bakers appeared on the sample of 1877-1907. For 1838-42, they were 28 hatters, 71 hand weavers, and 16 bakers. On the other hand, shoemakers (47), brick masons (47) and shawl weavers (29) had sufficient numbers.
principle. *Empleados* married quite late (31.2 on the average, and close to the merchants for whom they worked (30.2), as did lawyers (29.3). Interesting, a former high status craft, that of the painters, married earlier than most artisans (22.0). Artificial dyes had been developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century, significantly reducing the skills needed to mix paints, and dramatically de-skilling that craft nearly everywhere.³⁰⁸ (Appendix G: Table 4.6 Male Artisans by Craft and Age at Marriage, 1821-1907).

**Heads and Members of Households and Families**

As it has been seen, age and marital status are strongly related. Not surprisingly, therefore, age also has a strong relationship to one’s position in household—whether one is a head of household or a member of that household. The issue is important because it relates to that point in life when an artisan ceases to be one among other members of someone else’s household, and sets out to establish his own household and, perhaps, his own family. It is also important because one may, in fact, be the head of a family in someone else’s household—the number of multiple family households were high in 1821 (one third of all persons lived in multiple family households), and grew even higher in 1838-42 (40.5 percent). One assumes that being head of a household (in particular) is a significant and perhaps responsible position, and is one reason why the objective of the sample of 1888 was to gather data on household heads.

Looking at 1838-42 (Figure 4.1), one finds that, as expected, in the youngest group the number of artisan heads of a household is rare.³⁰⁹ And, as expected, as the artisans aged their likelihood to head a household increased. Contrasting that information with 1888 (Figure 4.2), it is noticeable that even though the same general pattern of increasingly likelihood of heading a household augments with age through age 29, that

³⁰⁸ In 1838-42, painters were among the higher status crafts. Nearly one third (32.0 percent) were accorded the don, higher than barbers (21.7 percent), cariptner/wheelwrights (14.1 percent), tailors (25.1 percent) or even the silversmiths (25.7 percent).

³⁰⁹ All data on position in household and family comes from the full count database, not the sample.
likelihood decreases significantly in 1888 compared to 1838-42. For instance, by the time one reaches mid-life in ones 40s, in 1838-42 nearly three-quarters (70.9 percent) of all artisans headed their own household; in 1888 less than half did (48.8 percent), and the percentage difference for artisans fifty and over is even greater. It is hard to know if the great differences is environmental or the result of some other condition. It is known that Guadalajara grew in population, perhaps by as much as doubling between 1842 and 1888. But its physical expansion was limited.

The Huentitán ravine prevented the population from expanding to the northwest and north of the city, and rising terrain similarly limiting expansion to the south. Thus, it is likely that the population density per residence increased, meaning an increasing number of families shared the same roof, and for that same reason the proportion of heads of the household decreased. The physical growth of Guadalajara will be analyzed in the next chapter. However, the average size of the artisan households in 1888 (6.97) is little larger than the average size of the same artisans in 1838-42 (6.85), so on the surface it would seem as if environmental factors were not responsible. Moreover, the portion of multiple family households actually declined according to sample 1888 data, from a high of 40.5 percent in 1838-42 to 29.6 percent, as will be seen later on in this chapter.

Nonetheless, it is probable that household size is underestimated in the 1888 data. Unlike the meticulous Spanish-trained bureaucrats in 1821, and even the post-Independence 1842 surveys (nationally ordered), the city officials in 1888 made no effort at all to distinguish between households. Therefore, unless the less than reliable street addresses provided clues, or married children and/or married kin follow the head of the household, the determination of whether the household includes multiple families is

If one compared artisans to all male occupied persons in 1888, the percentages would be similar. Artisans were more likely to be heads in their twenties than all others (33.8 percent to 27.4 percent), but less likely in their thirties (47.9 percent to 55.8 percent for all others) and evening out after age forty to more or less the same percentages. In other words, the trend among artisans more or less mirrored the trend among other occupations.

By estimating the growth in population from the quite accurate census in 1821 (38, 064) for those districts in 1842 for which there are returns (8.6 percent increase), the population at 1842 would have been approximately 42,000. While the returns for 1888 are for nine out of ten districts for an estimated 54,000 population, the clearly more accurate 1895 federal census listed the city’s population at 82,455.
tenuous at best. Therefore, it seems certain that the sizes of the households are underestimated. Even so, a greater portion of multiple family households would produce more household members, not less. That would increase the difference between 1838-42 data, not narrow it. So it may be that what is being seen in the numbers is the results of conditions not yet obvious. It may be that increasing the household size, and, therefore (presumably), the number of employed persons, or number of persons able to contribute to the rent, provide food for the table, information on possible jobs and, in general, improve the chances for economic survival. In the words of Michael Scardaville (echoing a contemporary wisdom), “la familia pequeña no vive mejor” (“the small family does not live better.”)

![Figure 4.1 Male Artisans by Position in Household and Age Cohort, 1838-42](image)

There is some historical evidence to support that sentiment. The silk weavers of Lyons, France, for example, were forced to increase family labor at their workshops, and decrease the number of hired journeymen, because of competition from more efficient
producers, and because of the economic downturn of the 1830s.\textsuperscript{312} Joan Scott encountered the same conditions for Parisian tailors in the same era, as does John S. Lyons for Lancashire weavers.\textsuperscript{313}
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\caption{Male Artisans by Position in Household and Age Cohort, 1888}
\end{figure}


The following figure (4.3) carries the analysis to the family level for 1838-42, which gives a picture of those families who are lost in a household analysis. Examining the data at family level, it is evident that even those artisans who were forced to live in shared households with other families, still headed their own family in even greater proportions than shown in the household analysis. For instance, of all artisans more than forty years of age, nearly ninety percent were married and headed their own family. This same tendency was found in my earlier study, in which 95.5 percent of artisans in that age group headed their own family.\textsuperscript{314}

As mentioned, for 1888, it is difficult to analyze the portions of household heads vs. members because only those artisan members who lived in households headed by artisans were sampled. However, of those sampled crafts, table 4.10 shows the different

\textsuperscript{314} Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 99.
portions for each of the seven crafts. What is interesting here is that nearly one third of all sampled artisans were members of households (32 percent), and about one fifth (20.7 percent) living in households headed by someone of the same craft. (Appendices H and K: Table 4.7 Male Artisans by Similar Occupation as the Head, 1888 and Table 4.10 Male Artisans by Position in Household, 1888).

That, itself, suggests a functioning craft system in which craftsmen lived together, a characteristic of what was assumed to be a pattern long sense abandoned. This subject will be returned to later in this chapter. Note the difference between crafts, however. By far, of all the crafts, carpenters and wheelwrights had the least household members of the same craft living with them, both by proportion and by number, despite the fact that it was the second most populous craft.

There are two factors working here. One, is that carpenters and wheelwrights may have lived near their work (see table 5.8, chapter five) but they did not do their work in their home, so they had little need for fellow craftsmen to be living in the household. Second, as table 4.7 for 1888 shows the carpenters and wheelwrights were the craft least likely to have male children of the same craft living at home. In the same table, blacksmith’s children were the most likely to follow their father’s craft and be living at home, and also the craft with the highest portion of other household members working in the same craft. Why that might be so will be explored later in this chapter. The shoemakers, shawl weavers and tailors, all who often worked in their homes, had the next highest portion of members, as might be expected. Interestingly but serving their purpose as surrogates for unskilled workers at the one end and professionals at the other, day laborers were the most likely to be living in someone else’s household, and lawyers the least likely. Poverty dictated the one, and affluence enabled the other.

**Occupations by Position in Household**

Getting a closer look at the different social groups in Guadalajara it is possible to reach some important conclusions (Appendix I: Table 4.8, Occupations by Positions in Household, 1838-42). In the period 1838-42, as expected, landowners, elite members, merchants and even unskilled workers had a larger likelihood of heading their households
(78.5 percent, 77.2 percent, and 74 percent). However, headship statistics actually obscure the importance of the household for artisans. Artisans had more children, by far, in their households than any other group, and more kin, and even more spouses who had an artisan occupation. In comparing the 1838-42 figures to those of 1821, the artisans not only have continued their lead over other categories in portion of spouses, children and in their households, they have increased those portions absolutely compared to their own figures in 1821.\textsuperscript{315} Only in non-kin in the household did the artisan portion in 1838-42 fall below the 1821 level. Although, as it will be seen, there are differences between various artisan crafts, but if the figures of the table tell anything, they say that, arguably, more than any other category, artisans used the household to their advantage, and if anything, the role of the household was increasing. Artisans working together in a household would have been an advantage, not a handicap and as the institutional buffer of the guilds disappeared, the city’s craftsmen fell back on the household, and family, even more than ever. As it will be seen, some years later, in 1888, the sample suggests that this tendency had accelerated. The portion of all artisans heading their own household increased, as did those artisans living in other artisans households; as a result, the portion of artisans who were child and kin declined. (Appendix I: Table 4.8 Occupations by Position in Household, 1838-42).

Looking at individual crafts different patterns emerge. In 1838-42, contrary to what one might expect, masons, leather craftsmen, hand weavers, bakers and blacksmiths were more likely to head their own household than crafts of a high status (barbers, silversmiths, carpenters, and tailors). The exceptions are blacksmiths, which will be dealt with later. But the reason, clearly, is that for artisans it is more advantageous for younger craftsmen to live with other, older, artisans. The headship for crafts in trouble is not a sign of strength but weakness. On the other hand, non-skilled workers such as day laborer or obreros were far less likely to be children or kin, and far more likely to be members of household living as renters with strangers, or persons of a different occupation.

Again, in 1888 (table 4.10), the sample shows carpenter/ wheelwright and shawl weavers, were, by far, more likely to head their own household than other craft but for all

\textsuperscript{315} See table 4.8, Rivas, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 100.
crafts the portion heading households had increased, suggesting, again, the central role of the household in the life of the artisan. Better off crafts (carpenters/wheelwrights, tailors, shawl weavers and blacksmiths were more likely to be living as kin or children in the household headed by one of their craft; shoemakers, bakers and hatters living as renters, but again, in households headed by someone of their own craft. 316 (Appendix J and K: Table 4.9 Male Artisans by Position in Household, 1838-42 and Table 4.10 Male Artisans by Position in Household, 1888).

**Household and Family Composition and Process**

In the 1960s and 1970s, Peter Laslett developed what he called the “Western Family” type—a nuclear family characterized by relatively late marriage. By the 1980s, however, most scholars had abandoned the idea of a “regional” family structure for one in which variations in heredity practices, landholding and economic factors played their roles in determining the kind of family and households in which individuals lived. Other historians pointed out the need to consider the impact of the life cycle of the family itself on the structure of the household, for younger families had far different needs—and possibilities—than did mature families whose children had left. Still others looked at the household in still broader contexts, as a fluid institution that changed relative to household production needs, migration factors, and life cycle considerations. The family was a “process,” not a thing. 317 Moreover, studies have shown that, “rather than being

---

316 Again, because artisans not living in households of one of the seven crafts were not sampled, these figures have to be taken carefully. However, since they would have been randomly ignored, the relationship between the crafts would seem to have been relatively similar to what they are in table 4.10.

317 Tamara K. Hareven, “The History of the Family,” is still the best overview of the history of thinking about the family. However, the most up-to-date summary of the various current views is David Kertzer, “Living With Kin,” in David Kertzer, ed. *History of the European Family* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001). The classic work on the household and family as “process” was done by anthropologist Jack Goody. For example, see Jack Goody, ed. *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).
isolated, nuclear households were embedded in kinship ties outside their confines.”

Kinship networks provide mutual assistance, foster relative’s children, a temporary home for migrants, information on jobs, contacts, loans and all manner of support.

Unfortunately, most census-based research on the family must, by the nature of their data, present a static picture of the household and family, frozen in time, unable to recover the process of household and family formation, and the inter-relationship between family and household, between family members and kin beyond the confines of the residence, or between the head of the household and its members. All that can be done with the data itself is to look for changes over time comparing census data, and to look for differences among categories of persons within each census, hoping that the comparison will provide clues to historical behavior. For the most part, that is what I have had to do here, looking at artisans, their families and their households.

However, this study also has access to a wide range of data collected and digitized by the Guadalajara Census Project that provides certain clues to the household and family process. Particularly relevant is research that has uncovered a high rate of mobility into and out of the households in 1811-1813, 1821-1822 and 1839-42. Work done by Monica Hardin found that by linking the two back-to-back population censuses, she was able to ascertain that just a little under three-quarters of all households within the city in 1821 could not be found in the same district in 1822; the figure was even higher for 1839-42. While her study did not attempt to follow them throughout the city, several


320 Hardin, “Household and Family in Guadalajara,” 133-34. In 1821-22 the city was divided into twenty-four districts. Of the two censuses, the 1821 census was taken in the immediately aftermath of the successful Insurgency against Spain, in the late fall of 1821, and the 1822 census taken in the early fall of 1822, by a newly elected city government. For the 1839-42 data, see ibid, 124-32.
partial counts of individual districts estimated that perhaps as much as 30 percent of those who left the district actually left the city.\textsuperscript{321} Significantly, of those households that remained within the same district, nine out of ten underwent a change in household personnel. Interestingly, except for the occasional seasonal migrant or infrequent death, the husband and wife partnership remained intact. Therefore, one has mobility and movement characterizing both the transient households and the persisting households, anchored by the head of household and spouse.

Those findings impact this study in several ways. First, a major theme of this work is the important role of the household, and Hardin’s research attests to that. For example, Hardin found that twelve percent of all persisting households that had no kin in 1821, added kinfolk in 1822, broadening the portion of the population living with kin to nearly one-third (31.6 percent). In other words, a table based on one census likely understates the portion of individuals who experience living with kin over the course of months, certainly over the course of several years.

Also, non-kin in large numbers moved into and out of the household as well, as did children, both of kin and of the head of the household. The movement of children was somewhat of a surprise, as nearly all studies (based on aggregate data of a single census) assumed that children leave the household as they got older, to work, or apprentice. That assumption was based on aggregate data that showed a progression of fewer older children for most households.\textsuperscript{322} But Hardin found that more children arrived into the household than departed it; something like forty percent between the ages of one through nine.\textsuperscript{323} This vast movement seemed too widespread and too ubiquitous to be accidental (fault of the census taker missing children who were actually there) or incidental, but appear more systematic and purposeful. Movement of kin and particularly

\textsuperscript{321} Anderson, et. al., “If All the World Were Guadalajara,” p. 10.

\textsuperscript{322} This was the assumption of Rodney Anderson in his monograph utilizing the census of 1821-22 data; Guadalajara a la consumación de la Independencia: Estudio de su población según los padrones de 1821-1822 (Guadalajara: Unidad Editorial, 1983).

\textsuperscript{323} Hardin, “Household and Family in Guadalajara,” 133-53.
of children suggests kin networks only hinted at in the literature, networks that this study also considers important in creating a craft community.\textsuperscript{324}

As for artisans, Hardin found that the guild crafts were more likely to stay put than any other occupational groups, particularly the carpenters, blacksmiths, barbers, silversmiths, hand weavers and shoemakers, and masters more likely than journeymen.\textsuperscript{325} Therefore, by the type of data that is available for this study, the view of the artisans’ families and household are necessarily static. But I believe that my study’s thesis is supported by Hardin’s work—that the process of household formation and change is a crucial element of the ability of the city’s artisans to survive economically and, for some, to prosper at a time when it has been assumed they were meeting their demise.

**Experiencing Household**

From an earlier work, it is known that living in a nuclear household was an experience of a minority of individuals in Guadalajara at the beginning of the Republican era (1821), a considerably different conclusion from Peter Laslett’s classic contention that most individuals in past times lived in nuclear households, although closer to the re-interpretation of family experience in more recent works.\textsuperscript{326} In 1821, nearly 20 percent of...

\textsuperscript{324} Lomnitz also found social networks as a crucial adaptation by Mexico City’s contemporary urban poor, particularly those urban households that served as a kind of half-way house for kin from the countryside looking for work in the city; Lomnitz, \textit{Cómo sobreviven los marginados}. See also Linda L. Greenow, “Microgeographic Analysis As An Index to Family Structure and Networks,” \textit{Journal of Family History} 10 (Fall 1985): 272-81 and Rosalva Loreto López, ed., \textit{Casas, viviendas y hogares en la historia de México} (México: El Colegio de México, 2001). For another look at family “strategies” in more contemporary Mexico, see Sarah Hamilton, Billie R. DeWalt and David Barkin, “Household Welfare in Four Rural Mexican Communities: The Economic and Social Dynamics of Surviving National Crises,” \textit{Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos} 19, no.2 (2003), 433-462.

\textsuperscript{325} Ibid., 93-94.

\textsuperscript{326} Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community”; Peter Laslett, \textit{Household and Family in Past Time: Comparative Studies in the Size and Structure of the Domestic Group over the Last Three Centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan and Colonial North America, with further materials from Western Europe} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); Peter Laslett, “Characteristics of the Western Family Considered
all the city inhabitants that year lived in extended or multiple related families, and another quarter lived with apparently unrelated families. Only 41.6 percent that year lived in a nuclear household, and from Hardin’s work it is known that short term mobility resulting in even more residents experience living with kin or unrelated strangers within less than a year time.\(^{327}\) (Appendix L: Table 4.11 Household Structure 1821-1888).

The question is, would the various economic, demographic and social forces of the next eight decades of the 19\(^{th}\) century change those relationships? The underlying thesis of this study maintains that despite scholarly assumptions to the contrary, that many but not all artisans, craftsmen, and petty producers retained a strong craft community, at least through to the coming of the railroad in 1888, and perhaps beyond. And clearly the craft family, and household, was the centerpiece of that culture.

The data from table 4.11 suggests that living with kin remained about the same throughout most of the nineteenth century, and, if one takes into account the over-counting of nuclear families in 1888 and the under-counting of multiple families unrelated, so did the nuclear family. But again, it is known that household structure was fluid, meaning that most families probably experienced most type of living arrangements as a common experience.

Focusing on artisans, it is evident that in comparison to the city overall, an even higher portion of individuals lived with kinfolk, and that remained stable and high throughout most of the nineteenth century. Indeed, if the artisans’ figures had been left out of table 4.12, the difference would have been even greater. Also, it will be remembered that the multiple family unrelated figures are likely under-represented, and so therefore, the portion of artisans living with apparent strangers would, too, have likely

\(^{327}\) Monica Leagans Hardin, “Household and Family in Guadalajara, Mexico, 1811-1842: The Process of Short Term Mobility and Persistence” (Florida State University, 2006), 101.
remained stable throughout the time period. (Appendix L: Table 4.11 Household Structure, 1821-1888.)

**Individual Crafts and Household Composition**

More interesting and significant than overall averages, are those of individual occupations. In the differences and similarity of individual jobs can be seen the impact of changes, and the continuity of life experience. By breaking down the general percentages of artisan family structures by craft, one can see noticeable differences. One of the more interesting, if ultimately, unsuccessful efforts to survive the arrival of commercial capitalism armed with labor-saving technology were the hatters (sombrereros). (Appendices N and O: Table 4.12 Male Artisans by Household Structure, 1838-42 and Table 4.14 Male Artisans by Household Structure, 1888).

**Hat Makers (sombrereros)**

Up to 1821 and a few years beyond, the city’s hatters remained a relatively tight-knit craft. One of the lowest ratios of apprentices to masters in 1791, hatters three decades later still had barely more apprentices than masters (20 to 18), with a master to journeymen ratio of 2.9, lower than any but the wax-makers of the guild crafts.\(^{328}\) In 1821, they were more likely to head their own household than any other craft, more likely to live with kin than any other craft, and had the highest ratio of sons age 12 to 19 to father of any craft, and a greater portion of their sons working with them than any other craft.\(^{329}\) They were not a high status craft (less than one in ten received the don), but close-knit and successful by the standards of the day.

Two decades later, in 1838-42, they continued living with kin and relatives more than any other craft (32.3 percent), and maintained their sons in the same craft more than most, but as a craft they were already in trouble from legal imports and contraband

---

\(^{328}\) Rivas, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 57, 66.

\(^{329}\) Ibid., 104, 111, 113.
alike. By the 1888 census, however, the situation had turned fundamentally against the small producer of hats. The 1880 business census mentions only one hat fábrica, an incorporated partnership owned by Ortiz y Onorac y “Cía” (company) and located in the heart of downtown Guadalajara. Thirteen sombrererías are listed but Bárcena’s authoritative list placed those under retail establishments. The fourteen sombrero fábricas mentioned by Banda in 1873 have succumbed to domestic competition, apparently under foreign ownership. The only shop owner that was uncovered by the 1888 sample was Juan Navarro, a 57 year old widower, who lived in a good neighborhood in cuartel seven, and whose shop was on block 24, a very nice, commercial section of cuartel one. His only companion was his 30 year old son, also a sombrerero, and presumably the next in line to take over the shop, if it was to continue. In neither later tax lists, nor in the business census of 1907, is there a Navarro hatter.

