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Abstract
This research originated in a study of the development of class consciousness among some British workers immediately before and after the First World War. In attempting to understand the different strands of thought, the different purposes and intentions of workers in both Glasgow and Liverpool the most important concepts became those of the 'social organism' and 'commonsense thought' derived from Gramsci.

Part 1 outlines the reasons why Gramsci's approach was considered the most important for this study. It is argued that through Gramsci it is possible to understand the relationship between social being and consciousness, base and superstructure, as an 'organic totality' rather than an 'essential totality' (Lukacs) or a 'unity totality' (Althusser).

In Part II the approach of the 'organic totality' is applied to a study of the social structures of Glasgow and Liverpool before the First World War with respect to their industrial structure, their 'natural' social organisms, the 'voluntary social organism' and the commonsense thought held by working men in those towns. The comparison between the two cities is fruitful because before the First World War the great conurbations of British society can still be studied as unique totalities.

In Part III, the different 'organic totalities' of Glasgow and Liverpool are then related to the different beliefs that developed in those towns. The Liberal 'commonsense' of the workers city of Glasgow was the setting for the development of an extremely radical ILP and all the 'societies' of the revolutionary Socialists; in Liverpool the commonsense of Tory Democracy and Irish Nationalism in a casual workers city was the setting for the
development of a right-wing lib-labism and an insurrectionary syndicalism. Moreover different patterns of political and industrial activity developed in the two towns; in Glasgow it was possible to believe in an evolutionary road to socialism, in Liverpool, riot always appeared a more likely path.
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Chapter 1  Introduction: The Problem

The original intention of undertaking research into the early years of the Glasgow and Liverpool labour movement in this century, was to 'chart' the development of a working class consciousness out of, and in relation to, a pre-war and war-time 'popular consciousness'. Initially the assumption was made that 'popular consciousness' was similar in the 1910s and the 1930s in both towns, and that the development of class consciousness was a process inherent in the very situation of the working class in a period of capitalist crisis. Many of the assumptions derived from Lukacs famous essay "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat"\(^1\), from Goldmann's "The Hidden God",\(^2\) and also from the various British 'community' studies of working class life that had been written in the 1950s.

But in studying Glasgow it was clear that the 'cultures' of different neighbourhoods in Glasgow depended upon extremely complicated sets of factors that were not necessarily related to the neighbourhood itself and that in fact the notions of 'culture' and 'community' were a hindrance to the study. Moreover, the different forms that revolutionary thought took in Glasgow and Liverpool also demonstrated that the development of the world vision of socialism, class consciousness, was not an inherent

process.

Goldmann's development of Lukacs theory of world vision,

"We believe that a social class is defined by
(a) its function in production;
(b) its relations with the members of other classes, and;
(c) its potential consciousness which is always a world vision."

had created a theory where a world vision became not only the
expression of the consciousness of a social class, but, necessarily,
an exclusive expression - one social class and one world vision.
But the 'world vision' of the British ruling class in the 19th
century - Liberalism - was quite different from that of the later
20th century - Modern Conservatism.

And this difference mattered to the history of the working class.
The craft workers who participated in the 'commonsense' of Liberalism
in Glasgow before the First World War had a quite different set of
assumptions from that of the post-1930s working class. The history
of the 'First Shop Stewards Movement' in Glasgow can't simply
be transposed to the working class today.

Approaching the history of Glasgow and Liverpool through
the concepts of 'culture', 'community', 'world vision' left too
many factors unexplained therefore it was necessary to find an
alternative theory. At the end of the 1960s two theories were
becoming 'fashionable' in dealing with the problem of ideology and
consciousness: in sociology the theories of the phenomenologists -

particularly Schutz and Berger and Luckmann - were influential, and in Marxism the first impact of Structuralist thought - via Levi-Strauss, and then Althusser - was being felt.

Berger and Luckmann's "The Social Construction of Reality" was a work that replaced concepts like 'culture', 'community' and 'world vision' with a concept even more vast and global, even less specific - that of 'everyday thought'.