The results can be seen in the hatters living arrangements. By 1888, hatters were the craft less likely to live with kin or relatives (6 percent) with the lowest ratio of sons to fathers in the ages of twelve to nineteen. Even oversampling, it was possible only to find 33 hatters of the 107 listed in the 1888 census, most of those probably worked for the two “palm hat” makers, selling to local peasants. (Workers for the hat “factory” were probably labeled operarios or obreros, as were the textile mill hands or the tobacco factory workers).

330 Mariano Bárcena, Estudio Presentado a la Secretaría de Fomento (Mexico: Tip. de Sinforoso Banda, 1880), 168. Bárcena’s list of imported goods into Guadalajara barely mentions hats. Likely, only the very wealthy bought imported hats. In 1888, French capital established the “Sombrerería Francesa” owned by Audiffred y Compañía. In 1907, this factory utilized assembly-line process powered by steam and electricity producing 15,000 hats annually with a total value of 45,000 pesos and employing only 45 workers, less than a third of the hatters than the city had employed nearly a century before.

331 AHJ, Estadística Industrial, Cantón Primero” Guadalajara, 1907, uncatalogued.
Shoemakers (zapateros)

In contrast, shoemaking, another low-status craft appears to have kept at least part of its traditional market, both because the investment cost to set up shop still remained very low, and repairing shoes supplemented, and probably surpassed, making shoes for customers on demand. The mechanization of shoemaking was relatively late in Guadalajara, in part because of the late arrival of the railroad, and in part because Guadalajara’s interior position made it less vulnerable to imports. The 1880 business census listed 46 zapaterías, and most if not all were small shops making and repairing shoes by hand. The 1895-1896 city tax lists numbered 302 shoemaking shops, but all but seventeen exempted from any tax because of their small turnover.332

By 1907, the situation had changed dramatically. There were sixteen shoe factories, producing 45 thousand pair of shoes annually. Most of those factories had been established during the 1890s (10 out of 16) and employed only 157 workers. However, only three establishments employed more than 10 workers and the biggest factory employed a maximum of 48 individuals.333 Even into the twentieth century, a newspaper reported that 1,200 businesses manufactured shoes in Jalisco, from which 80 percent were small productive units, 20 percent medium size, and only one factory (Calzado Canadá, still a major producer of shoes in Guadalajara).334 In addition, those small workshops performed the job mostly by hand (85 percent).335 The shoe industry in Guadalajara was based on “multiple and small to medium size workshops.”336 Moreover, unlike the hatters, shoemakers also had a brisk business in repairing shoes, both in their shops and as mobile neighborhood cobblers calling door to door. The point is that

332 El Estado de Jalisco, 1895, tomo 20, no. 46, 921-25.
333 AHJ, Estadística Industrial, Cantón Primero” Guadalajara, 1907, Uncatalogued.
334 El Occidental, 5 November 1979, Quoted in Patricia Arias, Guadalajara, la gran ciudad de la pequeña industria (Zamora, Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1985), 220.
335 Ibid., 228.
336 Ibid., 241.
mechanization per se did not spell the end of the shoemakers; in some ways, it allowed the shoemakers to survive by adapting to the new technology (foot peddle run sewing machines, for example) and maintaining part of their traditional market.

In any case, what shoemakers continued to do, as they had done throughout the century, was to increase their exploitation of the family and the household in order to survive. Shoemakers’ household arrangements included kin and relatives in the same high proportions for 1838-42 and 1888 that they had kept in 1821 (counting extended family and multiple family related: 19.8 percent in 1821, 20.1 percent in 1838-42, and 22.8 percent in 1888). Moreover, in the latter year shoemakers more identifiable multi-family households than any craft except the carpenters/wheelwrights, and, on the average, larger such households than any other craft save the tailors (who had only one). As a “household” craft, shoemaking involved many members of the family in curing, cutting and sewing the shoes; the wife generally marketed the shoes in local stalls.\textsuperscript{337} Since shoemaking was a low status job, the importance of family networks is evident in household arrangements. The 1880 census listed only 54 zapaterías; the federal census of 1895 listed 1,765 shoemakers. Clearly many worked out of their homes, or on nearby street corners (rinconeros), or walked door to door doing repair work, as was the custom. In 1838-41, only the blacksmiths had more employed persons per household, and of an assortment of crafts in 1838-42 (hand weavers, leather craftsmen, barbers, silversmiths, in addition to the standard seven), only hatters were more likely to live in a household headed by someone of their own craft. Everyone worked; everyone contributed.

Interestingly, age plays an unclear role. As they had been in 1821, in 1838-42 the zapatero heads of households were the youngest of all major crafts, averaging only 34 years (and 29.4 for all zapateros). Their youth reflected, essentially, the fact that entering the craft required little capital. In 1888, of all artisans, the shoemakers were nearly the youngest (table 4.16)—23.0 percent were nineteen years or younger, again, representing the low capital required to enter the craft. However, among heads of households, the shoemakers were among the oldest of craft. Only shawl weaver heads were older. Whether this is a positive trend, reflecting a craft that found a way to survive as it aged,

\textsuperscript{337} Rivas, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 71.
or craftsmen who, as they aged, found that they had no better opportunities than to continue what they had been doing all their lives, is not clear.

**Bakers (panaderos)**

While another low status, poor paying craft, the bakers were a craft centered around very specific, and traditional bakeries. The shop owners were invariably addressed as *don* or *doña* (in 1821 five of the fifteen shop owners were widows), but the journeymen and apprentices had a reputation for rowdy behavior. Unlike the shoemakers and hatters, in 1821 they were the least likely to head their own household (despite the fact that they tended to be older than the average craftsmen) perhaps because of the late hours they kept (and their reputation). In 1821, however, they were the most likely of all craftsmen to live with kinfolk in extended or multiple-related families, and they continued to maintain that living arrangements throughout the century (21.8 percent in 1821, 16.7 percent in 1838-42, and 25.5 percent in 1888). Bakers also had the highest ratio of apprentice age sons living with them in 1838-42 (Table 4.19, save the sparse candle makers) and the highest ratio of sons to heads of household in 1888 (except blacksmiths), and more daughters living with them in 1888 save for carpenter/wheelwrights and shawl weavers. Yet, at the same time, the 1838-42 bakers sons were less likely to follow in their father’s footsteps if he was a baker and head of his own household (only 2 of the 11 sons age 12 and over did) and, indeed, in 1838-42 bakers were far less likely than any other craftsmen to be living in a household headed by another baker. That likelihood increases somewhat in the 1888, when more bakers were heads of household in the 1888 sample, but still below average. Even of the four households identified as shop owning bakers, although there were four sons apprentice age (two being 18 and 23), yet only one other baker was listed in any of the four households, and he was an unrelated adult (age 43), the head of a secondary family. The picture that emerges from the statistics is a craft with a strong family connection, but not one translated into craft involvement, perhaps because the long nighttime hours were particularly difficult for children.
The four remaining crafts (carpenters/wheelwrights, blacksmiths, tailors and shawl weavers) are all ones that did fairly well through 1888—high levels of literacy and status (as far as the latter can be defined), and perhaps, for many, relative economic well being, although that is far more difficult to measure. Each craft that benefited from their ability to adopt specific technological innovations brought by the Industrial Revolution, without being overwhelmed by factory production.

**Carpenters/wheelwrights (carpinteros/carroceros)**

At least in the period under study, carpenters and wheelwrights represented the trade closest to the traditional household and family patterns. Carpenters and wheelwrights were combined not only because both were members of the same colonial guild but because their work followed similar economic patterns. Carpenters were not construction workers (masons and day laborers built buildings, although carpenters were sometimes employed on construction sites) but makers of wooden objects—tables, chairs, etc. The 1880 business census listed a “carrocería y muebles” (carriage and furniture) shop located just north of the San Francisco ex-monastery, whose owner/master, José María Cano, employed 20 workers. There were some 98 carpinterías and carrocerías listed in the business census of 1880 (80 of the former, 18 of the latter), and no doubt there were others, unofficial small shops scattered throughout the city (Table 4.15). As the city expanded, so did carpenter shops and others that relied on local markets. (Appendix P: Table 4.15 Workshops by Industry, 1849, 1854, and 1880).

Carpenters and wheelwrights followed the classic artisan household pattern of sending their apprentice-age children out of the household, although, until recently, it was generally assumed that artisan children stayed at home to help the family enterprise and prepare to take it over with the retirement or death of the father. Various studies, however, have found that only in non-guild crafts or in the homes of prosperous masters, or in textile trades, were children over the age of twelve, common. In crafts that maintained traditional patterns (in Vienna, for example, they were woodworking, metalworking, and clothing trades), households containing children older than 12 years
old were uncommon.\textsuperscript{338} My previous work using 1821 data corroborated this very pattern. Guild artisans had fewer sons living in a household than either merchants or landowners.\textsuperscript{339} The reasons why artisans did not keep their children at the household to work in the trade, according to Ehmer’s and Romero-Marín’s work, was that sending their children out of the home for apprenticeship was a means to strengthen the family networks: ‘‘apprentice exchange’ was useful not only to reproduce their world but also it became a chain in their vital and professional links arriving at places where family ties did not reach.’’\textsuperscript{340}

In 1888, while they had more sons, ages 2 to 11, than any craft but the blacksmiths, they had fewer sons of apprenticeship age than any but the hatters and shawl weavers (Table 4.22). Moreover, they had the least son to father ratio for adult children ages 20 and over, suggesting that carpenter/wheelwright sons did not follow in their father’s footsteps, or at least did not come home to do so. Of those children of any age residing in their father’s household, only three of twenty-three ages twelve and older were carpenters. And only eight carpenters (8.6\%) of the 93 sampled lived in a household headed by a fellow carpenter, by far the smallest portion of any of the crafts (Table 4.7). In other words, carpenters, whether children of carpenters or not, did not tend to live in households with other carpenters. Interestingly, the carpenter/wheelwrights had more female children in their homes than any craft but the shawl weavers (for whom female children were workers), again, an indication of the solvency of the craft. They could afford to keep female children at home, rather than marry them off, or have them work as domestics.

Among artisans, they were slightly more likely than the average to have kinfolk living with them, and to live in multiple family households, just as all artisans were more


\textsuperscript{339} Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 106.

\textsuperscript{340} Romero-Marín provides two examples among masons in Barcelona, Pablo Jambru and Francisco Ginot were sent as apprentices to mason masters that were not related their families. Romero-Marín, “Familial strategies of artisans,” 216.
likely to live with kin and in multiple family households compared to the average person in the city (Tables 4.11 and 4.12), even though they were among the youngest of heads (table 4.19 and 4.20). Carpenters and wheelwrights increased the percentage of individuals living with kin or relatives from 1821 to 1838-42 (18 percent 1821, 19.1 percent 1838-42) (Table 4.13).\textsuperscript{341} By 1888 nearly one third (30.6 percent) of all carpenter/wheelwrights lived with kin (Table 4.14).

The 1888 data also provides information on shop-owning master carpenter/wheelwrights. Of all the shop owners identified in the 1888 census, forty percent (15) were carpenters. Here, rather interesting differences appear of shop owners from all carpenters. The majority of master carpenter households were nuclear; only two were extended, and none had a kinship family living with them. Only three were multiple families. In other words, masters had less need for a complex household. In that, they more resembled the individualist family of the industrial era. They had more children than the average (2.5 to 2.0), and more boys at home (1.3 to .947). Significantly, perhaps, however, their ratio of boys apprentice age (12 to 19) was almost exactly the same as the average (.267 to .253). The one pattern that appears to be constant, therefore, is apprentice-age boys who are missing, a strong craft, with traditional patterns, but perhaps one that, for shop owners, begins to look like “modern-day” petite bourgeoisie.

**Blacksmiths (Herreros)**

The census of 1880 identified some thirty-nine shops that I have broadly classified as blacksmith shops but were specifically labeled: three ironworks or foundries (fierrerías), three forges (fraguas), one fragua y carpintería, one herrería and armería (maker/repairer of weaponry), two herradores (shops that shoe horses), and nineteen blacksmith shops (herrerías). For the most part, the skill level, tools and experience needed were similar. Most made and repaired items of iron with the herradores specializing in making, and installing horseshoes. Although rural estates had traditionally done their own blacksmithing, and some no doubt still did, the steady urban market for a wide range of iron goods keep the shops going in even hard times, and a

\textsuperscript{341} See Table 4.14 from Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 110.
good living in better times. They had little to fear from the economic changes of the nineteenth century and, until well into the twentieth century, much to gain.

In fact, of all the four strong crafts, the blacksmiths’ households appear to resemble those craft households that Josef Ehmer called the “modern family structure,” that is master artisans that “followed the pattern of the industrial bourgeoisie rather than that of the lower classes”\(^\text{342}\). That pattern, he believes, is one in which the apprentice age boys stay at home, and in which one of them is prepared to take over the family firm. His revisionist study maintained that usually sons did not take over the shop when their father retired or died, that in the guild system and under remnants of guild culture when the system was abolished, the family did not play the dominant role it would come to play under the full impact of industrial capitalism.

Looking at the blacksmiths in 1838 and 1888, several patterns stand out. First, they are more likely to live in a nuclear family household than any other craft in both years, and rarely live with kin, compared to the other crafts (only 11.7 percent lived with kin in 1838-42, and 16 percent in 1888, Table 4.13 and 4.14). (Paradoxically, however, they share with shawl weavers the highest number of kin per household (1.47), primarily because of three very large (38 persons) related multiple families. The typical blacksmith household had few kin.)

The key statistic involves children. Unlike the carpenters, for example, in 1888 blacksmiths had the highest portion of children of apprentice-age (.519), the highest portion of blacksmiths living in a household headed by the same craft (32.7 percent), and the highest portion of children with the same occupation of their father (52.6 percent). This is the same pattern as in 1821 in which blacksmith children with a job most like be the same job as head (68.8%), second only to the hatters. When one considers that six of the twenty-seven blacksmith heads of household had no children at all, the pattern is even stronger. Also, of the blacksmiths living in blacksmith households, only seven (of 22) were non-relatives. Two-thirds were children or kin.

Although, I was unable to specifically identify master blacksmiths from the 1888 census using the 1880 business census, a number of households look suspiciously like shops. For example, Jesús Gallo (not sampled) was a 55 year old blacksmith who lived

with his wife, ten sons and five daughters in block 49, district 8 (Analco), along the main thoroughfare from the city center to the outlying village of San Pedro (today usually referred to as Tlaquepaque). Along with the former indigenous barrio Mexicalzingo (district 7), Analco was the city’s heaviest concentration of blacksmith shops. Among Gallo’s sons were six blacksmiths, ages 29 (Enrique, listed first before his father and likely the heir), 20, 19, 18, 17, 16. One 16 year-old son is a student, and the other sons are ages 14, 9, 6, along with four sisters ages 20, 12, 10 and 3. Although I cannot be sure and therefore did not identify him as a shop owner since he was not one in 1880, it is likely, in fact, that he was, and perhaps living near his shop as well. On either side of this well-traveled street were a dozen or so other blacksmiths, including the large Reyes family (thirteen children, three of them blacksmiths) a few blocks east on the other side of the street and likely also an unidentified shop.

Shawl Weavers (reboceros)

A small but thriving craft at the end of the colonial era, the shawl weavers managed to survive the competition from foreign and domestic textiles that destroyed the cotton hand weavers, but not unchanged. In 1850, the immediate motive for the “Tarel Riot” at the Rebozos de Seda Tarel y Cía was the introduction of modern factory production techniques at the large, five hundred-worker factory, and the subsequent reduction of the some five hundred weaver’s wages. However, the competition with the traditional family shops had forced the surviving shops to adapt in some way or another to the new technology. The business census of 1880 listed two fábricas de rebozos (factories) located side by side in district two, thirteen talleres de rebozos (shops) all located in the traditional rebozo shop area in cuarteles three and four, and twenty-four rebocerías located mainly in districts eight and nine across the small stream San Juan de Dios.343 One assumes that the different labels describe different size establishments

343 Thirty establishments were designated “fábricas” in the survey, apparently with design. The Munguía family, for example, owned several textile “fábricas” including La Productora that employed 60 “obreras” and “obreros” producing blankets (colchas) and La Caja de Agua, called a “Fábrica de Tejidos” (weaving) employing fifty six workers (“operarios”) and producing both blankets and “rebozos de seda” (silk). The family
utilizing various technologies but this is not known for sure. However, that so many rebozo establishments were still operating concerns suggests that, despite local, domestic and foreign competition, and all the likely necessary changes such competition demanded, the rebozo crafts still survived, but not unchanged.\textsuperscript{344} As best as it is possible, the cultural clues of that survival will be explored below.

The shawl weavers were not a particularly prestigious craft—they were rarely awarded the don or doña in the 1838-42 census (3.4 percent) and none were called to jury duty (jueces de jurado) for the upscale district 6 in 1861 (although about one-fifth of those called were for cuartel nine, where many of them lived, were reboceros).\textsuperscript{345} They were more literate than the average craftsmen (at 46.4 percent) as recorded in the 1842 census. But perhaps more than any other craft, they depended on their family and other household members to keep their craft alive.

For one thing, a majority of reboceros lived either within an extended family (4.9 percent), a related multiple family household (13.4 percent) or an unrelated multiple family household (30.4 percent). By 1888, the percentage of shawl weavers living with kin had increased to 36.2 percent, the highest of any of the selected crafts, with another nearly twenty percent living in other multiple family situations. And more reboceros lived in households headed by a fellow craftsman than any but blacksmiths and the few hatters. Many of those reboceros were family children. Rebocero heads had more children living with them than any craft but blacksmiths, a high portion being either apprentice age or adults. They also had the highest ratio of female children to head of household (3.8) by far of any craft, clearly to work with their parents. Here there is

\textsuperscript{344} In 1879-80, some 479 dozen rebozos were introduced into Guadalajara from outside producers. Mariano Barcena, \textit{Ensayo estadística del Estado de Jalisco} (México: Oficina tipográfica de la Secretaría de Fomento, 1888).

\textsuperscript{345} AMG, expediente 24, paquete 117 and CS 03/1861, anterior paquete 118, caja 124, legajo 4, número 7.
actually documentation on the work that women and female children did in the household. The census takers for cuartel 8 in 1888 listed 313 costureras (seamstresses), one of the few officials to consistently give occupations to females. Most were daughters working for rebocero parents, although some were seamstresses in sastre shops as well.

Essentially, the reboceros remained a viable craft, in good measure, by intensifying the family labor component of their craft. Family labor is cheap, and to a certain extent, it is coercible, or at least more so than hired labor. Although one cannot be sure, it appears that the reboceros reduced the number of hired journeymen they employed because, as the number of children and kin reboceros in the household increased, the number of non-kin decreased. This is precisely the situation of the Lyons silk weavers in France during the economic difficulties of the 1830s and 1840s, and the same with Parisian tailors during the same period, and German masters of various trades. In order to survive in the depression years of the 1830s and 1840s, and for the Lyons silk weavers, through the 1860s, family labor increased and hired labor was decreased, as they families, in essence, exploited themselves.346 In other words, what appears to be a Mexican, and particularly, a Mexican garment crafts response to the particular difficulties facing Mexico after Independence, was, in fact, a more generalized condition of weavers everywhere.

Labor is only one aspect of the role of family, of course. What is not being seen are the many other aspects of the relationship between the (extended) family and the workplace—the training of younger craftsmen, the loans from wealthier family members (hence the choice of marriage partners for children is critical), the fostering of younger children, even the local market for goods produced—all aspects of the family beyond the household that need to be understood if the full role of the family and the workshop can be known. Supporting these relationships is another unseen structure—the ideology of the family, the values and identity that make the family work, that conditions what is expected and what is given.

Significantly, however, *rebocero* children who worked as *reboceros* (males) or *costureras* (females) were not particularly young. *Reboceros* themselves were spread evenly throughout the age brackets, with the largest portion being fifty years or older. Only 7.5 percent of all *reboceros* were under twenty. Of the *costureras*, the majority were over 20, with the average age of 25. (Appendix Q: Table 4.16 Male Artisans by Age Distribution, 1888).

So, although the household was clearly crucial to the *rebocero* craft, the age structure suggests that it was a mature craft, one that needed experience to be able to do the work as it should be done.\(^\text{347}\)

The sample of 1888 has identified five shop owners from the census of 1880, and so it will be useful to examine their households. Also, one was identified as the owner of a *rebozo* factory, one a shop and three, *rebocerías*. Since all were identified in 1888 only as *reboceros*, it can be assumed that everyone was considered master and not simply owner, or *propietario*.

Cruz Durán owned the *rebozo* factory located in 1880 in block 33, cuartel two, on the outskirts of the district, near gardens Morelos. In 1888 he is located in the same block, and at the same address, # 5, San Felipe street, north side of the block, in other words, he is living in, or over, his factory. At 60, he is the oldest of the five owners, although the others are mainly in their fifties. He is living with his wife, age 50, and, apparently, four daughters, ages 28, 19, 16, 14. The presence of daughters is a characteristic of the *reboceros*, and four of the five have at least two living at home. One assumes, but do not know, that they work in their father’s “factory.” Although other craftsmen live nearby, as do merchants, a lawyer, a general, no other shawl weavers do, and only seventeen live in the entire district, one of the older and well-off areas of central Guadalajara. However, one should note that Cruz’s factory is located near the border with Cuartel 9, where many shawl weavers do live, some of whom presumably would work for him if indeed, his establishment was a factory. (The other factory was located in block 32, to the north, and several shawl weavers do live in that block, but not the former owner, Guadalupe Paz. The latter’s factory was located at #14, block 32, where

---
in 1888 a young empresario (promoter, contractor) named Lusiano Hermosillo, age 30, lived.

Next is Jesús Medina, age 38, who lived on the south side of a small block that borders Avenida Aduana, the main north-south thoroughfare of the city dividing the east and west districts. It was an older, working-class district, traditionally the home of cotton and shawl weavers, and a number of other reboceros lived close by. In 1880 a second rebozo shop was located next door to Medina’s shop, but in 1880 two panaderos lived in those two locations (number 32 and 34), suggesting the residential flexibility of such shops. Medina now lived around the corner from his old shop, with his wife, age 40, and three daughters age 16, 15, 12. His sixteen year old is a teacher (“preceptora”) with no mention of a job for the younger ones. Medina is unusual in the neighborhood in that he can read; only three others (a carpenter, a stone mason and another rebocero) of the some 130 person in the block were noted as they knew (sabe) in the read column.

The last three reboceros all lived close together, although one cannot know exactly as no block numbers were given for cuartel nine, where thirteen of the 1880 rebocerías were located. In 1880, they had been located in blocks 34 and 35 on the outskirts of the district, close to the road to the nearby indigenous pueblo of San Andres. Doroteo Esqueda, age 57, lived with, perhaps, an older sister (60), and three other female Esquedas (ages 40, 42, 12, 14). It is not clear, but likely he was married but his wife was absent. There are many nearby reboceros, including two households headed by younger Esquedas (ages 40 and 31), presumably his sons or younger brothers. Asunción was married with five children—four boys and a girl. Gonzalo was also married, with seven children—three boys (one a fifteen year-old panadero) and four girls, including two teenage daughters. In both households, as was the widespread practice, the men and boys were all listed first, and then the daughters. In 1880 a Félix Esqueda ran a small store (tendajón) called “El Parcuso.”

Pedro Ibarra, 57, lived with his wife and three children, a boy age 15 and two daughters, ages 11 and 8. His shop was likely across the street from Esqueda’s and in the same block as Antonio Hurtado, 50, a widower, living with two female Hurtados (ages 76 and 47), both widows, and their (apparent) six children—two girls ages 17 and 12, and four boys, including two teenagers, one, Pablo, age 15, a rebocero. Not far away
was another Hurtado rebocero, Eligio, 35, perhaps his son, and a jornalero Hurtado living down the block.

In summary, the presumed master reboceros looked very much like the others—they were older, of course, but generally lived in extended families or close to others of the same name and presumed relatives, and, except for Cruz Durán, certainly near other reboceros. The presence of work-age females was also common. It is impossible to know anything of their economic situation but they were still practicing their trade some eight years after the 1880 census, and that, at least, is a good sign.

Table 4.17 includes all persons, not just head of the households, showing various household characteristics. Certain distinguishing patterns emerge according to the occupation or social group. Elite and merchants lived in bigger households than the landowners, artisans, or unskilled workers and for the elite at least, this means more kin and more boarders, as might be expected. Because the table measures all members of a household, it should not be interpreted to mean that households headed by unskilled workers had more boarders than artisans, for example. Rather, those unskilled workers live in households with other boarders more often than do artisans, which again points up the differences between the two groups. Many artisans would have headed households in which unskilled workers were boarders, providing some small economic advantage to the former. (Appendix R: 4.17 Occupations by Means, 1838-42).

More significantly, when the data is analyzed by social status (Table 4.18), changes occur within each group. Those individuals with the higher social status tended to live in larger households, with more children, more kin, more boarders and more servants. Clearly, social status marked a distinction between social groups and their household experiences. Artisans, for example, show an increase in the number of children in the household, if the head carried the hidalguía. In essence, social status indicates that those artisans, mainly masters, can afford to keep their children at home. Nonetheless, there was really relatively little difference between high and low status artisans and the average number of children. With some exceptions, as discussed in the

section on carpenters/wheelwrights, sending children out of the home was one way to maintain social networks that were a key to economic survival. In truth, it is unknown where the children went, and that is one of the major unresolved research problems of this study. However, the large number of artisans living in non-family situations, and the mentioned mobility into and out of the household, are clues that such a process did exist. (Appendix S: Table 4.18 Occupations by Means and Social Status, 1838-42).

Looking at different crafts through the lens of social status (Table 4.19) similar differences appear. While imperfect, using the *hidalguía* as a surrogate to differentiate between masters and journeymen is an attempt to “tease” as much complexity out of the data as possible, especially since the contemporary census documents give little indication of who were shop owning master craftsmen. In many, if not most such division, similar differences appear. Don artisans were generally older than those without the don, they generally lived in larger households, with greater number of kin and boarders living with them. Often, where the case is not true, the problem is usually that the few numbers (of dons) make the mean rather meaningless. For example, there were only three mason dons, so the mean number of boarders is not reliable. Overall, the age difference does not seem that great, meaning that where there are differences, the reason is not simply one of age. (Appendices T and U: Table 4.19 Crafts by Means and Social Status, 1838-42 and Table 4.20 Crafts by Means, 1888).

Another aspect of the role of the household can be seen in tables 4.19 and 4.20 is the question of household size, number of kin and children in the household, by craft and between 1838-42 and 1888. Although it is true, that having economic means generally means one can afford to have a larger household, with kin, lodgers and children. However, it is clear that for most crafts those numbers increased between 1838-42 and 1888. This is especially true when, as mentioned, it is considered that the household size was likely larger than the figures indicate for 1888, because of the difficulty of identifying unrelated families living together. As the previous discussion indicated, most crafts increased the role of the family, kin and strangers in the household in those decades past mid-century. Some crafts more than others, it is true, such as the shawl weavers. But a larger household, with more workers, more individuals helping to pay rent, more persons to work at the household craft is an indication of the increased pressures of the
time. As Michael Scardaville pointed out, commenting upon the role of the household in the economic crises of the 1980s and 1990s, “that families best able to endure the chronic economic recessions of the late twentieth century had been those who took refuge in larger domestic units,” something that he maintained characterized Mexico City at the end of the colonial era as well.\footnote{Michael C. Scardaville, “Respuestas de la clase trabajadora durante el período colonial tardío en la Ciudad de México, una perspectiva doméstica o la familia pequeña no vive mejor,” in Manuel Miño Grijalva, ed. \textit{La Cuidad de México a fines de la colonia} (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2002).}

The increased role of children in the household, particularly male children, can be seen in tables 4.21 and 4.22. They show that as the age of male sons increased, the ratio of son to head of the household decreased. This similar tendency was found in the previous research in 1821 data.\footnote{Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 112.} Higher status crafts (silversmiths, blacksmiths, stone masons, and barbers, table 4.20) had more small children on the average, preferring one assumes to have them at home and being able to afford to do so, and that figure increased over the decades between 1838-42 and 1888. For individual crafts, the higher the ratio in ages 12 to 19, the less the probability to leave the parents house in accordance with the traditional pattern to send out the male sons to learn an \textit{oficio}. Here, there were the bakers, tailors, hatters and candle makers. For all but the tailors, that fact is no doubt a sign of craft weakness, as has been discussed earlier in this chapter. On the contrary, in 1838-42 those crafts with the lower ratios ages 12 to 19—carpenter/wheelwright, barbers, silversmiths, blacksmiths, leather crafts and shawl weavers—tended to be the stronger crafts, and followed traditional patterns. Shoemakers were an exception; a craft economically weak but a strong follower of craft tradition.\footnote{José Olmedo, \textit{Los zapateros de Guadalajara. Nueva Galicia, 1751-1824} (Guadalajara, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara, 1997).}

Following this same pattern, male sons twenty years and older were more frequently found in low status crafts (hatters, shoemakers, and hand weavers in that order). The exception were tailors and carpenters/coach makers, both high status crafts that may have encouraged older children to return to the household for economic reasons,
although, as table 4.23 shows, they are very unlikely to have the same job as their father, compared to the other crafts. (Appendix X: Male Children Who Had the Same Job as the Head of the Household, 1838-1842).

The comparison with the 1888 data (table 4.22) is very interesting, but needs to be interpreted cautiously. Of the seven crafts sampled for 1888, in only one are sons less important than 1838-42—the sombrereros. Even over-sampled and with the increase in population, the hatters were a fading craft, if they were still a craft. They had fewer sons per head, fewer sons at each age group. They had nearly as many female children at home as males. By the 1890s, the only hatters would be “operarios”—factory workers.

For the other six, and one feels that it applies for most crafts, the increased role of the household is reflected in the more intense role of the sons of craftsmen. While for the most part retaining the differences between the crafts, each craft saw an increased presence of sons. From an average of hardly more than half a son per household in 1838-42, the craft average is over one in 1888. In particular, apprentice age sons in nearly every craft at least double, and usually more. Shoemakers, carpenters and blacksmiths, in particular, which had held to the traditional patterns in 1821 and 1838-42 of sending their sons off to apprentice, board or work, now have them home in double and triple the numbers; for the blacksmiths, nearly four times. For older sons, the trend held as well. Only the carpenters/wheelwrights (and, of course, the hatters) resisted the trend, having fewer older sons at home than in 1838-42.

What is fascinating, however, is the comparison of those male children’s occupation. Comparing all male children who were given an occupation by the census takers (tables 4.23 and 4.7), 65.3 percent followed their father’s occupation in 1838-42; only 48.3 percent did in 1888! Further, of all male children ages twelve and over in the households of the seven crafts in 1888, only one quarter (25.7 percent, or 38 of 148) followed the same craft as their father. Of the rest, however, of those that had an occupation, nearly three-quarters were working at another artisan craft; the rest did not have a craft occupation but most of those had presumably better jobs (comerciante, empleado, filarmónico, corredor, dependiente, músico). Only one, a maquinista, might
have presumed to be below the status of an artisan. None were day laborers, for example.\textsuperscript{352}

Therefore, although it seems clear that the artisan family in the 1880s were “exploiting” their own family more intensely than they had in the 1840s, they were not necessarily doing so by having their male children follow in the same craft. Although it may sound counter-intuitive, the reason may be that for sons not to follow their father’s craft is one way “to avoid the dispersion of the family patrimony,” is Romero-Marín’s conclusions for nineteenth century Barcelona.\textsuperscript{353} There he found that it was rare for brothers to work in the same trade, and that the portion of artisans’ children following their fathers’ craft was about one quarter. Moreover, he found that sons did not tend to inherit their fathers’ workshops; they “acquired their fathers’ craft skills—an intangible inheritance—but not their business.”\textsuperscript{354} Romero-Marín’s thesis for Barcelona was that the primary aim of the artisan family was not so much accumulate and pass on capital, but to avoid what he called “the poverty circle,” by expanding both their kin group through marriage, and through trade group through sons going into other crafts.\textsuperscript{355}

I believe that the same pattern holds true for Guadalajara. For example, the average portion of artisans’ children ages twelve and older who followed in their fathers’ craft was also exactly that of Barcelona—25.7 percent. And while three quarters of the 1888 artisans’ sons ages twelve and older did not practice their fathers’ craft, those that had occupations were generally artisans as well. And none, but one, could be said to have fallen into the unskilled or industrial worker category. True, there is no information about sons who have already left the home, but those who stayed at home certainly did so within the craft community.

\textsuperscript{352} Among individual crafts, those whose sons of apprentice-age (12 years or over) who followed their father’s craft were, by order: blacksmith (47.4 percent), hat maker (40.0 percent), shoemaker (31.2 percent), tailor (26.1 percent), shawl weaver (25.0 percent), carpenter/wheelwright (13.0 percent), and baker (9.0 percent).

\textsuperscript{353} Romero-Marín, “Family Strategies of Artisans,” 211.

\textsuperscript{354} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{355} Ibid., 211-23.
Also, three-quarters of those blacksmiths’ sons who followed their fathers’ crafts were single. About one third of all the city’s blacksmiths headed their own household. Perhaps those sons at home were waiting to establish their own household when they had finished their training and had saved sufficient capital to marry and open their own shop. In contrast, the shoemakers, who were second in following their fathers’ craft, needed little capital to establish their own shop. But given the economic difficulties of shoemakers, likely they were playing the trade of their fathers’ in order to contribute to the family income—working in their home, or as mobile cobblers working the streets. Nearly half the shoemaker sons were married (41.7 percent), suggesting the role of marriage and family work went hand in hand. (Of the shoemakers living in another artisan’s household, three quarters (72.2 percent) were single.) Concentrating both workers and married sons in the family enterprise was one way of surviving in a poor craft. But this pattern had the risk of over-specialization in a changing economic environment. For most crafts, the pattern was not to concentrate their sons in the same craft but to diversify their family’s means of making a living. Again, the 1888 sample must be looked at very cautiously, but the pattern is so pronounced that even a conservative conclusion would be that the family had become even more important in the economic survival of the crafts. Artisan marriage patterns confirm this conclusion.

(Appendices V, W, and X: Table 4.21 Sons in the Household by Craft and Age cohorts, 1834-42; Table 4.22 Sons in the Household by Craft and Age Cohorts, 1888; Table 4.23 Male Children Who Had the Same Job as the Head of the Household, 1838-42.)

**Artisans and Marriage**

A crucial aspect of the role of the family in maintaining the craft is who craftsmen married. Did they marry within the craft, or within the city’s other crafts? Did they marry up or down, in terms of status? The marriage registry consistently gave the groom’s age, occupation and birthplace, and the groom was required to sign the marriage document, so that at least the ability to write one’s name is attested. Far less often, unfortunately, was the groom and bride’s fathers’ occupation listed. Nonetheless, the data gives some indication of the answers to the relevant questions. In the forty-one
instances where artisans bridges’ fathers’ occupation is known, artisans overwhelmingly tended to marry the daughters of other artisans. In a few cases, they married “up”—one to a daughter of an empleado and three to daughters of small landholders. In a few more cases, they might be considered marrying down (three to daughters of day laborers and one to a daughter of a domestic). But mainly they married within the craft community, and, surprisingly, often within the same craft. Two of five carpenters married carpenter’s daughters; five of eight reboceros married within the craft, as did four of nine zapateros and five of thirteen masons.

Although it cannot be known for sure, there is no reason to think that the cases where the bride’s father’s occupation is known were somehow untypical. Certainly, the trend among the cases that are known is clear. Artisans married other artisans’ daughters, and if not particularly surprising (the opportunity to meet females from families of craftsmen was, as it will be seen in the next chapter, quite common because they were often living nearby), the pattern none-the-less supports the argument that has been put forth by this study—Guadalajara’s artisans were not just an occupational category but a social community.

The marriage registers provided one other characteristic of the artisan community—the question of literacy. In all, the sample from 1877 to 1907 gives 41.6 percent ability to write their names. The artisans and small producers were 34.2 percent (unskilled workers were 9.6 percent; merchants were 83.2 percent). Individual figures were: painters (75.0 percent); tailors (63.6 percent); carpenters/wheelwrights (62.5%); blacksmiths (30.0%). Day laborers were 7.2 percent. But the figures improved each year. Artisans were 24.7 percent in 1877, 30.0 percent in 1888, 44.2 percent in 1900 and 45.6 percent in 1907. Anecdotal evidence from the 1888 census showed a number of children of artisans in school, and the School of Arts that had been established for artisans had 150 students registered. Of the family values that the petite bourgeoisie held dear, not only in Mexico, but in Europe and the U.S., education for their children was considered particularly important. By 1907, nearly all carpenter/wheelwrights were able to sign their names, and even half the shoemakers.

The great difference between artisans and unskilled workers, however, remained large. The second largest category behind artisans, unskilled workers averaged 9.6
percent over the entire era, and the highest was 12.8 percent in 1888. As late as 1907, of the fifty-seven grooms, only six (10.5 percent) could sign their names. If the artisans were able to take advantage of the “progress” of the Díaz regime, their less fortunate comrades were not. (Appendix Y: Table 4.24 Ratio of Female Children to Head of the Household, 1888).
CHAPTER FIVE
URBAN SPACE AND ARTISAN RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS

This chapter will describe the residential patterns among artisans. Beginning with a description of the city, my purpose is to answer the various questions of urban space. To what extent is it possible to uncover the role that “neighborhood,” the barrios (in France, the quartier), play in the nature and persistence of artisan culture? First, it is necessary to determine the inter-relationship of the artisan shop and the locale in which it was situated. Where were the concentration of artisan shops, and did the concentration of shops correspond with the concentration of artisan population? In what way can the utilization of urban space indicate the presence, and process, of an artisan community, even culture? And further, how did artisan residential patterns vary by craft, and did it stay the same, or change, over the nineteenth century?

In my earlier work, I found that in 1821, merchants tended to concentrate in the older city’s center, and that those artisans that depended on better-off consumers followed their customers to the wealthier districts. The artisans of lesser status more often lived in poorer neighborhood, but no clear residential patterns based on social status emerged from the data. Did this tendency change over time, as Guadalajara’s population grew, and particularly as the nation began to industrialize in the latter quarter of the 19th century?

The City

Guadalajara, as most urban settlements established by the Spaniards, followed a grid pattern, with parks and plazas built into the original design. Except to the north,

———
356 Claudia Patricia Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community, Guadalajara, Mexico, 1791-1842” (M.A. Thesis, Florida State University, 2005), 121-152.
few natural obstacles limited the city’s expansion, and therefore, as it expanded during the
colonial era and into the nineteenth century, parks, gardens and wooded lots were left
behind. Visitors commented favorable on the broad, tree-lined streets, the parks and
gardens.\(^{358}\) Much of the public life centered around the city’s numerous public plazas,
and religious institutions.\(^{359}\) In the heart of the city, there was the central plaza (Plaza
Mayor), known since 1821 as the Plaza de Armas celebrating the military victory of the
insurgent forces over the Spanish. Surrounding this plaza were the major public, civil and
religious buildings. In the east was the *Palacio de la Audiencia Real* (Government
Palace), to the north was the Cathedral, to the south and the west lived the most
distinguished citizens, occasionally in two stories buildings. However, the vast majority
of the houses in the city were one-story buildings, including the wealthiest ones, but the
abundance of space enabled many of the latter to have internal patios, gardens, orchards
and open spaces in the Moorish tradition.

Also located around the Plaza were the *Portales*. The portales were “open-air”
arches in which merchants lived on the second floor and had their businesses on the
ground floor. In some cases, they rented portions of it to artisans or smaller merchants,
who would lock their goods up in “cantons” (boxes) over night. By 1888, there were a
total of fourteen *portales*; the four that formed Plaza de Armas were called Hidalgo,
Morelos, Matamoros, and Flores; the next block also was surrounded by four *portales*
called Washington (yes, named for George Washington, a hero in Mexico), Mina,
Allende, Galeana, and Quintanar or Quemado. The Teatro Degollado and San Juan de
Dios constituted other section of *portales*. According to Villa Gordoa, the most
important businesses of the city were located at the first two sets of portales and “during

---

\(^{358}\) See George F. Lyon, *Journey of a Residence and Tour of the Republic of Mexico in
the year 1826* (London: John Murry, 1828), vol. 2.

\(^{359}\) In 1821, the city boasted of one *catedral*, three neighborhood churches, five parish
churches, seven monasteries and seven nunneries. The Church ran two educational
institutions for girls and young women, and two *seminarios* for boys and young men, and
one *seminario* for ordained priests. The Jesuit University of St. Thomas Aquinas had
been secularized in 1767 with the expulsion of that order, and was the Real Universidad
de Guadalajara until 1821, and a state public university afterwards.
night they were illuminated.” Later, departmental stores founded by French merchants were located there – *Las Fábricas de Francia* (1876), *La Ciudad de México* (1880), and *El Nuevo Mundo* (1886).