"Theoretical thought, 'ideas', Weltenschauungen' are not that important in society. Although every society contains these phenomena, they are only part of the sum of what passes for 'knowledge'. Only a very limited group of people in any society engages in theorising, in the business of 'ideas' and the construction of Weltenschauungen. But everyone in society participates in its 'knowledge' in one way or another".

But the everyday thought of working men in Glasgow and Liverpool pre-First World War was not an 'everyday' construction of social reality, with its own validity derived from 'everyday experience' - or why would a Liberal 'construction of reality' exist in one and a Conservative in the other. The 'social construction of reality' of Glasgow and Liverpool men in the 1900s obviously depended on industrial, social and political processes that had matured by the 1880s. And the history of the Liverpool working class, a history of the Conservative Working Men's Association, Orange lodges and the enormous syndicalist strike wave of 1911, was particularly problematic.

The 'new' Marxism of Althusser didn't help explain Liverpool either. The belief systems of workers in Glasgow and Liverpool could not be reduced to being 'hailed' by the family-education couple of Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses. Despite the separate cultural systems of Protestant and Catholic families, and the separate education systems, both Protestants and Catholics were also capable of seeing each other as workers and acting together.

Althusser has since added the argument of the existence of a Proletarian 'class instinct'. But in that case we are left with the argument that in Liverpool in 1909 (anti-Catholic riot) and 1912 (signing the Covenant) the family-education 'couple' won, and in 1911 the Transport Strike it didn't - class instinct won. But why? And why was it normal for 'class instinct' to win in Glasgow, and for the 'family-education' couple to win in Liverpool. We merely return to the question that I first started with.

The problem was that neither of the two 'new' positions of phenomenology or Althusserian Marxism could solve the problem of contradictory consciousness either. Everything is too static. One constantly returns to the previous questions - why this knowledge? why this interpellation? - particularly in Liverpool where workers appeared to be interpellated differently from year to year.

The only theory that appeared to start from the problem of contradictory consciousness was that of Antonio Gramsci:


"It must first be shown that everyone are 'philosophers', by defining the limits and characteristics of the 'spontaneous philosophy' which is proper to everybody. This philosophy is contained in: 1. language itself, which is a totality of determined notions and concepts and not just of words grammatically devoid of content; 2. 'commonsense' and 'good sense'; 3. popular religion and, therefore also in the entire system of beliefs, superstitions, opinions, ways of seeing things and of acting, which are collectively bundled together under the name of 'folklore'.

... Having first shown that everyone is a philosopher though in his own way and unconsciously, since even in the slightest manifestation of any intellectual activity whatsoever, in language, there is contained a specific conception of the world, one that moves on to the second level, which is that of awareness and criticism.

... When one's conception of the world is not critical and coherent but disjointed and episodic, one belongs simultaneously to a multiplicity of mass human groups. The personality is strangely composite: it contains Stone Age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all past phases of history at the local level and intuitions of a future philosophy which will be that of a human race united the world over."¹

It therefore became necessary to attempt to construct a model using Gramsci's work (especially the Prison Notebooks) that could make sense of the different experiences of the Glasgow and Liverpool working class (see Chapter 2, Part 1). It also, however became necessary to attempt to understand why Gramsci's theoretical assumptions were different from those of other writers, in order to be able to integrate his work with them. Why was Gramsci's model different from other models that were available in sociology or Marxism and why particularly in British sociology and British Marxism which has made a particular study of the British Working Class?

Paradigms in Sociology and Marxism

Kuhn has argued that unlike the natural sciences, the social sciences lack 'paradigms' and thus fail to develop periods of relatively stable 'normal science'. But his argument depends upon an understanding of the concept of paradigm which assumes that a paradigm must contain a basic matrix of answers to certain central questions.