In 1790, Guadalajara municipal government reorganized the city based on a spatial organization called *cuarteles*, similar to wards as they would be called in U.S. cities. This system divided the city in sections to allow for better police control over the population. One of the basic steps in the new regulations was to officially name the streets and plazas, and to number the houses on each street. Also, for each cuartel, the authorities named a *juez mayor* (judge of peace) and for each neighborhood in the cuartel a *alcalde menor de barrio* (selectman of neighborhood) was named to “ease the administration of justice.” Their functions were to patrol their portion of the city, intervening in public disturbances such as drunkenness, family fights, etc. In terms of the welfare of the community, they were to guarantee “the presence of a least one physician, one barber, one midwife, and one pharmacist” in their jurisdiction. Also, they were responsible for the welfare of orphans, widows, and beggars. Sometimes, male orphans of working age were assigned to a master to learn an *oficio* (skill). In the case of beggars, some were sent to jail to work on public works.

In 1809, during the beginnings of the unrest that would lead to the Independence movement, the Spanish authorities modified the cuartel division system, subdividing the original fourteen cuarteles into twenty four. By narrowing the administrative
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360 José Villa Gordoa, *Guía y album de Guadalajara para los viajeros. Apuntes sobre la historia de la ciudad, su situación, clima, aspecto, habitantes, edificios, etc.* (Guadalajara, Mexico: Tip. José M. Yguíniz, 1888), 42.


362 AHG, CS 1/1791, Paquete 11, legajo 6. There is not an exact translation into English of the word *cuartel*. The word cuartel in Spanish has a military connotation, meaning the center of operations. It was used throughout New Spain as an urban administrative unit.

363 AHMG, CS 1/1791, Paquete 11, legajo 6, and Gálvez Ruiz, *La conciencia regional*, 129.

364 Ibid., 130.
jurisdictions, the city authorities hoped to have even closer control over the population.\footnote{According to Rodney Anderson, driving this change was the French invasion of Spain in 1808 that increased the fear of Spanish authorities of a Creole rebellion; “Guadalajara in 1821: Origins of the Cuartel System,” in \textit{Guadalajara Censuses Project} vol. 1, CD-ROM, 2007.} The new cuartel system divided the city north and south, and east and west, by the same divisions as before—the Avenida Aduana (today, Pedro Loza to the north and Colón to the south) and Río de San Juan de Dios (Today Avenida Independencia).\footnote{Ibid.} Limiting the expansion of Guadalajara to the north and northeast was the ravine of the Río Grande de Santiago; thus the city grew naturally towards the other cardinal points. In the late eighteenth century, the indigenous villages of Mexicalzingo and Analco—located in the southwest and south respectively—had been incorporated into the city, and in 1821, they were declared official city neighborhoods (barrios).\footnote{Eric Van Young, \textit{Hacienda and Market in Eighteenth-century Mexico. The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675-1821} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 32.} Sometime between the census of 1824 and the census of 1838, the city was re-combined into ten cuarteles, a division that was maintained on into the twentieth century (Figure 5.1 and 5.2).\footnote{Jaime Olveda, “Segunda parte 1768-1910. La transformación urbana. La modernización urbana,” in \textit{El crecimiento urbano de Guadalajara} (Guadalajara, Mexico: El Colegio de Jalisco: CONACYT: Ayuntamiento de Guadalajara, 1995), 157.} To the benefit of historians, however, the same divisions north/south and east/west were maintained, to permit easy comparison. For example, cuarteles 13, 14, 15 of the old system were now cuartel 6 in the new.

The water supply has been a constant problem for Guadalajara since its foundation. In 1821, there were thirteen public fountains (seven located in plazas and six on religious property), plus two public springs located in the indigenous barrios of Analco and Mexicalzingo. A few springs were also located in private residences to the west and unavailable to the public. Especially during the dry season (March to June), at least three of the wells were prone to go dry, leaving long walks for many of the city’s
poor. The situation was not improved until the introduction of piped water in 1885, but even then, the water was insufficient to provide running water within all the city residences. Thirty-nine fountains and fifty-five hydrants were needed throughout the city to satisfy all its residents’ needs.

The project of paving the city’s streets began in 1791 in order to facilitate the internal traffic and for sanitary reasons. By 1802, three-quarter parts of the city’s streets were paved with cobbledes, a total of 170 square kilometers, including extensive areas of the indigenous neighborhoods. Around the city there were smaller plazas with the same layout which functioned as the center of neighborhood religious and public life. In 1821, Guadalajara counted fourteen plazas, most of them identified with a barrio (neighborhood). In 1888, seven additional plazas were added. Usually adjacent to the plaza were a Catholic parish or neighborhood church, and a public market. The experience of living in a barrio, however, was more than a geographical occurrence; it also implied a social dimension. Around each plaza, Guadalajara’s residents carried out their social and economic life. What is difficult to document are the associations and social relations among families and neighbors that create “neighborhoods” out of urban space, allowing the development of an urban identity related to a specific barrio. What is known is that those same plazas and plazuelas continued being the center of the social life of the neighborhoods throughout the century.
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369 Rodney Anderson, “Guadalajara in 1821.”

370 Villa Gordoa, Guía y album, 42.

371 Gálvez Ruiz, La conciencia regional, 134-137. The Merchant Consulate of Guadalajara and the Church paid for the pavement of the poorest barrios.

372 Joaquín Romo, Guadalajara. Apuntes históricos, biográficos, estadísticos y descriptivos de la capital del estado de Jalisco, desde su fundación por el conquistador Nuño Beltrán de Guzmán hasta nuestros días (México: I. Paz, 1888), 162.


374 Villa Gordoa, Guía y album de Guadalajara, 41.
The desamortización law of 1856 and the 1859 nationalization of ecclesiastic property, had an impact on property ownership in Guadalajara. The church was the major owner of urban property, and therefore, after the enforcement of the desamortización law, it was forced to sell the property it usually rented. The law stipulated that the tenant might have the opportunity to buy the property, but few artisans could afford it. However, what is not clear is just what impact this had on the city’s artisans. It is known that there were significant transfers of property during that era, and that rich merchants and industrialists bought the former church property. Nonetheless, it is likely that they continued to rent out the property. According to geographic historian, Dolores Bra, in 1889 only two percent of Guadalajara’s residents owned the place in which they lived, meaning that the vast majority of the city’s population paid rent, including, one would think, many if not most of the city’s artisans. Nevertheless, as shall be discussed shortly, artisans appear not to have been pushed out of the city’s traditional neighborhoods, not, at least, during the period of this study.

The city’s nineteenth century expansion followed essentially the same lines from colonial times, particularly to the west, but also many new migrants filling up the blocks of cuarteles 8 and 9, across the Río San Juan de Dios. However, the last quarter of nineteenth century witnessed the biggest transformations. Telegraph (1868), trolleys (1878), telephone (1884), electricity (1884), sewage and piped water (1885) were some of the innovations that were introduced in the city.

Of all the innovations and transformations of Guadalajara in that last quarter of the nineteenth century, potentially the most important were those affecting transportation.
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375 José Palomar, Manuel de Jesús Olasagarre, Jesús Ascencio and Manuel Luna bought or through unpaid loans eventually became owners of many urban properties in 1850s. Olveda, “Segunda parte 1768-1910. La transformación urbana. La modernización urbana,” 155.


377 Villa Gordo, Guía y álbum de Guadalajara, 17.

378 Ibid., 45, 46-53, 55.
In Mexico City, the initiation of mule-driven tramways and, then, the railroad as early as 1857, allowed wealthier families to reside in the popular western suburbs around the Paseo de la Reforma and beyond, in essence providing the convenience of less congested living while retaining access to the heart of the city. Historian John Lear sees that city’s transportation networks (electrified by 1886) as “fundamental…reorganization of space in the city, allowing for different neighborhoods to specialize in function and class.”

To what extent was that the case for Guadalajara as well?

First of all, the tramways as well as the railroad arrived much later in Guadalajara—the mule-driven tramways first installed in the city in 1878, and the railroad arrived a decade later in 1888. By 1881, the tramway lines connected Mexicalzingo and San Pedro Tlaquepaque, by 1888 (map 5.1), diverse tramway lines crisscrossed the city, and reached also to Los Colomos, Atemajac, and Zapopan, and even crossed the great Atemajac arroyo to the village of Mezquitán, totaling 42 kilometers of track. The first electric trolley, the Compañía de Tranvías, Luz y Fuerza, did not begin operating until September 1907. By 1918, they were 110 street cars covering a total of 96 kilometers in Guadalajara and surroundings pueblos.

What was the impact of the tramway system, and the railroad? First, like Mexico City, the lines ran more in the center/west of the city, rather than the more rapidly expanding eastern districts eight and nine. They ran, in essence, where the paying passengers were, and like Mexico City, even the second class fare was more than most artisans could afford on a regular basis. But arriving later than Mexico City, the transportation transformations appear to have had less of an impact, at least during the era
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380 Manuel Caballero, *Fiestas inaguarales del ferrocarril a Guadalajara* (Guadalajara: Imprenta del Diario de Jalisco de Rafael León, 1888), 8.


383 Lear, “México City. Space and Class,” 466-467; Morris, “The Tramways of Guadalajara.”
under study. As we shall see, although some masters clearly took advantage of the tramways to live away from their work, most masters and journeymen appear to live in traditional barrios, near their work. And the barrios remained a combination of residences, shops and commerce, in the traditional patterns even as the modernization of their city took place.

Figure 5.1, Map of Guadalajara’s Tramways Lines, 1888
Population Growth and Density

Table 5.1 shows the increase in population and population density between 1863 and 1888. Leaving out cuartel ten (essentially a rural appendage to the city), the city grew by 16.7 percent during those twenty-five years, from an estimated official 45,947 in 1863 to a pro-rated 53,603 in 1888, a fairly modest pace.\textsuperscript{384} Even if the population figures undercount the actual population (and that is likely), it is reasonable to assume that they undercounted in much the same portion. While the population outpaced the number of city blocks (16.7 percent to 4.2 percent), the density only grew from 59 persons per block to 66 per block. The fastest growing district, cuartel 7, nearly doubled but the density was barely over the city-wide average. Cuartel 8 and 9 east of the Río San Juan de Dios were the second fastest growing areas of the city (22.3 percent), but their portion of the city’s population barely budged (from 24.6 percent to 25.8 percent), and their density was still well under one hundred per block. Four districts actually experience a decline in density, either because they lost population (districts one, two and four), or because they built outwards, absorbing undeveloped or underdeveloped land. Comparing map 5.2 with 5.3 will give a good idea of how the city grew. The density per hectare (43.5) or acre (23.2) confirms the overall modest population density. Even by increasing the estimated population by twenty percent still leaves the density well below one hundred per block, a still modest figure. Essentially, the city had room to grow outward, and it did.

\textsuperscript{384} Mexico City grew an estimated 43.5 percent from 1869 to 1895. Lear, “Mexico City. Space and Class,” table 1, p. 464. The pro-rated estimate for 1888 is because the population manuscript for cuartel five is missing. The estimate of 6,500 is a conservative estimate based on halving the city’s population increase. Officially the city encompassed 934.2 hectares (around 2,308 acres).
Table 5.1 Cuarteles by Number of Blocks and Population Density 1868-1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuartel</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of Blocks</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of Blocks</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>6,166</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>5,821</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>9,348</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,029</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8,102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,947</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>53,431</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the exponential growth of the city would begin in 1898, when the city introduced the *colonia* concept of urban planning, already introduced into Mexico City. Patterned after the U.S. suburb concept then taking hold in North American cities, the colonia was a sociologically segregated urban development that changed the traditional way that Guadalajara had grown up to that time. Essentially, the term described neighborhoods that were developed for middle and high classes only (except for their servants, of course), where the use of the urban space became exclusively residential. Initially, the colonies attracted foreign residents who wished to live in
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386 AHJ. Ramo de Estadística, Clasificado, Año 1888, ES-4-888, Caja 121, No. 1381, 426f. Population figure for cuartel 5 is not available, population was estimated based on the rate of the population increase from 1868 to 1888 minus cuartel 5 from 1868 (20.6 percent). Number of blocks came from the "Plano de la Ciudad de Guadalajara" in Villa Gordoa, *Guía y albúm*, s/p.

387 Lear, “Mexico City. Space and Class,” 468-470.

388 Brandis García and Mas Hernández, “Propiedad inmobiliaria y morfología urbana: Guadalajara en los inicios del siglo XX,” 15.
relatively segregated barrios in the western part of the city. As a gesture, the city planned a colonia aimed popular classes. The land is near Mezquitán, and fronting on the municipal cemetery, located specifically because the location lowered the value of the land making it “appropriate” for the lower classes. That area is still called “artesanos” today. In a short period, from 1898 to 1908, Guadalajara expanded 45 percent its territorial extension by adding thirteen colonias. The impact, however, of the colonia development is essentially outside the scope of this study but, without a doubt, it changed the nature of Guadalajara’s urban life.

The Cuarteles

Although there are several exceptions, the city’s cuartel divisions were, for the most part, administrative divisions rather than identifiable neighborhoods. Cuarteles seven and eight are the exceptions, although not entirely. Cuartel seven is made up of the indigenous pueblo of Mexicalzingo, which can be seen on map 5.2 as those blocks south of the Arenal (a ravine) and west of the Río de San Juan de Dios, at that time connected to the city by a bridge to the north. It had its own parish church, its own water supply and a long history of independence. That nearly everyone in the village had been born in the village (or at least Guadalajara) in a city with twenty-five percent migrant is certainly significant. However, the blocks to the north of the Arenal were never part of Mexicalzingo, and those closest to cuartel six and cuartel one were upscale neighborhoods, that had been more than three-quarter Spanish in 1821.


390 Adding a total of 434.7 hectares (1,074 acres). Ibid., 3

391 The village founders were “Mexicanos,” i.e. Mexico or Aztecs who came west with the Spanish Viceroy’s army in 1541 to help put down the indigenous uprising called the Mixtón War, and were rewarded by a grant of land. As late as 1821, two-thirds of the population were called “Spanish” by the census taker, but an analysis of their surnames reveal pattern more similar to the city’s large Indian population than it was to Spanish surnames.
Cuartel eight roughly comprised the indigenous village of Analco, founded by Franciscans who re-settled Cocas and Tecuexes from further west and north. Due to unhealthy conditions, the Franciscans moved across the Río San Juan de Dios but the Indians stayed. Analco became part of the city during the mid-seventeenth century.\footnote{Hélène Rivière D’Arc, “Las fases del crecimiento y del desarrollo de Guadalajara y de su región durante la colonización,” in Lecturas históricas de Jalisco. Antes de la Independencia, ed. José María Murià, Jaime Olveda, and Alma Dorantes (Mexico: Unidad Editorial del Estado de Jalisco, 1981), 162. Olveda, “Segunda parte 1768-1910. La transformación urbana. La modernización urbana,” 113.} They remained self-consciously Indian, and had numerous disagreements with the city authorities.\footnote{Ibid., 146.} Only 31.1 percent were labeled Spanish in 1821.\footnote{Ibid., 146.} The bridge San Juan de Dios connected it to the rest of the city, crossing the river of the same name. They had their own parish, San Sebastián de Analco, as well as a neighborhood church, San José de Analco. Although only 1.7 percent of the artisan shops were located there in 1880, the district, in fact, was noted for its leather craftsmanship and its reboceros. By 1888, its population surging, the district had more artisans (25.9 percent) than any other district for which there are data.

To the north of district 8, district 9 looked quite a bit different. Although cuartel nine had the San Juan market \textit{portales} and the venerable monastery, San Juan de Dios, as the center of its neighborhood, and also housed the city’s famous orphanage (Hospicio Cabañas), and was the site of one of two bullfight plazas that existed in the city by 1888, but the fact was that it was the first stop of a large migrant population from the north and west. And then, as now, except in the blocks around San Juan de Dios, it was essentially a working class population, including a large artisan population, particularly \textit{reboceros}.

Across the river from cuarteles eight and nine was cuartel 1, the administrative and commercial center of the city, as map 5.4 clearly shows. However, note that it also included 42.3 percent of the city’s artisan shops, although how many artisans lived there is not known. The \textit{Plaza de Armas} was the center of the activities of this district. This plaza was where \textit{gente decente} (“decent people”) promenaded every Sunday after they...
attended mass. The tapatía elite enjoyed this activity with their family as one of the few public entertainments of the era.\textsuperscript{395}

To the north of cuartel one, lay cuartel two, in many ways the religious center of the town just as cuartel one is the administrative center. Besides the Cathedral and the Parish Church, Sagrario, the neighborhood church, Nuestra Señora de Soledad, and the convent Santa María de Gracia, district two held the Episcopal Palace, and the Seminary College. Many of Guadalajara’s popular religious festivities were held in this district and, in the 1840s, many priests and bishops lived on the main street of this barrio, giving it the name of “calle de los obispos” (bishop’s street).\textsuperscript{396} But after the Reform and the desarmotización law, only fourteen clerics (sacerdotes) were recorded in cuartel two. It also had a large number of construction trade shops and artisan shops, particularly situated in the northeast of the district.

The parish of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (Our Lady of Guadalupe) forms the district three. Guadalupe, district three, in 1821 had a high portion migrants and a high concentration of multiple family household arrangements, suggesting that new immigrants arrived to live with relatives or friends who served as a social network. The census of 1880 shows few artisan shops in cuartel three, but a fair number of petty services and trades, as one might expect from a low status district, with large numbers of migrants. In this same district, Bishop Friar Antonio Alcalde constructed the Royal Hospital of San Miguel (Belén) to serve the urban poor who in general went there to pass away. The remote location of the hospital was not a coincidence; hospitals in that time were very unsanitary places that did little to improve people’s health.\textsuperscript{397}

District four was another district with heavy religious presence, including at least eight religious buildings. They were the Colegio de San Diego, the church of Santa Monica, the Capuchín Convent, the monastery of Our Lady of Mercy (La Merced), and the Convent of Jesús María (Dominican). Even though Jesús district had a significant

\textsuperscript{395} Tapatío/tapatía is an expression which refers to a native from Guadalajara.


\textsuperscript{397} Ibid.
number of clergy and professionals living near the barrio principal plaza, the rest of the
district housed an extensive number of common people. In 1888, although the 1880
business census listed only 3.7 percent of the city’s artisan shops, it housed nearly a
quarter (22.4 percent) of all artisans recorded in the census of 1888. Especially common
were shawl weavers, masons, shoemakers and carpenters.

District five was a major commercial district of the city, and in the census of
1848, the most populous, as it had been in 1842 (there are no data for 1888).
In 1842 more artisans lived in the district than in any other for which we have data (23.3
percent), including large numbers of shoemakers, tailors, shawl weavers, etc. And in
1880, more craft shops than any other district but one, but also large numbers of all other
categories except transportation. Notably, by 1888 the tramways would bisect the district
both north and south, and east to west, encompassing some 60 blocks where the vast
majority of the businesses were located. Note that the district extended westward farther
than any other, with the 1888 map noting at its western extreme “camino para pueblitos,”
meaning that it was the major western road to the villages beyond. In addition to
commerce and crafts, the important buildings that this district encompassed were the
Royal and Literary University of Guadalajara, Santa Teresa church and Nuestra Señora
del Pilar church. One thing that made this district attractive to the rich was the
availability of water, as private springs were common.

Cuartel six was also popular with the wealthier families of the city. Notably, it
contained nearly ten percent of the city’s artisan shops (forth among the nine districts),
but fewer artisans living there than any of the recorded districts. Rent no doubt was
higher in the district than elsewhere—it also had private water sources, and probably
better served by the tramway than any other district. It also was the site of the city’s
penitentiary, although sufficiently remote as not to be terribly unsightly.
Figure 5.2, Map of Guadalajara by Cuartel Division, 1842

---

Figure 5.3, Map of Guadalajara by Cuartel Division, 1888

Domingo Torres García, “Plano de la Ciudad de Guadalajara 1888,” in Villa Gordo, Guía y álbum de Guadalajara.
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Table 5.2, Population by Cuartel, 1838-1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuarteles</th>
<th>1838-42&lt;sup&gt;400&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1848&lt;sup&gt;401&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1868&lt;sup&gt;402&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1888&lt;sup&gt;403&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>3,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>6,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>5,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>7,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>5,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>9,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>7,029</td>
<td>8,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>4,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,549</td>
<td>34,220</td>
<td>45,947</td>
<td>53,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Barrios

While work on the artisan family is abundant and well known, scarcer is our knowledge of where the artisan lived within the city. To what extent was the neighborhood (the barrio) a significant aspect of artisan culture? First of all, did artisans tend to congregate in the same neighborhoods? If so, was the location chosen more for nearness to their customers or their workshop, or for some social aspect of the craft community, or for none of these reasons? Within the city, which crafts tended to concentrate in which districts and barrios? And within the trades, did journeymen live in any proximity to their masters? Research on Latin American urban space is relatively

<sup>400</sup> Population data for cuarteles 1, 2, 3 and 4 are unavailable. Figures represent 1848. Data for 5, 6, and 7 came from 1842. Data for cuarteles 8 and 9 came from the census 1838.

<sup>401</sup> Guadalajara, mayo 15 de 1848, Juan Ramón Solís. Estadística de la municipalidad de Guadalajara, página 69, legajo 245, Secretaría del Ayuntamiento.

<sup>402</sup> AHJ, ES-4-869, JAL/65, páginas 39-41, 1361 expediente. "Cuadro Estadístico de la Población de la Ciudad de Guadalajara."

<sup>403</sup> AHJ, Ramo de Estadística, Clasificado, Año 1888, ES-4-888, Caja 121, No.1381, 426f. Population figure for cuartel 5 is not available, population was estimated based on the rate of the population increase from 1868 to 1888 minus cuartel 5 from 1868 (20.6 percent).
I believe that a close analysis of the distribution and use of urban space can disclose a pattern of a craft community that the data on the family and household suggests did exist.

**Location Quotient.**

First, I will look at where the various craftsmen tended to live, and second, how that compared to the location of the city’s artisan shops. To do this I will use an index called the “location quotient” used in my previous study to compare changes over time. (Please refer to tables 5.5 and 5.6 for an accurate impression of location concentration; tables 5.3 and 5.4 are included for reference to absolute numbers.) The selected districts are those that provided occupation information. Thankfully, 6, 7, 8, 9 are available for both comparisons. Cuartel five is available for 1838-42, and cuartel 2 and 4 for 1888. 1 is

---


405 The calculation is as follow: the percentage of a specific trade in a district compared to the total number of that trade in the city is divided by the total percentage of the working population (selected for the chart) in the same district compared to the total in the city. The meaning is that if the location quotient equals 1, the distribution of that occupation in the district is the same as the distribution of the working population in the city. If the value is greater than 1, it signifies that there was a concentration of that occupation in that particular district. If the value is less than 1, means that that occupation was less concentrated in that particular district than in the city as a whole. For instance, in 1838-42, there were 24 bakers in cuartel five, which represented 28.6 percent of all bakers in the city divided by 27.3 percent, which represented the percentage of the working population in the same cuartel (1,706 workers), equals to 1.05 location quotient. (28.6/27.3=1.05).
missing, unfortunately, for both years. It was the heart of the older, city central, and housed many merchants’ shops and homes, as well as the better off artisan shops (see map 5.4, 1880). However, districts five and six are a good surrogate for upscale shops and homes. Notice that merchants were concentrated in district five more than any other district, except district one. Also, in both 1821 and 1842, the highest concentration of those titles (*hidalgua*) is found in the eastern blocks of both districts. In the literacy question that accompanied the 1842 census, district six was the highest in the city followed by district five, of the districts for which there is data.

In 1888, district two and six will stand for the better-off districts. Districts eight and nine, on the other side of Río San Juan de Dios (paved over later in the century and now Calzada Independencia del Norte), were then, as now, home for the city’s poor, cheap boarding houses and the first stop for many migrants. Cuartel 7 has few migrants and many poorer craftsmen; however, the blocks above the ravine that can be seen in both maps but partially filled in for 1888, were homes of better off craftsmen. (Appendices Z and AA: Table 5.3 Distribution of Male Workers by Cuartel 1838-1850 and Table 5.4 Distribution of Male Workers by Cuartel, 1888.)

In 1838-42, those crafts that depended primarily on wealthier customers (barbers, silversmiths, wax chandlers, and tailors) generally followed their patrons to districts 5 and/or cuartel 6. But so did bakers, blacksmiths, carpenter/wheelwrights, hatters, even masons and shoemakers, even though the latter two were among the lowest status crafts in the city. In part, what is operating is the nature of the measurement. District six has fewer artisans than any but district four, which tends to emphasize those who do live there. However, what also is operating is the fact that for those craftsmen who could afford the rent, living among the city’s wealthier classes was good for business and for one’s social image. As proof of this, in cuartel six, the portion of those earning the don for nearly every crafts was at least double that of their overall city average. For example, a quarter of all tailors in the city earned the don; 53.4 percent of those living in cuartel six did. For carpenters, it was 35.3 percent verses 14.2 percent city-wide. Even one of the three day laborers living in the district was called don.\textsuperscript{406} And, of those artisans not so

\textsuperscript{406} The same holds true for the ability to read, although not as dramatically. Silversmiths, 83.3 percent could read; painters, 80.0 percent; tailors, 78.7 percent; barbers, 76.9
honored, many lived on the western outskirts of both districts, or in the case of district five, the northern streets as well, where rents were cheaper. So for both districts, the old principle that “craft follows customers” seems to be true.

Meanwhile, for every craft listed on table 5.4 except the barbers, their first or second (or both) highest concentration in 1838-42 were either districts 7, 8, or 9. For blacksmiths, carpenter/wheelwrights, stonemasons, hatters, leather craftsmen, shoemakers, hand weavers, even wax chandlers and silversmiths, one of the three was their highest concentration in the city. For some, such as the leather workers and the blacksmiths, their business were traditionally on the margins because of the noise, the smell or the need for greater space, or in the case of the stone masons, to be nearer to the materials which they worked. But for others, such as the shoemakers, the masons, the hatters, the hand weavers, and no doubt poorer tailors, shawl makers and others, either the cheaper rents or the presence of a greater concentration of customers, if poorer ones, were the motivating factors. District seven (Mexicalzingo) is a different situation, at least for those that lived south of the raven that once separated the city from the ancient village of Mexicalzingo, settled by Mexica Indians from central Mexico who had accompanied the Spanish armies to put down the western Indian revolt of 1541. There, long family traditions had created deep-rooted barrios. (Appendix AB: Table 5.5 Location of Quotients of the cuarteles by Crafts, 1838-1850.)

By 1888, the concentration of the craft residences had changed dramatically. Artisans no longer flocked to cuartel 6; the portion of artisan population living there relative to the total of all male employed persons had declined from 29.0 percent in 1842 to a 18.1 percent in 1888, and no craft except the high status silversmiths had a positive (greater than 1) score. Notice that merchants relatively evenly distributed throughout the city, in good part because the socially high status attached to the term “comerciante,” had been watered down by the presence of a large, sometimes itinerant, body of lower status merchants who sold what they could to make a living. However, the landowners had the highest concentration anywhere, of any listed occupation, clearly signifying that district

percent; carpenter/wheelwrights, 63.3 percent. By the way, 100 percent of the five seamstresses could read in cuartel six—55.1 percent city-wide, on the high average for any craft.
six was where absentee landowners, hacienda owners and larger ranchers had their “city” home.

By appearances, then, one might say that district six had become “gentrified,” using a modern-day term. Nearly half the counted lawyers live there, over a third of the empleados (high level clerks), half the doctors, most of the teachers, half the servants, etc. Yet, if we look at the individual crafts, another story emerges from the data. The great decline in the presence of artisans in district six were among those already unlikely to locate there. Of the craftsmen, whose percentage is less than the percentage of all artisans in district six (relative to all counted artisans for 1888), only the bakers had a positive score in 1838-50. The rest—leather craftsmen, stonemasons, shawl weavers, tinsmiths, candle makers, hand weavers—were all negative in 1838-50 to begin with. And because most except the tinsmiths were very numerous craftsmen in the city overall, they account for the decline in artisans of district six relative to all employed persons (.0.72 to 0.48). For all other craftsmen, their percentages were higher—that is, they were more likely to live in district six relative to their numbers city-wide, than were all artisans likely to live in the district relative to all employed persons. For example, 11.7 percent of all barbers and 11.5 percent of all blacksmiths were likely to live in district six compared to the portion of all artisans (6.8 percent). And as improbable as it seems, hatters and masons, actually improved their quotient from 1838-50. In other words, those factors that encouraged those craftsmen with positive readings in 1838-50 likely still played a role in their housing motives in 1888. And those that were going out the door in the earlier period completed their exit. The district saw an increase in population of some 30 percent since 1842, and certainly many were the city’s “gentry.” But neither were all craftsmen eased out to cheaper, if poorer, accommodations elsewhere. The residential segregation, if it was to come, must have come later than 1888. (Appendix AC: Table 5.6 Location of Quotients of the Cuarteles by Crafts, 1888.)

In looking at the portion of listed artisans to total employed persons in each cuartel, only in district four did the listed artisans make up more than a majority of employed persons (tables 5.2 and 5.3), up from 46.4 percent in 1850. District nine is close at 48.8 percent (down slightly from 52.0 percent in 1838). The big drop, of course, was in district six (28.9 percent to 18.1 percent), while cuarteles seven and eight
actually lost ground (from, combined, 45.0 percent to 35.6 percent in 1888), although, of course, the actual number of artisans nearly doubled. The reason, clearly, is that the population of those two districts more than doubled, well above the average for the city during those years (56.5 percent).

Cuartel nine’s population also doubled, but the ratio of artisan jobs to the total remained about the same (48.8 percent, down only slight from 52.0 percent). Essentially its craft jobs kept pace with other type jobs, particularly among masons, carpenters, leather workers, shoemakers and shawl weavers. But the number of tailors tripled, and the number of barbers quadrupled, although up only a little over a quarter city-wide. The reason may be that cuartel nine, with its great room for expansion to the northeast and east, and its tradition of cheap accommodations aimed at the large migrant population, was by 1888 also attracting artisans from other districts of the city, as well as its traditional migrants. The formal number of blocks did not increase but one can see from comparing the two maps (5.2 and 5.3) that many of those blocks had certainly “filled out” since the 1840s.

Of the twenty-one listed crafts, ten had the highest concentration in either District 7, 8 or 9, and ten crafts had their second highest there (blacksmiths, leather workers, tinsmiths, candles/match makers and weavers had both their highest and second highest concentrations there). As mentioned, of those three districts, districts eight and nine still retained their reputation of the first stop for migrants, and the highest concentrations of cheap boarding houses.

In short, the crafts themselves that had been relatively evenly distributed throughout the city in 1838-42 saw their concentrations increase in districts 7, 8, 9, and four (the latter also one of the poorer districts, on the city’s northwest corner). They declined in district six, but even there, the realignment was only relative, affecting certain crafts and not others. Interestingly, although we have no data for cuartel two in 1838-50, in 1888 it had a modest artisan population, but one that more or less stayed at the city average of craft to non-craft jobs, suggesting that in the traditional city-center, the crafts were holding their own. And, overall, the crafts retained about their same portion of the population, down only slightly from the 40.0 percent of all employed persons in 1838-50 to 37.4 percent in 1888. So, although clearly there had been some realignment of
population but without migration statistics it is impossible to say if the realignment was
due to migration, or represented a broader movement within the city itself. Later in the
chapter, the issue of where artisans live relative to where the shops are located hopefully
will shed some light on this question.

Production Location

In my previous study, I introduced Gideon Sjoberg’s theory on the nature of pre-
industrial cities.\(^{407}\) The city center of pre-industrial cities, Sjoberg maintained,
contained the “hub of the governmental and religious activity more than of commercial
ventures,” while the working classes lived on the city’s margins.\(^{408}\) This did not prove
to be the case for late colonial Guadalajara. Although the administrative and religious
functions were concentrated in the city, commercial and productive activities were
scattered throughout, although not randomly, with significant differences seen between
the crafts. No division existed between residential areas and manufacturing areas, as
one might expect to find in modern urban centers.

So what do tables 5.7 and 5.8 say about 1880, several generations later. On the
surface the shops appear to be located based on their customers—that is cuartel 2, 5, and
6 were positive—more likely to be located there than the other categories, and cuartel 4
on the cusp, no more or no less. Cuartel 6 neutrality may reflect its popularity as a
residence, compared to a place to locate artisan shops. All the cuarteles with a positive
better than one were relative better off than the poorer cuarteles—3, 4, 7, 8, 9. Cuartel 8
was particularly negative, no doubt reflecting its lack of purchasing power. But there is
another pattern within a pattern that stands out, although not from the data presented
here. (Appendices AD and AE: Table 5.7, Number of Artisans Shops by Cuartel, 1880
and Table 5.8, Location of Quotients by Industry and Cuartel, 1880.)

Almost every type of artisan shop tended to be located near a shop of the same
craft (and of course, often other crafts as well). If one looks at barbershops, for


\(^{408}\) Gideon Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City. Past and Present* (New York: The Free
example, and this was the first one to draw my attention, the most positive location was in cuartel 5 (1.82); nine of the 33 barbershops in the city were located there. I assumed that they would be located in the better off blocks in the south-eastern part of the district and that turned out to be the case—the most western blocks were blocks 31 and 34, only six blocks from Avenida Aduana, its eastern border. But what also stood out is that five of the nine were located on the same blocks as another barbershop; in fact three were on the same block and one was located in the next block. They were clearly not seeking to gain a competitive advantage by locating away from their competitors! And that pattern held true throughout the city; of the twenty-seven barbershop, sixteen were located with at least one other barbershop in the same block, and six more were within one or two blocks of each other. Of the three on the same block, Félix Provincia was located just down the street in the same cuadra from Tranquilino Aranda’s shop; the third shop owned by Matías Leiva was located just around the corner. Of the four barbershops that appeared to not be located near one another, two were located on block one cuarteles two and five (actually across the street from each other), one on block three of cuartel five, and one on block 6—all actually located on the same street, Av. Aduana, the dividing street each and west, and one with considerable commercial activities (and all on a tramline). Indeed, of the shops in cuartel nine, most were located either on the tramway line, or next to a church, possibility of customers may have played a role. But also, I believe, so do more obscure reasons that have to do with how the city’s crafts responded to the pressures and changes brought on by the nineteenth century. Whatever the reasons, the tendency to cluster together seems to be the norm by 1880. Take, for example, the silversmiths (makers and sellers of jewelry) and relojeros (“watchmakers,” but really watch sellers and repairers, a new craft).

In Guadalajara in 1880, there were twelve silversmith shops and ten relojeros. The silversmiths were more heavily located in cuarteles one, two, three and five, relative to the number of other shops located in each district. Of the twelve, only two were actually located on the same block (block 1, cuartel 5). But in fact, most were located in the vicinity of both silversmiths and relojero shops. For example, side by side with silversmith Manuel Hurtado’s shop in block one, cuartel five, was Sabino Aguilar’s relojería. Both faced Av. Aduana, facing cuartel one. Two doors down the street were
silversmith Ambrosio Lugan shop and, next door, relojero Amado del Muro’s shop. Silversmith and relojero, side by side, immediately suggesting a more than symbolic relationship between the two. Directly across the street (block 1, cuartel one) were two jewelers and cattycornered from them (block thirteen, cuartel one) were two more jewelers. Two blocks down the street (in cuartel six) from our cuartel five shops were two other jewelers, and across the street from them (in cuartel one) was another silversmith. Of the other three silversmiths in cuartel one, all were located in contiguous blocks (numbers 26, 38, 41), and one block away, in cuartel two, was another silversmith shop. So the location quotient needs to be interpreted tentatively, understanding that a cuartel line is an administrative convenience.

Nearly all the other crafts show the same “cluster” effect. Of the more numerous crafts: sixty-five percent of all tailors and shoemakers were located within one block of another colleague (many on the same block). Sixty percent of all rebocero shops and carpenter/wheelwright shops were located within one block or the same block as another shop.

They, of course, were quite numerous, which makes more likely that they would be located near each other. But if one looks at the thirteen talabateros leather craft shops, of the eight in cuartel one, six were located on block apart from each other, all in a line. Of the two in cuartel two, both were one block from their counterpart in cuartel one (and two block from another). The two leather shops in cuartel five were around the corner from each other in block twelve and thirteen. Of the four print shops, three were located within a block or two each other in cuartel one, and the other some six blocks away in cuartel five. Of the thirteen hatter shops, four in cuarteles one and two were located within a block or so of each other. Four others were located in a line on Avenida Aduana in cuarteles one, five and six. Seven of the thirteen tinsmith shops were within a block or so of another colleague in four different cuarteles. Even a third of the eighteen blacksmith shops were located no more than a block away from each other—all four in cuartel nine had their shops on the same street or one block away.
In fact, of all the listed shops, the only craft whose location was to serve separate neighborhoods were the bakers, as might be expected. They were relatively evenly scattered around the city, despite the appearance of concentration in several cuarteles, and the lack of concentration in others. For example, the location quotient was only
0.50 in cuartel one, even though five shops were located there, because so many other shops were also placed there. There were none located in cuartel eight, however, and only one in cuartel 4, attesting to their remoteness and perhaps their poverty. I doubt that those figures reflect the total lack of bread or baking goods in those districts, however. Private homes would have sold bread and bakery goods on the street.

In conclusion, the tendency for crafts to cluster together may not be a long-held guild tradition. Indeed, the guilds theoretically discouraged the clustering of shops in order to discourage competition. However, whether that described Guadalajara’s artisan shops at the beginning of Independence is not clear, but by 1880 the tendency to cluster is a fact. At this point there is no documentation to explain why that should be. Likely the factors involved were a combination of increasing population density, location near customers, and, as has been seen in the increasing role of household and family, the strategic means by which craftsmen live near their shops (or in them!), and respond to, and develop, a sense of a craft community based on social and kin networks, craft identity and the practical needs of craft cooperation. In essence, the clustering, I believe, is one more example of how artisans responded to the pressures and evolving changes in the nineteenth century. The next issue is do craftsmen themselves live near each other, and do they live near the shops of their trade? (Appendices AD and AE: Table 5.7 Number of Artisans Shops by Cuartel, 1880 and Table 5.8 Location of Quotients by Industry and Cuartel, 1880.)

**Urban Space and Residential Patterns**

Did artisans tend to live near one another, particular those of the same craft, or where they dispersed throughout the city? Were artisan households near the shops of their trade? My earlier work found a surprising tendency of residential proximity for many of the crafts, one that actually increased for most crafts from 1791 through 1842. Having available further data for 1842, and incorporating the business census of 1880 and

---

409 I say theoretically because there is no documentation on the location of artisan shops in the guild era.
the population census of 1888, to what extent did this tendency maintain itself, or change, in the intervening decades.

First, do shop owners and artisans of their craft live close to each other? Lyman Johnson found that Argentine colonial artisans, both masters and journeymen, tended to live near each other.\footnote{Lyman Johnson, \textit{Cities and Society in Colonial Latin America} (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981), p. 228.} In Europe, however, with the coming of the Industrial Revolution, the movement of the masters from artisan neighborhoods was often a sign of a craft undergoing proletarianization, as the master detached themselves from the living quarters and neighborhoods of their journeymen, and, therefore, from their culture.\footnote{Adriana López Monjardín Adriana, “El artesano urbano a mediados del siglo XIX,” in \textit{Organización dela producción y relaciones de trabajo en el siglo XIX en México} (Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1979), 179.} Using data compiled by Adriana López Monjardín, Leal and Woldenberg maintain that in Mexico City by mid-century the masters concentrated in the city’s center while their journeymen had retreated to the city’s outskirts.\footnote{Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, \textit{Del estado liberal a los inicios de la dictadura porfirista}, vol. 2 of \textit{La clase obrera en la historia de Mexico} (Mexico: Siglo XXI/ Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales UNAM, 1980), 143-145.} Although John Lear’s study of Porfriano Mexico City did not distinguish between masters and journeymen, he did maintain that, although artisans were pushed northward from their traditional location in the city center, that during much of the late nineteenth century, the city “maintained its traditional preindustrial mixture of residences, commerce, and trades.”\footnote{Lear, “Mexico City.  Space and Class,” 461.}

To what extent were patterns similar in Guadalajara, at least so far as the period under study? My earlier data through 1821 suggests masters and their journeymen lived side by side. Does this pattern continue through the rest of the 19th century? If so, then...
the pattern may be one more aspect of the maintaining of a craft identity, perhaps strengthened and continued by barrio localism and craft family ties and networks.

In order to examine these questions, I have drawn on a variety of sources. The statistical data comes from city population censuses for 1838 to 1842, a business census of 1880 and a population census for 1888. The technical details of each source have been discussed earlier. It bears repeating, however, that the 1838–42 data are missing four districts (cuarteles one, two, three and four) of the city’s ten cuarteles, comprising of an estimated one third of the city’s population. Fortunately, the available districts represent elite, middling and poor areas of the city, giving a representative if tentative data. The business census of 1880 is an excellent source for the location of shops and businesses, and, in combination with the 1888 census, will serve the discussion of the location of shops and artisan residences. The 1888 population census is far more complete than the 1838–42 data (missing only one of ten districts), but information on occupations was provided for only six of the ten districts. They were dispersed throughout the city, however, and reasonably representative, again, if used tentatively.

In order to determine the residential patterns of a selected group of major artisan occupations, four categories were created from the 1838–42 data: persons who lived next door to someone of the same craft; persons who lived within five households of a person of the same craft; persons who lived within ten households of a person of the same craft; and persons who lived beyond ten households. The categories are arbitrary but useful. The statistics in table 5.9 are a conservative representation of residential proximity.

While the majority of households were houses, many were also living in apartments or boarding houses. Hence, the proximity was even closer than had they been living in a separate house.