But in the social sciences paradigms have been different: they have tended to be a set of central questions to which different traditions have given different answers. If one understands a paradigm in the social sciences as a central set of problems then it would be possible to divide the history of sociology into three periods:

1. The phase of the 'forefathers' of sociology whose central problematic concerned the attempt to make sense of the history of society. Each major thinker developed their own periodisation of human history and all their models were concerned with the origins of industrial society.

2. The phase of 'classical sociology' where the concern with the origins of industrial society was still present but also a new problem came to the fore: the problem of the 'community'. As Goldmann wrote:

   "...from Hegel to Marx, 'other' men become more and more not beings which I see and understand but beings with whom I act in common. They are no longer on the object side but on the subject side of knowledge and reality".2

1. Thomas S. Kuhn "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (1970)
2. L. Goldmann "The Human Sciences" op cit p.28.
This was not only true for Marx's transition from Hegelian philosophy but also for Weber's transition from German philosophy, and Durkheim's from the French. The transition from the "I" to the "We" was the fundamental question on which Classical sociology developed. The question - What is a community? who is the community? - became the central problem for Weber, for Toennies and for Durkheim.

It was of course, not just a question of philosophy but a real question. Classical sociology arose in the midst of the break up of the old social order as the capitalist mode of production advanced throughout Europe. In Germany in particular, the new social relations based on the rise of capitalism were seen in sharp contrast to the old social relations of landed societies.

3. The Phase of 'Modern Sociology' has been a period in sociological theory where the problems of the origins of industrial society (the problem of the "phase of the forefathers") and also the problem of status groups and social classes (the problem of "Classical Sociology") have both been reworked in the light of a new central paradigm. Underlying the development of the Chicago school of sociology from the 1920s, of 'mass society' theory from the 1930s and of structural functionalism from the 1930s, there arose a new set of assumptions and relevant questions. All these different perspectives shared a common problematic - what is the relationship of the individual to society, how is society present in the individual? In this theory man becomes mass man and the modern world is mass society - undifferentiated, dominated by mass production,
consumption and the mass media. It is this tradition which entered later discussions of post-industrial society.

Thus, in the 1930s, the sociological answer to the question of 'who is my community' became the neighbourhood. The old notion of a community being a social relationship between people whose common interests were a bond of critical significance for the power structure and the industrial structure was lost.

Instead, when neighbourhood became the fount of 'community' culture became a geographical phenomena rather than something pertaining to a particular status group, a particular social class. In structural functionalism, of course, the neighbourhood became the 'national state'. But it was still the same paradigm of the integration of the individual into society, and society into the individual. And, also when, in the 1960s, American sociologists began the break from structural-functionalist orthodoxy of social system, personality system and cultural system, and the imposition of norms values and roles on a socialised subject, they re-emphasised the individual.

The break took the form of studying the contextual determination of meaning (Garfinkel, Douglas) or the way an individual presents himself (Goffman), rather than assuming a 'socialised' man. But it was a break within the same central paradigm - stressing the individual rather than the society, Schutz's 'commonsense world' rather than the cultural system. The community was still to be discovered in 'shared meanings', whether created from below or above, and contradictory consciousness was not a problem.

1. See the summary of this tradition in S. Giner, Mass Society, (Martin Robinson, 1976) which I found very illuminating.
The paradigmic question of this period of Modern Sociology - what is the relationship of the individual to society? - is still the question that dominates American sociology. Moreover, this is now the paradigm adopted by French Marxism although the history of paradigms in Marxism was slightly different.

The three stages that occur in sociological thought also occur in Marxism but in a different form. The paradigms available in Marxist thought have often overlapped with sociological paradigms but have also been distinct.

1. Marx himself tackled both the problem of the transformation of society (the problem of the sociological 'forefathers') and the problem of 'community' (the problem of the classical sociologists) equally. Unlike Weber or Durkheim he never had two separate theories for these problems. Marx's analysis of the 'epochs' of human society, which he first outlined in "The Communist Manifesto" had at its heart the history of class struggle which was also the heart of his theory of community. Weber on the other hand had both a theory of the rise of rationality in the West and a separate theory of class, status and party.