Also, the procedure does not indicate persons who lived across the street from a household, unless the census taker crossed the street to take the survey. Further, some census takers moved back and forth, sometimes reversing their route several times. The official taking the census for cuartel eight, for example, methodically went from block one to block nine (west to east), and then reversed his route back and forth as many as six

414 The missing districts made up 30.7% of the city’s population in 1821. It was decided not to include cuartel four from 1850 in the current database.
times, obviously to obtain information on missing households. The database household variable follows the order given in the manuscript. Usually, that order is the order in which they lived, one house or residence next to the other. However, for cuartel eight, for example, in block six, rebocero Pioquinto García is recorded as living beyond ten households from other reboceros. In fact, however, five other reboceros also lived in block six, but were visited at an earlier and a later time, and may well have lived within ten households but was not recorded in our data as such. The point is that the following data are a conservative representation of proximity; it is very likely that the rates of proximity are even higher than are recorded.\(^{415}\) (Appendix AF: Table 5.9 Residential Proximity Among Artisans, 1838-42.)

In 1821, a majority of all artisans of the major crafts except weavers (obrajeros) and shoemakers lived outside the ten household range. Two factors contributed to the latter two crafts exception. One is shear numbers—weavers and shoemakers were the most numerous craftsmen in the city, and therefore most likely of all the crafts to live close to their confederates. The second factor, however, is economics. As perhaps the poorest of crafts (few of either were honored with the hidalguía don or doña), they were concentrated in the poorer districts where cheaper rents were to be had.

Within two decades, however, the average (among our selected crafts) was only 27 percent of all craftsmen lived beyond ten household—primarily blacksmiths, barbers, silversmiths and bakers. However, all crafts except blacksmiths saw a substantial decline in the portion of their trade living beyond ten households. Those crafts with still a majority living beyond ten households were also the four smallest crafts, so numbers surely played a role. However, they were also traditional neighborhood crafts.

But the most dramatic change were the portion of all crafts (except blacksmithing) living within five households—60.4 percent of all measured crafts now lived within five households of each other, and an astonishing 26.9 percent lived next door (or in the next room, if it were a boarding house or similar) to a fellow craftsmen (and 22.0 percent of all

---

\(^{415}\) The procedure used to obtain the data involved a sort of the 1838-42 database by district, occupation and household number. Then each person was place, by hand, in one of the four categories. While it would have been possible to sort the data by block, instead of household number, it was felt that household number was the most consistent variable to use for measuring proximity.
the selected crafts lived in a household headed by an artisan of the same occupation. Carpenters were over three times as likely to live within five households in 1838-42 as they were in 1821; leather craftsmen and tailors over twice as likely. For shoemakers, hand weavers, and shawl weavers, nearly three quarters lived within five households of their fellows. For carpenters and leather workers, that figure was over half, and tailors were not far behind.

What might account for such a dramatic shift in residential patterns? One cannot discount the possibility of error, of course. While the 1821 data included 23 out of 24 districts, the 1838-42 data are more problematic, as noted. However, the numbers (2,068 cases) lend validity to the “sample.” And the trend seems to clearly impact nearly all the crafts, lending some credibility to the figures. The conclusion I reached in the previous study seems to be born out with even better data—that as the guild system declined, “a barrio-based craft community, founded on social and kinship networks and developed both out of craft solidarity and the very real professional needs of each craft, grew up to take its place.”

First of all, other studies of the twentieth century Guadalajara uncovered a modern pattern of neighborhood specialization in particular crafts. Obviously, simply living near each other does not make a craft community of and in itself. The process of making and maintaining a culture is complex and still little known, despite the recent emphasis on cultural history. The statistics are clues that such a process was taking place, but they do not explain the nature of that process, or even give details of how it worked from day to day. Still, the question remains, just what does the 1888 census show about residential proximity?

---

416 Due to an updated database compared to that used in the MA thesis, the 1842 data is both more extensive and more accurate than that used previously.

417 Rivas Jiménez, “Roots of an Artisan Community,” 143.

Craft Residential Patterns in 1888

Unfortunately for a comparison of residential patterns in 1888 with those of 1838-42, the data for the former is restricted to a sample of 464 artisans for seven occupations only, compared to the larger sample of 2068 and eleven occupations. None-the-less, the sample does provide a rough indication of residential patterns, if taken cautiously. Moreover, a full count of all occupations is available for two districts (four and six). (Appendix AG: Table 5.10 Residential Proximity Among Artisans, 1888.)

First, the overall comparison of the residential proximity patterns shows similar trends, if not as dramatic as previously. Nearly 45 percent of all seven sampled artisans lived within five households of a head of a household in the same craft, compared to 60.4% of all the crafts for 1838-42 (Table 5.9) (58.4% if using only the seven crafts from 1838-42 that were used in the 1888 sample.) The overall portion of the crafts living outside ten households grew from just 27.0 percent in 1838-42 to nearly 40 percent in 1888. However, three factors reduce the significance of the difference.

First, the city’s official population had grown from an estimated 42,000 in 1842 to an estimated 53,431 in 1888, and that figure is clearly a large under-count of the actual population. The 1895 federal census far more accurately counted just over one hundred thousand residents. Second, the survey of all residents living in district 4 in 1888 found that nearly 60 percent of all occupied persons (not counting servants) lived either in the same household or next door to someone of the same occupation! Even in prosperous district 6, that figure is 42%. And in both cases, if only artisans were counted, I suspect that the pattern of residential proximity would be even higher.

---

419 For details of how 1888 sample was constructed see footnote 48 in the Introduction.

420 By actual count, 100,199, divided into 45,583 men (45.5%) and 54,616 women (54.5%). The last, most accurate count of the city’s population was in 1821. That year found 15,361 males (44.3%) and 19,306 females (55.7%). Those percentages remained nearly constant throughout the nineteenth century, suggesting that factors other than the slaughter of males during the war for Independence (1810-20), or the political violence of the post Independence years were driving the demographic nature of the city.

421 Anderson, “Guadalajara’s Artisans and Shopkeepers,” 297.
Finally, the tendency among the surveyed occupations in 1888 is very similar to the same craft from 1838-42. The shoemakers and shawl weavers were among the highest crafts living within five households in 1838-42 (75.5 percent and 68.7 percent respectively) as they were in 1888 (59.5 percent and 70.9 percent); indeed, the reboceros were even slightly more likely in 1888 to live close to a craft colleague than earlier. As a neighborhood craft with the technological advantage of the sewing machine introduced in the 1850s, the tailors remained a strong craft, with a similar residential pattern as in the 1840s. At the other end of the scale, the blacksmiths and bakers were among the least likely of the crafts to live close, and among the most likely to live further than ten households. Both were trans-neighborhood crafts that tended to concentrate in the three “outer” districts—seven, eight and nine.

Note, however, that the blacksmiths were a far different craft than the bakers. While both had been relatively unaffected by any significant technological change in their professions, baking was a notoriously “casual” craft, requiring little technical training, attracting the young and the restless (over half of all panaderos found in the 1888 full count were under the age of 30, very similar to the zapateros, another “casual” craft. Blacksmiths were also young—52 percent under thirty years of age in the full 1888 count; both heads and all blacksmiths in our 1888 sample were the youngest in average age—37 years for heads and barely 31 years for all herreros in the sample, the reasons were quite different. Just as in 1821 (but less so in 1838-42, table 4.21), blacksmiths’ sons were the most likely of all crafts both to stay at home and to follow in their fathers’ footsteps (Table 4.22). Moreover, the 1888 sample shows that in blacksmith households, of all occupied persons, they had the highest portion of same jobs of any of the seven sampled crafts. Over one third of all occupied persons in blacksmith household were blacksmiths—sons, kin and non-kin alike. Blacksmiths, however, were fortunate. The hat makers were not.

One of the strongest crafts in 1821 in terms of the ratio of journeymen to masters (table 3.6, pp. 66) and apprentice to master (table 3.4, p. 57), the sombrereros had been hard hit by the liberal trade policies post 1821, but particularly hard hit by local factory production. Even finding only 93 hatters in the surveyed districts in 1838-42, still nearly 40 percent lived within five households of each other, the highest ratio of percent by
number in the craft of any of the selected crafts that year. But by 1888, their numbers lagging behind population growth, the vast majority under the age of thirty living in other people’s households, scattered throughout the city. Even a determined over-sampling found only 32 for the 1888 sample; unsurprisingly, the vast majority (84.4 percent) lived beyond ten households from colleagues, the highest of any craft, even given their low numbers. Still, where hat maker households were found (23 of them), they tended to group together in the same household—over thirty percent of occupied persons in those households plied the same trade as the head—the highest of all seven sampled crafts, except the blacksmiths. The census of 1895 listed over six hundred sombrereros, but most were likely working for Ortiz y Onorac y Cía, or in the two shops making the palm hats for common folk. The hay day of the city’s once proud sombrereros had long since passed.

**Living Close to Work**

A related issue is to what extent were the artisan shops still located within the neighborhoods where the craftsmen lived? As mentioned earlier, Leal and Woldenberg maintain that in Mexico City by mid-century the masters were concentrating in the city’s center while their journeymen had moved to the city’s outskirts. What is the pattern of Guadalajara? Utilizing two of the three databases, the residences of sixteen crafts were compared to the location of the appropriate shops. Table 5.11 gives the number of blocks that an artisan would have had to walk (or ride, or take the mule-driven trolley) to reach the nearest shop where they might have worked.\(^{422}\) Obviously, one cannot know that, in

\(^{422}\) Utilizing the 1880 business census, the 1888 population census and the 1888 map of the city that identified the same block numbers as in the census, the blocks between each craftsman and the closest shop of the same craft were counted. If no such shop existed, the nearest shop in the nearest district was the designated shop. Only three print shops were located in districts 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 (the 1888 districts that recorded occupation), and they were all in district two. Hence, any printers in either district two or four were identified with the shops in district two. The route of the counter followed the likely straight line route of least resistance in determining the number of blocks. The total number of blocks for each artisan in the district were then totaled and divided by the number of artisans, by craft, in the district. In addition, the portion of all craftsmen for each craft who lived within two blocks, within three to four blocks and five or more
fact, a particular craftsman worked in the closest shop. However, the persistent pattern of the location of shops within walking distance of artisans of the same craft, for example, are clues that neither the artisans nor their shops have left their traditional neighborhoods. (Appendix AH: Table 5.11 Proximity of the Artisans to a Shop of the Same Craft, 1888.)

Due to the labor-intensive nature of the measurement, only districts two and four were surveyed. I believe, however, that reflect the nature of the artisan barrio community. In cuartel two, for example, the average craftsmen lived just several blocks from a shop, and for cuartel four, the walk would have been only slightly greater. Rarely did the average for the selected crafts fall beyond five blocks. And none of these figures take into account the craftsmen who worked out of their homes, as did many shoemakers, shawl weavers, tailors and hat makers, rather than as journeymen in a shop.

Artisans from a craft with more shops would seem, statistically, to be more likely to live within a shorter distance of a shop than other crafts with only a few shops. Shawl weavers lived within just 1.2 blocks, on the average, of the nearest of their fifteen shops, and carpenters within two blocks of the twenty-one shops in the two districts, to name the most numerous. Nonetheless, printers with only three shops (all in cuartel two) were only 3.7 blocks, on the average. And the 95 bakers in the two districts still lived, on the average, just 3.7 blocks from one of the 5 bakeries in their districts. With only two blacksmiths shops, the 40 blacksmiths lived within six blocks of one.

Overall, if the experience of those artisans living in districts two and four are any indication, most of the city’s craftsmen lived close to each other and close to work, not counting, of course, those who worked out of their homes in the first place. Only a quarter of the surveyed artisans lived beyond four blocks from the nearest shop, and those were more likely to be in the occupations more likely to be dispersed—blacksmiths (dispersed to the outskirts), bakers, silversmiths (closer in to the city center) and tanners (again to the margins of the district because of the offensive odor of the shops). The presence of the hat makers and the tailors living five or more blocks from their work relates more precisely to the economics of their trade. Hatters, a craft in decline, were

blocks were separately recorded. Only two districts (two and four) were surveyed, given time restraints.
scattered throughout the city, with few shops that still operated. Tailors, on the other hand, were more likely to work out of their homes, rather than in one of the ten shops in the surveyed districts. They were counted as having to walk (or ride) to the nearest shop but many of them did not have to leave home.

Again, the statistical measurements have proven nothing except that craftsmen tended to live near each other, and near shops of the same craft. We assume that they passed each other on the way to work, spent time in the same taverns, attended mass in their parish church and were conscious of belonging to a profession with a history and a common culture. Much of the ordinary, day-to-day activities of such individuals may never be know. The measurements presented here are simply clues to the existence of a craft culture that is still not well understood.

Masters Residential Patterns

Next up in the search for an artisan culture are the masters and shop owners—if their journeymen lived close by the shops, where did they live? The conventional wisdom about medieval artisans is that the apprentices and journeymen tended to live with their masters while they learned the trade and before they could save enough to open a shop of their own. More recent research suggests a more nuanced pattern. By the nineteenth century, for example, artisan male children did not regularly apprentice with their father, nor necessarily take up the same profession. My earlier work tended to confirm that interpretation; apprentice-age children were far scarcer than sons’ ages two to eleven, and of the older male children living at home, only hat makers, blacksmiths and weavers had a significant majority following the same trade as their fathers. This conclusion is supported in the earlier chapter on the craft family and household.

Conversely, did the masters tend to remove themselves from the neighborhoods where their journeymen lived, as happened in some European countries? In other words,

---


if we know the location of their shops, and have found a tendency for craftsmen to live near them, where did the masters live? Did the masters desert their shops for more comfortable residences in the city center, or the upscale blocks of district five or six? From my earlier work, I know that at least in 1821, the average guild master and the average guild journeymen resided in the same urban space. What patterns can be seen in the following decades?

Distinguishing between masters, shop owners and their journeymen is difficult from census data, since the latter rarely indicated such distinctions. Fortunately, the rare and important 1880 business census listed shop owners by name, and the 1888 population census listed thousands of artisans by name. First, the 1880 list was sorted by type of business. Then the shops were identified, and separated from the retail shops on the one hand and factories on the other. For example, the one “expendio de rebozos” (retail store selling shawls) and the one “fábrica de sombrereros” (hat factory) were eliminated. Then owners of more than one shop were isolated to remove duplicates.

Here the data was both surprising and revealing—of the listed owners of the 348 artisan shops in 1880, only five owned two shops. And none owned more than that. In other words, although the colonial restriction that confined masters to only one shop had long been removed, and for whatever reason—economics, the practicality of the craft, or tradition—the practice remained relatively intact. Then, the list of 343 shop-owning masters was compared to each head of household of the 1888 sample (336 of the seven selected crafts). Of those, twenty-seven were clearly identified by name, age and occupation as shop owners from the 1880 list, or, in at least two cases, were masters who had either bought or obtained the business at the 1880 address. Another twelve were possible show owners—usually of the same last name but with a different given name, and close enough to the old address to be likely the same person using a different first name or, in several cases, a son or kin who had obtained the shop, possibly at the death or retirement of the original owner.

While a mere thirty-seven may appear to be a small portion of the original 343 shop owners, remember that the 1888 list is a sample of the craftsmen, and at that, drawn only from those six districts that provided occupational data. Indeed, the thirty-seven

\[425\] Ibid., 152.
represent something like a one to twelve ratio of masters to journeymen captured in our sample, better in fact, then the individual ratio of workers to shops for those seven crafts using the full 1880/1888 data. And since the census data of 1888 did not identify shop owners or master craftsmen, the list of identified owners is clearly understated. Shops would have been started in the intervening eight years and hence not in the 1880 census.

For example, Enrique Gallo was a 55 year-old blacksmith. He lived with his wife, ten sons and three daughters in block 49, district 8 (Analco), along the main thoroughfare from the city center to the outlying village of San Pedro (today usually referred to as Tlaquepaque). Along with the former indigenous barrio Mexicalzingo (district 7), Analco was the city’s heaviest concentration of blacksmith shops. Among Gallo’s sons were seven blacksmiths. As noted elsewhere, blacksmith children tended to stay home (rather than apprentice out like, say, a carpenter’s sons). Although I cannot be sure, and therefore did not identify him as a shop owner since he was not one in 1880, it is likely, in fact, that he was, and perhaps living near his shop as well, for security purposes. On either side of this well-traveled street were a dozen or so other blacksmiths, including the large Reyes family (13 children, three of them blacksmiths) a few blocks east on the other side of the street and likely also an unidentified shop.

In any case, the data closely mirrors the conclusion from the earlier study based on 1821 data—that shop-owning masters tended to both live near their shops, and within the locale of craftsmen whom they employed. The sample of the 1888 census provides some evidence that the pattern may have been similar nearly seven decades later. Of the thirty-seven owners, approximately one-third (thirteen) lived in the same block, or across from the street of the shop. Although most could not be located any more precisely, many may have actually lived over their shop, or their house was their workshop (as was likely for the shawl weavers, and perhaps tailors). Of the rest, another forty-one percent (15) lived in the same cuartel as their shop, the average distance (when such could be calculated, 11 of 15), the average is 3.5 blocks, or rather close to the 3.1 average for all craftsmen taken from the survey of districts two and four (table 5.10). Of those who lived in other districts (9/24.0%) and whose distance could be calculated (7/9), the average distance was ten blocks.
While ten blocks might be considered a fair walk, it can also be assumed that master craftsmen may well have had wagons of their own, or horses. Perhaps more convenient, would have been the mule-driven tramway introduced in 1878. Nearly everyone who lived outside their home district, lived on, or one block off, the mule-driven trolley line. Map 5.1 shows the various routes traveled by the trolley line. Gavino Rodríguez’s bakery lay further than any of our shop owners, some fifteen blocks north west of his home in cuartel seven. The mule trolley could pick him up at his home and drop him off just three blocks from his shop. Most of the others whose shops lay in another district were even closer via trolley. One of the few successful local hat makers, Juan Navarro, also lived in the Mexicalzingo district, his home being in one of the city’s nicer neighborhoods bordering the ex-convent San Francisco, and today just south of the little ex-San Francisco Monastery garden. Navarro’s shop was located on the south side of block 24, facing El Carmen street, (the colonial name was El Coliseo, named for the long-disappeared eighteen century theater, and today Av. Júarez, still the heart of downtown Guadalajara), just ten blocks door to door, by the tramway.

For several reasons, the example of master tailor Agustín Rocha is another interesting example of a shop owner living at a distance from his work. His upscale tailor shop, “El Progreso,” lay in the commercial heart of the city, Las Armas, at number 36, block thirteen, also facing El Carmen street, nestled among several other sastrerías, lawyer’s offices and retail stores. Rocha could leave his home in block 62 of District 7 have the mule trolley take him directly to his shop, door to door.

The fifty-eight year old Rocha is also interesting in that his success was reflected in his household, supporting the principle that the better-off master craftsmen could afford to have their sons at home, rather than apprenticing them off to other masters, often in another trade. Unlike the vast majority of the sampled artisan households, five of his children were unmarried sons living at home. The oldest, Mauricio, followed his father in the profession, as did nineteen year old Lauro. The second oldest, Agustín, was a “dependiente,” meaning that he clerked, whether in his father’s shop or elsewhere is not known. Seventeen year old, Ramón, was listed as a “comerciante.” Only eleven year
old, Manuel, had no occupation. In our sample, of the 32 tailor’s sons living at home, only six followed their father’s craft and three had other craft jobs. The rest were not given an occupation, and most were underage children.

Also, it should be noted that the identified masters lived among journeymen of their profession, and other artisans as well. Table 5.12 indicates that shop owners were even more likely to live near others (mainly journeymen) than those who did not own shops, and slightly less likely to live beyond ten households from another of their craft.

(Appendix AI: Table 5.12 Shop Owners by Residential Proximity of the Same Craft, 1888.)

The statistics do not provide the reasons why the residential patterns should be so little changed in nearly seventy years. Certainly one factor is the fact that urban space had not increased with the population, as can be seen by comparing the number of blocks officially noted in the maps for 1813, 1842 and 1888. Another likely cultural factor, although impossible at this point to determine, is the role of the parish church, and the other local churches. Since colonial times, the activities of the city’s population had been centered around the city’s thirteen plazas, each with its own church, and also the barrio’s water fountain. Changing neighborhoods would have meant changing the parish church of their family, a not inconsiderable change if it were undertaken. While the evidence is lacking for this factor—the role of the parish church—one has to, at least, assume that such a factor existed.

In conclusion, certain changes in residential patterns appear to have taken place since the beginning of Independence, particularly in the growth of population density in those districts with large numbers of poorer citizens, and the movement of certain portions of various crafts to those districts, perhaps in search of cheaper dwellings,

426 Interestingly, Rocha’s wife was listed as Francisca Gonzáles de Rocha, age 50. The listing is technically correct, of course, (the wife would officially be given the husband’s paternal surname preceded by a “de” although keeping her paternal surname) but rarely recorded in census documents as such. Further, the children’s surname were all recorded as R. Gonzáles, again technically correct in Hispanic tradition in which children receive both the paternal and maternal surnames of their parents. In our full data base for the years 1824, 1838-42 and 1850, only 177 of the 44,244 individuals were listed with both surnames. Perhaps, the census taker is recognizing some elevated status of Rocha’s wife?
perhaps in pursuit of customers. But for the most part, journeymen and masters like appear to still live among each other, not far from the shops, which themselves appear clustered together whatever cuartel was their residence. At least as late as 1888, and likely beyond, the city still resembled the combined functions of the colonial city—residence, trade and production mixed together. And while some artisans had been pushed out of the older historic center of the city, others remained. And those that left appeared to have reconstructed or reconstituted their residence and work much as they had their families and households, with a view of surviving as a craft.
CONCLUSION

On May 15, 1888 the railroad arrived in Guadalajara. It was celebrated as one of the great events in the history of the city. To Mexico’s positivist leaders, the railroad was the foremost symbol of “progress,” an almost mystical concept in which the nation would triumph over backwardness, violence and underdevelopment.\(^{427}\) Except for the Yucatan Peninsula, the West was the last area of the country to be connected by rail to the nation’s capital, and to the United States and the world beyond, fifteen years after the first train had arrived at Mexico City’s Buenaventura station, and four years after the completion of the Mexican Central Line to the United States.\(^{428}\) The reasons for the delay were many, but now, at last, the city joined the rest of Mexico in Porfirian “Progress.”\(^{429}\) By May 15, 1888, the city’s hotels, inns, and boarding houses were full as dignitaries and common people from all over Jalisco and Mexico flocked to the city to witness this special occasion.\(^{430}\) The official inaugural party to celebrate the event lasted four days, and included elaborate official receptions, banquets, bull-fights, serenades, and even an *Exposition de Productos Regionales* with the greatest exhibition of regional industrial and agricultural products since the great exhibition in 1880. Naturally, a grand ball, private invitation only, closed the celebrations.\(^{431}\)

The railroad arrived at 4:45 pm on the fifteenth, the first wagon full of prominent politicians from Mexico City, cabinet ministers, governors, militia men, senators, delegates, diplomats, and journalists, of course, to record the great event, greeted by


\(^{428}\) For many reasons, including the hugely difficult *Salsipuedes* (“Get Out If You Can”) Gorge, the final link of the railroad west of Guadalajara leading up the west coast to the United States, did not happen until April 17, 1927. Ibid., 77-79.


\(^{430}\) *Defensa Católica*, 16 May 1888.

\(^{431}\) Manuel Caballero, *Fiestas inaugurales del ferrocarril a Guadalajara* (Guadalajara: Imprenta del Diario de Jalisco de Rafael León, 1888), 20 pages.
Ramón Corona, Governor of Jalisco.\textsuperscript{422} Houses were decorated, cannons and fireworks were fired, ringing bells from the multiple churches, and musical bands played at the arrival of the railroad and almost seventy thousand residents, guests and foreigner visitors packed the streets, “trees, walls, housetops, the platforms, balconies, windows.”\textsuperscript{433}

During the inaugural ceremony at the railroad station, Governor Corona read a telegram from President Díaz congratulating Jalisco for being finally connected to Mexico City and stressing the opportunities that the railroad would bring to the regional industry.\textsuperscript{434} That night a great storm, “la primera tormenta de mayo,” swept the bandstand and interrupted the fireworks and brilliant displays of lights.\textsuperscript{435} It would serve as a symbol of the forces to be unleashed by the railroad, and the economic changes that inevitably accompanied it. For, as Díaz had predicted, the connection of Guadalajara with the railroad system brought many changes and while merchants celebrated the arrival of cheaper domestic and foreign goods, some artisans struggled to survive.\textsuperscript{436} Others took advantage of the arrival of the railroad to depart themselves for opportunities elsewhere.\textsuperscript{437}

The state and the nation’s economy would grow exponentially in the years ahead, great textile mills established, huge increases in the production of mines and Mexico’s fields shipped out of the country, great Victorian style buildings built in Guadalajara, as well as in Mexico City and elsewhere throughout Mexico. But also, huge economic downswings, as well, as inflation, unemployment, and financial crisis became a price that Mexico would pay for its Progress. Those developments, both positive and negative, that accompanied the transformation of Mexico’s economy, would lead to the rise of a new

\textsuperscript{422} For a whole list of passengers see Caballero, \textit{Fiestas Inaugurales}, 4-8.

\textsuperscript{433} \textit{Two Republics}, 17 May 1888.

\textsuperscript{434} \textit{Diario del Hogar}, 19 May 1888.

\textsuperscript{435} Ixca Farías, \textit{Casos Y Cosas De Mis Tiempos; Artículos Costumbristas Sobre Guadalajara} (Mexico: Colegio Internacional, 1963), 110; \textit{Two Republics}, 17 May 1888.

\textsuperscript{436} Juan Panadero, 13 February 1890.

\textsuperscript{437} Juan Panadero, 19 May 1889, \textit{Diario de Jalisco}, 8 June 1889.
type of working class, new militancy, new violence and a political crisis that ended in the great Mexican Revolution of 1910. Inevitably, Guadalajara’s artisans, masters, owners of small workshops, shopkeepers would have to confront those changes, but how they would do so is another story.

The story that I have tried to tell began in the early decades after Independence in 1821. Those early decades were characterized by economic disorganization and contraction of many markets. The constant political turmoil retarded the development of regional markets, left them relatively independent of each other. It was not an easy time for this very fragile situation meant for most artisans a small reduction in the demand for their product caused which unemployment. Yet, despite the difficulties, Guadalajara’s artisans still remained as an important part of the economy. And ironically, the late arrival of the railroad may have permitted those artisans to strengthen their ability to survive, permitting them to further strengthen social and cultural ways and means to maintain their way of life that the railroads, symbolically and in reality, endangered. Whether that way of life would survive in the twentieth century, and if so, in what form, require another research.

The historiography of the artisan is long, difficult and contentious. Marxist scholars have often considered the artisans and all petty bourgeoisie as political supporters of the capitalist system, and therefore enemies of the working class, or at best,

---


439 I have alternately used the terms “artisans,” “craftsmen,” occasionally “small producers” to describe the workers in my dissertation. I also have talked about them as “petty bourgeoisie,” although I do not want to talk about class. The working definition that I have used is that of a social group dedicated to small-scale production for local consumption, who have ownership of the means of production. I have tried to avoid political ideological concepts, except as they were the product of the workers themselves. I have occasionally, also, referred to my subjects as “workers,” although I know that the term is most often used to refer to factory workers. Perhaps my approach can be seen as exploring the workers’ cultural “experience” but with a “structuralist” perspective, as Emilia Viotti da Costa seem to say was needed in labor history. See her “Experience versus Structures: New Tendencies in the History of Labor and the Working Class in Latin America—What Do We Gain? What Do We Lose?,” International Labor and Working-Class History 36 (Fall 1989): 3-24.
irrelevant to the formation of the working class. Scholars such as E. P. Thompson, E. J. Hobsbawm and others re-interpreted the craft experience as a legitimate precursor to the development of working class consciousness, but did little to explain the nineteenth century artisan’s experience in terms of the artisan and all petty bourgeoisie’s cultural response to conditions posed by industrial capitalism. Other scholars argued for a more complex approach to understanding the political, and sociological, world of the artisan, petty trader and small producers. Especially relevant for this study were those scholars who attempted to reconstruct the artisan’s family life, and the community in which he lived and worked. Among such scholars, the work of Michael Anderson, Geoffrey Crossick and Tamara K. Hareven stands out.440

Particularly important for this study is the work of Tamara K. Hareven, and others, who insisted that the Industrial Revolution did not destroy the family, but forced it to adapt and change. Under their influence, the family became, not a victim of economic change, but both a product of it, and a molder of the community in which that change took place.441 Spanish historians, particularly relevant to understanding the Latin American family, began to revise the role that the family, and family networks, played in the community’s response to social change. David S. Reher’s work on nineteenth century England: Cambridge University Press, 1971). While Anderson’s work did not treat the artisans separately, his study of the industrial working class affectively and permanently destroyed the myth that the Industrial Revolution somehow destroyed the pre-industrial extended, three generational family, and left the industrial workers in small, nuclear, individualistic families. Geoffrey Crossick’s work has been mentioned many times in this study so there is no need to cite it here. However, Crossick was probably the historian most responsible for bring the study of the petite bourgeoisie back as a legitimate, indeed, necessary, academic field of study. Tamara Haveren is widely acknowledged as the leading family historian of our era. She needs no citation here as well. However, Haveren is important for our study of the artisans because the “Haveren thesis” is that modern industry, per se, was not a process that automatically led to the destruction of the family, but that the family itself had “agency” (before the term was invented) in the process. That, also, is a fundamental thesis of my study.

440 Michael Anderson, Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1971). While Anderson’s work did not treat the artisans separately, his study of the industrial working class affectively and permanently destroyed the myth that the Industrial Revolution somehow destroyed the pre-industrial extended, three generational family, and left the industrial workers in small, nuclear, individualistic families. Geoffrey Crossick’s work has been mentioned many times in this study so there is no need to cite it here. However, Crossick was probably the historian most responsible for bring the study of the petite bourgeoisie back as a legitimate, indeed, necessary, academic field of study. Tamara Haveren is widely acknowledged as the leading family historian of our era. She needs no citation here as well. However, Haveren is important for our study of the artisans because the “Haveren thesis” is that modern industry, per se, was not a process that automatically led to the destruction of the family, but that the family itself had “agency” (before the term was invented) in the process. That, also, is a fundamental thesis of my study.

441 Haveren, “The History of the Family and the Complexities of Social Change,” American Historical Review 96:1 (February 1991), 11-112. She also argued for the merger of “quantitative and qualitative” methodologies, which I very much approve! Ibid., 110.
century Cuenca revealed hidden family networks that enabled urban families to maintain circular migration patterns, connecting and re-connecting with village life, sending members return trips to the village and to the city when such helped either the sending or the receiving family.\footnote{442}{David Sven Reher, \textit{Town and Country in Pre-Industrial Spain. Cuenca, 1550-1870} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.)}

Juanjo Romero-Marín’s micro-history of nineteenth century Barcelona artisan families is particularly important for my work, because he found exactly what I believe to be Guadalajara’s artisans experience—that families avoided the “circle of poverty” by maintaining the family trade, while at the same time encouraging sons to go into other crafts, and enabling them to do so by expanding kin groups through marriage (and here daughters played a crucial role), and maintaining social contact with other artisans, both within the same craft, and with other crafts as well.\footnote{443}{Juanjo Romero-Marín, “Family Strategies of Artisans During the Modernization Process: Barcelona, 1814-1860,” \textit{The History of the Family} 6 (2001): 203-24. Romero-Marín also devised a means to show the linkage of kin groups within specific occupations, something I have not been able to do for my dissertation, but hope to do in the future. In his work, he finds shoemakers to have the highest kin linkages of any artisan craft except the bakers, and this finding reflects what my data on those two occupations seem to say as well; ibid., p. 214, table 5. Those two occupations were under great economic stress in Guadalajara but their heavy use of the family in their work was crucial to their survival as craft families.}

Mexican scholars have traditionally, and as recently as Mark Wasserman’s 2000 study of nineteenth century Mexico, condemned Mexico’s artisans to illiteracy, poverty, misery and a social status no better than servants.\footnote{444}{See Introduction, p. 9, notes 20, 21, 22, 23.} It is my argument that the city’s artisans responded to governmental economic liberal policies, to domestic and foreign competitors, to economic troubled times by a multi-tiered, complex behavior. On one level, they petitioned, protested and pushed government to curb foreign imports. And just a year or so after the 1848 European revolutions, the first socialists appeared in Guadalajara, and, in the presence of 803 artisans, helped to organize one of the first post-guild artisan organizations in the country – the \textit{Compañía de Artesanos de Guadalajara}. And when only a few weeks later, a French capitalist who had introduced machinery to a
shawl weaver’s factory, and then attempted to cut artisans’ wages, the weavers walked out, and then threatened to burn the factory.

Yet, that was the height of the city’s radicalism, until they protested the death of Mexican, Antonio Rodríguez, by a Texas lynch mob in 1910. Despite several declarations of radical intent (Jesús García in 1868; Aurelio Ortega in 1870), only mutual aid societies and aborted attempts to create artisan collectives appeared in the city for the rest of the century and beyond. And slowly the city’s artisans appear to fall under the influence of merchants (Las Clases Productoras) and then the reinvigorated Catholic Church’s many mutual aid societies. So, what happened to the city’s radical artisans, if that was what they were?

The answer is multi-tiered. First, it is important to understand that the “Catholic Solution” was not imposed from above to a beaten, conservative and impotent artisan class. The Church had been an integral part of the guild system. Artisans marched under their patron saints in Church processions, and continued to do so after the guilds were abolished. The artisans formed their own Catholic cofradías, whose holdings were only finally outlawed by the Liberals in the 1850s. As has been demonstrated, the residence patterns favored close craft barrio ties, and the Parish Church was certainly fundamental to the social and family networks that, while still cannot be documented, must have existed. So, Catholicism would have been a natural aspect of any artisan community and culture. While the Church’s artisan/working class organizations may not have been effective for mitigating the worse of the Diaz regime’s economic policies, and history proved them largely impotent in the twentieth century, artisans could not have read that far into the future.

More important than a Catholic organizational “solution” to the problem of the artisans was, I believe, the importance of the family, the household, and the kinship clan, and the craft networks and sense of craft identity that supported them. They are the “community” that I believe existed. In the chapter on the family, I have attempted to show that the artisans differed in certain fundamental ways from other social groups—elites, professionals, merchants, and unskilled workers. That, it seems to me, is evidence of a separate social group, which I have called a “community.” But the data also shows that there were substantial differences with the artisan community. Lower status artisans
tended to marry sooner than higher status artisans, for example, marriage being a means to expand kinship networks, and the poorer artisans needed those networks very much. But in the end, using data from a sample of marriages from 1877 to 1907, it was shown that artisans of all types married other artisans’ daughters, more often in the same craft, and if they did not, they tended to marry “up.” Marriage was a fundamental key to maintaining the family, and the craft ties.

When comparing the data from 1821, 1838-42 and 1888, the family trend that stands out is the increased importance of the family. The family (and the household) became larger, with more children staying home as the century grew, more kin and others came to live in the household, particularly for those crafts that could utilize the family within a cottage industry setting (i.e. working out of their homes). 445 As a result, household composition became more complex as the century wore on, and by 1888 over one quarter of all individuals in the average artisan household (of the seven crafts used for the 1888 sample) lived with kin. It varied by the economic health and status of the craft itself. Ironically, two of the healthier crafts were at opposite ends of the spectrum in terms of household structure. Blacksmiths keep the most sons at home with fewer kin in 1888, perhaps because they were the most “modern” of the craft families, making their transition to the “individualist” family household. The carpenter/wheelwright kept the fewest sons at home, perhaps because they kept to the most traditional artisan pattern—to send sons out to apprentice or foster with other artisan households, not necessarily carpenters or wheelwrights.

Just as Romero-Marín found for Barcelona, artisan children in general tended to have craft jobs, but only one in four were those of their father. The principle here is that diversification of the family crafts was a hedge against overspecialization that could doom a family in hard times, and that broadening craft contacts was a very good survival strategy. Conversely, the crafts that had the most sons and kin at home—shoemakers and shawl weavers—were those crafts fighting hard to survive, but still surviving. For all

crafts, the increasing “exploitation” of the family was a key aspect of that survival, as Joan Scott and others had found among similar trades in Europe a generation earlier.

Even when the data shows that, just several decades after Independence, all other social groups were more likely to head their own household than artisans, that indicated the importance of the artisan household, not the reverse. They had more spouses in their household, more children by far, and more kin than landowners, elite, merchants, unskilled workers or servants. In other words, artisans used the entire household to their advantage, and that tendency had increased to the census of 1888.

Another study, not by my research but by Monica Hardin, using data from the common database developed by the Guadalajara Census Project, showed even greater importance of the household, although using only the data from the censuses of 1821 and 1822. But if true for the later years, it is very important. First, she found that within the short period of less than one year, households that held no kin, received them, meaning that the role of kin would have been even greater than the one census statistics implied. Then she found that children did not simply leave the household in progressive numbers as they got older, but left and returned at various ages, implying that somewhere there was a (kinship?) network that took care of children at various ages, but for whatever the reasons is not known. As I said in the chapter on the family, there must be an unseen “ideology” of the family supporting such a kinship network, values that presumably most family members must hold to make the network work. Perhaps that is the origin of the famous Mexican family values of today.

A crucial aspect of the artisan family was where they lived. My data found that craftsmen tended to live near other craftsmen, near the shops in which they worked (or, of course, worked at home, as many cottage industry crafts existed, particularly those that could use the family in their production), and near the masters of their craft (if they could be identified in the sample of 1888). In an interesting find, the shops themselves tended to congregate as well. The data does not say why, of course. Perhaps they needed to be near their customers, or to be near their workers, but also, perhaps it was for the craft’s convenience—customers generally expected to find artisan shops near each other, a traditional pattern that likely increased throughout the nineteenth century.
It is true that the location of artisans’ residence seem to have shifted during the century, as some crafts gravitated toward cheaper lodgings in poorer cuarteles. But others stayed put, and all crafts appeared to reestablish their housing, family and craft patterns, even after their move. At least as late as 1888 (where much of my data ends) but likely much later, the traditional residential patterns of a mix of residence, trade and production continued nearly everywhere in the city.

At the beginning of twenty century, Guadalajara expanded, following a plan of “modern” urban development to establish mainly residential neighborhoods called *colonias*. Over the next decade, some twenty were constructed, ten of which were dedicated to the popular classes, as working people were called then. Over the next forty years, *all* of the formerly working-class *colonias* had reverted from the residential “monofunctional” design envisioned by the Porfírian planners to “multifunctional” neighborhoods incorporating the traditional residential, trade and production activities of a barrio. “The people of the popular colonies realized that this spatial form…did not fulfill the economic, social and cultural needs of their life. Their needs for a multifunctional neighborhood were founded on experience from their past.”

One of the first colonias was constructed near the Mezquítán cemetery, for cost saving purposes. Today, that neighborhood is still called “colonia artesanos.” Perhaps Guadalajara’s artisans were capable of reproducing their life style even confronting the Porfírian model of “Progress.”