2. The 'Classical Marxists' of the Second and Third International (Luxemburg, Lenin, Trotsky and Lukacs, have probably been the four most influential writers) all concentrated on Marx's second problem: on the question of the working class as the agency of change in the capitalist epoch. What Hindess and Hirst wrote about Lukacs would stand for all four:

"Where Lukacs differs from the bulk of neo-Kantian positions is in his conception of the decisive point of reference for historical investigation. It is not the will and consciousness of the individual that is crucial. Nor is it the role of a determinate spirit of culture in constituting a distinctive mode of life. For Lukacs the decisive point of reference for historical investigation is the will and consciousness of a class" 1.

Of the four, two (Lenin and Luxemburg) also followed in Marx's footsteps in investigating the development of the capitalist mode of production. But, like Lukacs, the central orientation of their work is on the community of class, and the problem of class consciousness. The heritage of the 'classical' period of Marxism was that every phenomenon was directly related to the class structure. Trotsky's analysis of fascism was an analysis of the petty-bourgeoisie rather than an analysis of late monopoly capitalism, for example. With these writers even the analysis of the state was concentrated on the class nature of each state form, not on the development of new state functions in relation to new development in the capitalist mode of production. The Marxism of the 30s started from quite different premises.

3. Modern Marxism like Modern Sociology also arose in the 1930s. The Frankfurt School, the existential Marxists, the structuralist Marxists all shared the subject-society paradigm of modern sociology. The Frankfurt school concentrated their analysis on the rise of fascism on the transformation of monopoly capitalism in the twentieth century, not on the petty-bourgeoisie. Although Lukacs' work was important for them the problem of reification became with them the study of mass culture.

Existentialism emphasised the 'everydayness of freedom' the choices that everyman makes in his life, and from there became involved in Husserl's phenomenology (developing the concepts of 'bad faith' and the situation'). Against the mechanistic Marxism of Stalinism and Durkheim's domination of the social sciences in France, the existentialists reaffirmed the importance of the individual against that of society, or 'the mode of production'.
When structuralism reacted against existentialism in France, first in the work of Levi-Strauss, and then in the work of Althusser, it was to re-emphasise society over the subject, not to reconstruct Marxism around the problems of the 'classical Marxists', the problem of the 'community', the social class. In Althusserian Marxism the subject is the victim of society in a way he is not in classical Marxism where collectively the workers are seen as the agency of social change. For this reason Thompson's comparison between Parsons and Althusser is a legitimate comparison.

The Paradigms in British Sociology and Marxism

From the 1950s, various traditions in the British social sciences concentrated their research into the ways of life and patterns of thought of the British working class. Initially research was concerned with uncovering working class sub-cultures that were resistant to dominant cultural forms (Institute of Community Studies, Hoggart etc.) and shared a common concern with the transformations that 'affluence' might bring to such sub-cultures.1

Increasingly, however, research into working class styles of life became dominated by quite a different paradigm from that of the culture - sub-culture studies. In 1966 Lockwood developed a typology that was to underlie the research projects of a new group of neo-Weberian sociologists for the next decade:

"... on the basis of existing research, it is possible to delineate at least three different types of workers and to infer that the work and community relationships by which they are differentiated from one another may also generate very different forms of social consciousness. The three types are as follows: first, the traditional worker of the 'proletarian' variety whose image of society will take the form of a power model; second, the other variety of traditional worker, the 'deferential', whose perception of social inequality will be one of status hierarchy; and third, the 'privatised' worker, whose social consciousness will most nearly approximate what may be called a 'pecuniary' model of society."2

In attempting to explore the necessary relationship between occupation and community, and 'images of society' held by these three

1. A partial review of such studies is given in Chas Critcher's essay on working class community studies in J. Clarke, C. Critcher, R. Johnson, "Working Class Culture" Hutchinsons (1979)

types of workers, these sociologists were returning to the central paradigm of Weber and all classical sociologists - the search for a 'community' through which men understood their world.