In conclusion, I have chosen to write a social history of the artisans of Guadalajara, utilizing traditional quantitative data. As a result, there are many clues about the artisan community, and many seemingly hard facts, but facts that do not give us a solid base for a conclusion, but a lot more questions. I have not written an economic history of the artisans, except only in general. I have written a “community” history that attempts to describe, and understand, the artisan responses to those economic changes that did take place. I was not able to carry the story far into the Díaz regime, and to be able to analyze how his ruthless liberal policies affected Guadalajara’s artisans. Still, I

---

believe that the story that has been told is one of a surprising survival, adaptation and continuity to a group that most scholars have ignored. The reputation of this city, today, for small producers has been mentioned a number of times, but I still believe that it is a deserved reputation, and not one that simply happened in the twentieth century without origins. This study has been an effort to understand those origins.
### Table 1: Occupations by Ability to Read 1838-1842

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/coachmakers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmakers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>537</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Operarios/obreros</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstresses</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other jobs</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>7,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

Table 4.1 Male Workers by Occupation and Marital Status, 1838-1842

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widower</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


# Table 4.2 Male Workers by Marital Status and Social Status, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don (%)</td>
<td>Non Don (%)</td>
<td>Don (%)</td>
<td>Non Don (%)</td>
<td>Don (%)</td>
<td>Non Don (%)</td>
<td>Don N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Table 4.3 Male Artisans by Marital Status and Social Status, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Non Don</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Non Don</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Non Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Wheelwright</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

447 Leather craftsmen category includes leather tanners, saddlers, and harness makers.
APPENDIX E
Table 4.4 Male Workers by Occupation and Age at Marriage, 1821-1907

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1821</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1838-42</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1877-1907</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5 Male Artisans by Craft and Marital Status, 1838-42, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1838-42</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1888</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Masons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Wheelwrights</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPENDIX G

Table 4.6 Male Artisans by Craft and Age at Marriage, 1821-1907

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1821</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1838-42</th>
<th>Mean Age at First Marriage 1877-1907</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coach makers</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax makers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Masons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.7 Male Artisans by Similar Occupation as the Head, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Same Job</th>
<th>Not the Same Job</th>
<th>Head of the Household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>24 20.9</td>
<td>19 16.5</td>
<td>72 62.6</td>
<td>115 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwrights</td>
<td>8 8.6</td>
<td>11 11.8</td>
<td>74 79.6</td>
<td>93 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>21 26.6</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
<td>56 70.9</td>
<td>79 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>10 15.9</td>
<td>10 15.9</td>
<td>43 68.3</td>
<td>63 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>12 20.0</td>
<td>9 15.0</td>
<td>39 65.0</td>
<td>60 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>17 34.0</td>
<td>5 10.0</td>
<td>28 56.0</td>
<td>50 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>10 30.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>23 69.7</td>
<td>33 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102 20.7</td>
<td>56 11.4</td>
<td>335 68.0</td>
<td>493 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX I

#### Table 4.8 Occupations by Position in Household, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Head N (%)</th>
<th>Spouse N (%)</th>
<th>Child N (%)</th>
<th>Kin N (%)</th>
<th>Non-kin N (%)</th>
<th>Servants N (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>306 78.5</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
<td>40 10.3</td>
<td>23 5.9</td>
<td>19 4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>390 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>112 77.2</td>
<td>2 1.4</td>
<td>7 4.8</td>
<td>6 4.1</td>
<td>18 12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>145 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>462 74.0</td>
<td>8 1.3</td>
<td>61 9.8</td>
<td>28 4.5</td>
<td>64 10.3</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
<td>624 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>474 65.1</td>
<td>10 1.4</td>
<td>81 11.1</td>
<td>51 7.0</td>
<td>80 11.0</td>
<td>32 4.4</td>
<td>728 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>1,288 63.4</td>
<td>33 1.6</td>
<td>319 15.7</td>
<td>177 8.7</td>
<td>211 10.4</td>
<td>4 0.2</td>
<td>2,032 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>26 9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2 0.7</td>
<td>1 0.3</td>
<td>18 6.2</td>
<td>242 83.7</td>
<td>289 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,668 63.4</td>
<td>55 1.3</td>
<td>510 12.1</td>
<td>286 6.8</td>
<td>410 9.7</td>
<td>279 6.6</td>
<td>4,208 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.9 Male Artisans by Position in Household, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Head N (%)</th>
<th>Spouse N (%)</th>
<th>Child N (%)</th>
<th>Kin N (%)</th>
<th>Non-kin N (%)</th>
<th>Total N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>110 77.5</td>
<td>3 2.1</td>
<td>9 6.3</td>
<td>12 8.5</td>
<td>8 5.6</td>
<td>142 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>97 68.8</td>
<td>3 2.1</td>
<td>17 12.1</td>
<td>16 11.3</td>
<td>8 5.7</td>
<td>141 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>216 67.3</td>
<td>6 1.9</td>
<td>37 11.5</td>
<td>29 9.0</td>
<td>33 10.3</td>
<td>321 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>39 67.2</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>7 12.1</td>
<td>4 6.9</td>
<td>5 8.6</td>
<td>58 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>39 67.2</td>
<td>2 3.4</td>
<td>8 13.8</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
<td>58 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>12 66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2 11.1</td>
<td>1 5.6</td>
<td>3 16.7</td>
<td>18 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>12 66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3 16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3 16.7</td>
<td>18 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>27 65.9</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>6 14.6</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>41 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>19 63.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2 6.7</td>
<td>3 10.0</td>
<td>6 20.0</td>
<td>30 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>192 62.5</td>
<td>1 0.3</td>
<td>46 15.0</td>
<td>32 10.4</td>
<td>36 11.7</td>
<td>307 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>130 60.2</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
<td>42 19.4</td>
<td>21 9.7</td>
<td>21 9.7</td>
<td>216 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coach makers</td>
<td>97 56.7</td>
<td>3 1.8</td>
<td>42 24.6</td>
<td>11 6.4</td>
<td>18 10.5</td>
<td>171 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>42 54.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22 28.6</td>
<td>7 9.1</td>
<td>6 7.8</td>
<td>77 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>76 53.1</td>
<td>1 0.7</td>
<td>29 20.3</td>
<td>13 9.1</td>
<td>24 16.8</td>
<td>143 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,108 63.6</td>
<td>26 1.5</td>
<td>272 15.6</td>
<td>154 8.8</td>
<td>181 10.4</td>
<td>1,741 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX K

Table 4.10 Male Artisans by Position in Household, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coahmakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmakers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX L

### Table 4.11 Household Structure, 1821-1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household Structure</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>1838-42</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Family</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>14,315</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>8,794</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Related</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Unrelated</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6,416</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34,415</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20,739</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX M

**Table 4.12 Artisan Household Structure, 1821-1888**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household Structure</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1838-42</th>
<th>1888</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guild Artisans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary Head</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Family</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Related</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Unrelated</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Artisans                    |      |         |      |
| Solitary Head               | 23   | 4.7     |      |      |
| No Family                   | 37   | 7.5     |      |      |
| Nuclear Family              | 241  | 48.9    |      |      |
| Extended Family             | 47   | 9.5     |      |      |
| Multiple Family Related     | 63   | 12.8    |      |      |
| Multiple Family Unrelated   | 82   | 16.6    |      |      |
| Total                       | 493  | 100.0   |      |      |
### APPENDIX N
Table 4.13 Male Artisans by Household Structure, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Solitary Head</th>
<th>No Family</th>
<th>Nuclear Family</th>
<th>Extended Family</th>
<th>Multiple Family Related</th>
<th>Multiple Family Unrelated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36 52.9</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
<td>6 8.8</td>
<td>24 35.3</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>7 14.3</td>
<td>2 4.1</td>
<td>24 49.0</td>
<td>5 10.2</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>10 20.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2 2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38 48.7</td>
<td>8 10.3</td>
<td>5 6.4</td>
<td>25 32.1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>12 3.1</td>
<td>3 0.8</td>
<td>161 42.1</td>
<td>34 8.9</td>
<td>49 12.8</td>
<td>123 32.2</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>15 5.3</td>
<td>15 5.3</td>
<td>115 40.6</td>
<td>14 4.9</td>
<td>38 13.4</td>
<td>86 30.4</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>73 40.6</td>
<td>5 2.8</td>
<td>34 18.9</td>
<td>61 33.9</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>16 8.6</td>
<td>3 1.6</td>
<td>75 40.5</td>
<td>12 6.5</td>
<td>10 5.4</td>
<td>69 37.3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/ Wheelwrights</td>
<td>11 5.0</td>
<td>7 3.2</td>
<td>89 40.5</td>
<td>18 8.2</td>
<td>24 10.9</td>
<td>71 32.3</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>8 4.4</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>71 39.4</td>
<td>16 8.9</td>
<td>24 13.3</td>
<td>58 32.2</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>10 38.5</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>5 19.2</td>
<td>8 30.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>6 6.5</td>
<td>33 35.5</td>
<td>8 8.6</td>
<td>22 23.7</td>
<td>23 24.7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>15 3.6</td>
<td>12 2.9</td>
<td>145 35.2</td>
<td>40 9.7</td>
<td>50 12.1</td>
<td>150 36.4</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>4 12.1</td>
<td>3 9.1</td>
<td>11 33.3</td>
<td>2 6.1</td>
<td>2 6.1</td>
<td>11 33.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/ Candle makers</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9 32.1</td>
<td>3 10.7</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>14 50.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97 4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>58 2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>890 40.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>168 7.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>271 12.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>733 33.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>7 1.6</td>
<td>6 1.4</td>
<td>226 51.0</td>
<td>37 8.4</td>
<td>62 14.0</td>
<td>105 23.7</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>32 3.4</td>
<td>20 2.2</td>
<td>390 42.0</td>
<td>73 7.9</td>
<td>106 11.4</td>
<td>308 33.2</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX O

**Table 4.14 Male Artisans by Household Structure, 1888**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Solitary Head</th>
<th>No Family</th>
<th>Nuclear Family</th>
<th>Extended Family</th>
<th>Multiple Family related</th>
<th>Multiple Family Unrelated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>8 16.0</td>
<td>30 60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8 16.0</td>
<td>3 6.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>3 5.1</td>
<td>32 54.2</td>
<td>7 11.9</td>
<td>8 13.6</td>
<td>8 13.6</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>3 4.8</td>
<td>10 16.1</td>
<td>31 50.0</td>
<td>8 12.9</td>
<td>5 8.1</td>
<td>5 8.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>8 24.2</td>
<td>3 9.1</td>
<td>16 48.5</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>4 12.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36 43.4</td>
<td>14 16.9</td>
<td>16 19.3</td>
<td>16 19.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>6 4.9</td>
<td>9 7.4</td>
<td>51 41.8</td>
<td>6 4.9</td>
<td>25 20.5</td>
<td>25 20.5</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwrights</td>
<td>3 2.8</td>
<td>5 4.6</td>
<td>45 41.7</td>
<td>11 10.2</td>
<td>22 20.4</td>
<td>22 20.4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 7.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>241 46.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>47 9.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>85 16.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>83 16.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>517</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>2 9.5</td>
<td>3 14.3</td>
<td>12 57.1</td>
<td>1 4.8</td>
<td>1 4.8</td>
<td>2 9.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
<td>16 23.2</td>
<td>28 40.6</td>
<td>5 7.2</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
<td>16 23.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinterías (Carpentries)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrocerías (Carriage shops, sold and repaired)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutidurías y tenerías (Tanneries)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrerías (Blacksmith shops)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilados y tejidos (Textile shops)</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panaderías (Bakeries)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platerías (Silvershops)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebocerías de algodón (Cotton shawls shops)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebocerías de seda (Silk shawls shops)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sastrerías (Tailors shops)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silleterías (Saddler shops)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombrererías corrientes (Cheap hat shops)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombrererías finos (Fine hat shops)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talabarterías (Saddlery-harness shops)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejidos de lana (Wollen weaving shops)</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapaterías (Shoeshops)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>552</strong></td>
<td><strong>593</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX Q

### Table 4.16 Male Artisans by Age Distribution, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>0 to 19 years old</th>
<th>20 to 29 years old</th>
<th>30 to 39 years old</th>
<th>40 to 49 years old</th>
<th>50 years old and older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/coachmakers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>616</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>933</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.17 Occupations by Means, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Mean Number of Members in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Kin in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Boarders in HH</th>
<th>Mean Numbers of Children in HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX S
### Table 4.18 Occupations by Means and Social Status, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Mean Age Head of Household</th>
<th>Mean Number of Members in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Kin in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Boarders in HH</th>
<th>Mean Numbers of Children in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Servants in HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>Don 44.6</td>
<td>No 40.3</td>
<td>Don 7.95</td>
<td>No 7.22</td>
<td>Don 1.09</td>
<td>No 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>Don 41.9</td>
<td>No 37.5</td>
<td>Don 8.52</td>
<td>No 6.38</td>
<td>Don 0.28</td>
<td>No 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>Don 38.3</td>
<td>No 41.9</td>
<td>Don 8.31</td>
<td>No 6.31</td>
<td>Don 0.68</td>
<td>No 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Don 40.4</td>
<td>No 41.3</td>
<td>Don 8.23</td>
<td>No 6.77</td>
<td>Don 0.41</td>
<td>No 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>Don 44.6</td>
<td>No 39.0</td>
<td>Don 9.96</td>
<td>No 8.75</td>
<td>Don 0.10</td>
<td>No 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>Don 41.1</td>
<td>No 37.5</td>
<td>Don 8.08</td>
<td>No 6.59</td>
<td>Don 0.31</td>
<td>No 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>Don 41.1</td>
<td>No 37.5</td>
<td>Don 8.08</td>
<td>No 6.59</td>
<td>Don 0.31</td>
<td>No 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Don 41.9</td>
<td>No 38.8</td>
<td>Don 8.32</td>
<td>No 6.72</td>
<td>Don 0.34</td>
<td>No 0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX T

### Table 4.19 Crafts by Means and Social Status, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Mean Number of Members in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Kin in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Boarders in HH</th>
<th>Mean Numbers of Children in HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>No Don</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>No Don</td>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Weavers</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coachmakers</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX U

Table 4.20 Crafts by Means, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Mean Number of Members in HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Kin in the HH</th>
<th>Mean Number of Children in the HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwrights</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX V

**Table 4.21 Sons in the Household by Craft and Age Cohorts, 1834-42**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Male Head of the House (Married/Widowed)</th>
<th>Sons 2 to 11 years old</th>
<th>Ratio Sons to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 12 years and older</th>
<th>Ratio Sons to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 12 to 19 years old</th>
<th>Ratio Sons to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 20 years and older</th>
<th>Ratio Sons to Head HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coachmakers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.06</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.22 Sons in the Household by Craft and Age Cohorts, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Male Head of the House (Married/Widowed) N</th>
<th>Sons Total N</th>
<th>Ratio Sons to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 2 years old to 11 years old</th>
<th>Ratio Sons (2 to 11 years old) to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 12 to 19 years old</th>
<th>Ratio Sons (12 to 19 years old) to Head HH</th>
<th>Sons 20 years and older</th>
<th>Ratio Sons (20 years and older) to Head HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coachmakers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.23 Male Children Who Had the Same Job as the Head of the Household, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Same Job</th>
<th>Not the Same Job</th>
<th>Same job as some in HH, but not the head</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>3 42.9</td>
<td>4 57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>2 66.7</td>
<td>1 33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>1 33.3</td>
<td>2 66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>15 39.5</td>
<td>14 36.8</td>
<td>9 23.7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>11 57.9</td>
<td>2 10.5</td>
<td>6 31.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>12 36.4</td>
<td>13 39.4</td>
<td>8 24.2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>20 60.6</td>
<td>9 27.3</td>
<td>4 12.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coachmakers</td>
<td>8 25.8</td>
<td>17 54.8</td>
<td>6 19.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>4 28.6</td>
<td>4 28.6</td>
<td>6 42.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/Candle makers</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>5 21.7</td>
<td>12 52.2</td>
<td>6 26.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>3 25.0</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>5 41.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>3 30.0</td>
<td>5 50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79 65.3</td>
<td>28 23.1</td>
<td>14 11.6</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX Y

Table 4.24 Ratio of Female Children to Head of the Household, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Male Head of the House (Married/Widowed) N</th>
<th>Total Daughters</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Adult females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Coachmakers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 342

| Laborers         | 42                                         | 47              | 1.120  |
| Lawyers          | 15                                         | 19              | 1.460  |

**Total** 397 675
# APPENDIX Z

## Table 5.3 Distribution of Male Workers by Cuartel, 1838-1850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Cuartel 4</th>
<th>Cuartel 5</th>
<th>Cuartel 6</th>
<th>Cuartel 7</th>
<th>Cuartel 8</th>
<th>Cuartel 9</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/ Wheelwright</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/ Candle makers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
<td><strong>584</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
<td><strong>361</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,506</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Cuartel Working Population</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Artisans Working Population</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Male Working Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>580</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>828</strong></td>
<td><strong>694</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,254</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuartel Percent of Working Population</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.4 Distribution of Male Workers by Cuartel, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Cuartel 2</th>
<th>Cuartel 4</th>
<th>Cuartel 6</th>
<th>Cuartel 7</th>
<th>Cuartel 8</th>
<th>Cuartel 9</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetmakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/ Wheelwrights</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair makers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire works makers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax makers/ Candle makers/ Match makers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>3,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Cuartel Working Population 36.4 51.0 18.1 33.6 37.6 48.8 37.4

Percent of Artisans Working Population 6.4 22.4 6.8 21.7 25.9 16.8 100.0

Merchants 172 273 353 375 517 331 2,021

Landowners 3 16 76 21 5 36 157

Total Male Working Population 682 1,702 1,461 2,500 2,670 1,334 10,349

Cuartel Percent of Working Population 6.6 16.4 14.1 24.2 25.8 12.9 100.0
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Table 5.5 Location of Quotients of the Cuarteles by Crafts, 1838-1850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Cuartel 4 (%)</th>
<th>Cuartel 5 (%)</th>
<th>Cuartel 6 (%)</th>
<th>Cuartel 7 (%)</th>
<th>Cuartel 8 (%)</th>
<th>Cuartel 9 (%)</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/ Wheelwright</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone masons</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxmakers/ Candle makers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Working Population</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 5.6 Location of Quotients of the Cuarteles by Crafts, 1888**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Cuartel 2</th>
<th>Cuartel 4</th>
<th>Cuartel 6</th>
<th>Cuartel 7</th>
<th>Cuartel 8</th>
<th>Cuartel 9</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetmakers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/coachmakers</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair makers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire works makers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilder</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftmen</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry carver</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmiths</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax makers/Candle makers/Match makers</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,875</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Male Working Population</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.7 Number of Artisan Shops by Cuartel, 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbería (Barbershops)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpintería (Wheelwright shops)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerería (Wax-chandler's shops)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtiduría/ Leather craft shops</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábrica de rebozos (Shawl weaver's shops)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábrica de velas (Candle factories)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrería (Blacksmith's workshops)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hojalatería (Tinsmith's shops)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panadería (Bakeries)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platería (Silversmith's workshops)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sastreña (Tailor's shops)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombrerería (Hat workshops)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapatería (Shoe workshops)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Workshops in the Cuartel</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Workshops in the City</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail commerce, trade, and finance</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>587</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Businesses in the City</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 5.8 Location of Quotients by Industry and Cuartel, 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbería (Barbershops)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpintería (Wheelwright shops)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerería (Wax-chandler's shops)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtiduría/ Leather craft shops</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábrica de rebozos (Shawl weaver's shops)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábrica de velas (Candle factories)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrería (Blacksmith's workshops)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hojalatería (Tinsmith's shops)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panadería (Bakeries)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platería (Silversmith's workshops)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sastrería (Tailor's shops)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombrerería (Hat workshops)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapatería (Shoe workshops)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail commerce, trade, and finance</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX AF

### Table 5.9, Residential Proximity Among Artisans, 1838-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Total Artisans</th>
<th>Living Side by Side</th>
<th>Living Within 5 Households</th>
<th>Living Within 10 Households</th>
<th>Living Outside 10 Households</th>
<th>Total Percent of Artisans Living Within 5 Households or Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand weavers</td>
<td>421 40.4</td>
<td>155 36.8</td>
<td>44 10.5</td>
<td>52 12</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>448 39.1</td>
<td>163 36.4</td>
<td>50 11.2</td>
<td>60 13</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>297 29</td>
<td>118 39.7</td>
<td>36 12.1</td>
<td>57 19</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>155 23.2</td>
<td>60 38.7</td>
<td>15 9.7</td>
<td>44 28</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>227 14.1</td>
<td>88 38.8</td>
<td>30 13.2</td>
<td>77 34</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>194 14.4</td>
<td>59 30.4</td>
<td>44 22.7</td>
<td>63 33</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>93 14.3</td>
<td>15 16.1</td>
<td>14 15.1</td>
<td>42 45</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>35 14.3</td>
<td>6 17.1</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>22 63</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>47 4.3</td>
<td>12 25.5</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>31 66</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>81 2.5</td>
<td>13 16</td>
<td>15 18.5</td>
<td>51 63</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>70 0</td>
<td>4 5.7</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>59 84</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,068 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>693 33.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>259 12.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>558 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5.10 Residential Proximity among Artisans, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>Next door</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Within 5</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Within 10</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Beyond 10</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/wheelwrights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX AH

### Table 5.11, Proximity of the Artisans to a Shop of the Same Craft, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Total Artisans</th>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Living Within 0 to 2 Blocks</th>
<th>Living Within 3 to 4 Blocks</th>
<th>Living Within 5 or more Blocks Away</th>
<th>Total Percentage of Artisans Living Within 4 Blocks or Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl weavers</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>184 (91.5)</td>
<td>15 (7.5)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11 (68.8)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/wheelwrights</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>103 (67.8)</td>
<td>35 (23.0)</td>
<td>14 (9.2)</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>37 (38.9)</td>
<td>19 (20.0)</td>
<td>39 (41.1)</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather craftsmen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (13.3)</td>
<td>8 (53.3)</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>51 (30.4)</td>
<td>77 (45.8)</td>
<td>40 (23.8)</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (15.0)</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25 (20.8)</td>
<td>28 (23.3)</td>
<td>67 (55.8)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>6 (60.0)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmiths</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4 (19.0)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
<td>11 (52.4)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7 (17.5)</td>
<td>14 (35.0)</td>
<td>19 (47.5)</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>858</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>434 (50.6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>206 (24.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>218 (25.4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.12, Shop Owners by Residential Proximity of the Same Craft, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Next door</th>
<th>Within 5</th>
<th>Within 10</th>
<th>Beyond 10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (% )</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner of Business</td>
<td>6 15.8</td>
<td>12 31.6</td>
<td>6 15.8</td>
<td>14 36.8</td>
<td>38 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Owner of Business</td>
<td>70 18.5</td>
<td>96 25.4</td>
<td>55 14.6</td>
<td>157 41.5</td>
<td>378 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76 18.3</td>
<td>108 26.0</td>
<td>61 14.7</td>
<td>171 41.1</td>
<td>416 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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