When Weber argued against Marx,

"classes are not communities...In contrast to classes status groups are normally communities" 1.

he was identifying an alternative social group to that of class that could be expected to hold similar beliefs and to act in similar ways. Similarly the neo-Weberian sociologists have made it clear that their concern with worker's images of society is quite distinct from a concern with the problem of class consciousness; 2 the category of occupational community cannot be confused with the category of class.

At the same time, of course, one group of British social scientists - the Marxist historians - were attempting to discuss the problem of class consciousness in terms of the classical Marxist understanding of 'community'. While Thompson and later followers explored the formation of the working class in the early nineteenth century through the development of class consciousness; Hobsbawm and his followers explored the very different 'craft' consciousness of the labour aristocracy in order to explain the absence of such class consciousness in the latter half of the 19th century 3.


2. M. Bulmer ed. "Working Class Images of Society" (1975) Quotes J. Goldthorpe on the distinction between class consciousness and working class images of society on p.5

Thus both the neo-Weberian sociologists and the British Marxist historians have shared a common starting point and a similar central concern. Both have been concerned to discover the 'community' - whether class, class fraction or occupational community - through which men gain and develop their own understanding of the world. They have thus clung tenaciously to the central project of Marx and the classical sociologist with the result that both British sociology and history have had a decidedly 'old-fashioned' look compared with the earth shattering debates in America (structural functionalism versus the social interactionists) which were essentially debates posed around the much newer paradigm of the subject in society and society in the subject.

It may well be that Hegelian Marxists had such an impact in the 1960s and early 1970s in Britain because it was a tradition that shared a common starting point of the identification of a 'community'. For the tradition of Lukacs (and later Goldmann) the subject of history is a collective subject, a 'community', the class subject.

Lukacs and Goldmann's work has had a clear influence on Raymond Williams and thus - through him - Thompson and the other historians. (Despite Thompson's explicitly anti-Hegelian stance). It can be argued that the early version of Gramsci that was influential in Britain is a version which was heavily coloured by a simultaneous reading of Lukacs and Goldmann and that Gramsci's concept of hegemony was interpreted as merely an expanded version

1. R. Williams "Base and Superstructure in Marxist cultural theory" , New Left Review 82
of Goldmann’s world visions.¹

Certainly all three traditions, British Marxist historiography, neo-Weberian sociology and Hegelian Marxism, have dealt with very similar problems:

i. What is the relationship of the specific community identified to the held beliefs of the people who make up that community? Does the 'fact' of class imply a particular set of beliefs which is class consciousness? Does the 'fact' of an occupational community imply a particular image of society?

ii. What is the relationship of these beliefs to social action - whether of pamphleteering, rioting or voting?

iii. How far do the beliefs of a 'community' constrain and construct the individual member of that community and how far do individuals create the 'community themselves?

It is this third problem - the vexed problem of 'voluntarism', of 'men making history' - that has not only been the most problematic for all three traditions but has also focused attention upon the difficulties inherent in problems i. and ii. Of all three traditions the British Marxist historical tradition has appeared the most 'voluntaristic', allowing most scope for the part played by the individual in the development and sustaining of attitudes and beliefs - and the Hegelian Marxist and neo-Weberian have appeared almost equally deterministic. It is on this question that all three traditions now appear to be at a crossroads.

From within the tradition of Marxist historiography has come the demand that the experience of the working class must not

¹ see Gwyn Williams early article "The Concept of Egomania" Journal of History of Ideas 1960
be narrowly conceived in terms of true working class consciousness (for 1790-1830)\(^1\) nor in terms of the false status consciousness for some male workers for the rest of the 19th century.\(^2\) It has been argued that any model of class consciousness must be able to explain both progressive political beliefs and reactionary political beliefs held at one and the same time - that to repossess the traditions of the working class in terms of its creative response to its own history must not lead one to neglect the extremely contradictory elements in those traditions. The response by Thompson, in particular, has been to attempt to widen the definition of those 'traditions' to include other problems such as women, as crime and social control, but to still put to one side the heart of the problem of contradictory consciousness.\(^3\)

From within the tradition of neo-Weberian has come the argument that it is not possible to understand workers' images of society in any direct relationship to their occupational community. A whole series of attitude studies have taken up this question and have come to similar conclusions: that beliefs, men's normative orientation

1. At present there is a considerable amount of work being done on women and sexual politics in this period, and on the utopian socialists. See B. Taylor and G. Steadman Jones papers to Ruskin History Workshop Dec. 1979.

2. See the debate on the 'labour aristocracy' in recent issues of Society for Labour History Bulletin. Many historians have preferred to use a rough, respectable distinction rather than skilled, unskilled. See Bulletin No. 40, Spring 1980 for debate.

3. E. P. Thompson *Folklore, Anthropology and Social History*, (1979) p.7-8
to behaviour and their predisposition to action are much more complicated and contradictory than had been allowed.\(^1\) However, again, this had led to the attempt to redefine the problem of 'occupational community', within its original frame of reference.

"The trend of the argument, therefore, is to suggest the inadequacy of 'occupational community' as a simple explanatory principle in the understanding of class imagery, and the need to break down the nature of occupational identification, occupational culture and social relations among those who work together, more finely than this simple concept allows."\(^2\)

or alternatively, had led to the argument that we must look instead at the structure of the labour market,\(^3\) or at the necessary development of consciousness associated with the new technology.\(^4\)

From within the tradition of Hegelian Marxism has come an increasing awareness that the attack of Althusser on the 'essentialism' of Lukacs is a genuine hit. Lukacs argument that class consciousness derives from the workers necessary understanding of the commodity structure of capitalism because they too are commodities, and that false consciousness derives from the reification process of capitalism, is too abstract. It is impossible for this model, put forward in "History and Class Consciousness", to distinguish between a racist and a reformist. Thus one of the groups that has been most influenced by Hegelian Marxists - 'Telos' - has increasingly turned to phenomenology and existentialism and to deriving a theory of the subject.

1. see Bulmer, Ed. \textit{op cit.} which presents interim papers on research that has subsequently appeared in book form, see especially chapters by R. Moore and Blackburn and Mann, and Bell and Newby.

2. \textit{Ibid.}, this is Bulmer's position

3. R. M. Blackburn and M. Mann \textit{"The Working Class in the Labour Market"} (1979)

4. The new technology/workers attitudes debate has a separate history. See the summary in D. Gaillie\"In Search of the New Working Class\" (1979)
Moreover, critiques of these traditions have also occurred between themselves. At present there is a sustained attack on the concept of the Labour aristocracy from the neo-Weberians.¹ There is also the attempt among the Marxists to derive a theory of consciousness which is directly linked to the labour process.²

Clearly there are common problems faced by all three traditions standing at all three crossroads. Is it possible to appropriate the totality of social experience through an understanding of a 'particular' community? Does the notion of a 'community' of men who share an understanding of the world and act in common necessarily lead to a rigid theory of what those men should believe and should do, and the discovery of those beliefs, rather than the understanding of what those men do believe and actually do? Finally, if the response of all three traditions has been to ignore the problem of contradictory patterns of thought within their chosen 'community' then is it necessary to abandon the search for a 'community' completely.

Hindess and Hirst would argue that it is necessary to abandon the paradigm of 'community' - the search for a collective subject - in favour of a subject/society paradigm:

"First to treat class action as a form of communal action, that is based in the recognition of common interests by a mass of individuals, is to admit that there may be other, non-class forms of action. The problem here is that once the recognition of common interests on the part of individuals is thought to play a decisive role in class action, then as Weber correctly maintains, there is no reason why other 'common interests', nationality,

¹ See the debate on the concept of labour aristocracy in Social Review, January 1978 and subsequent articles.

religious beliefs, 'race' etc., should not play an equally decisive role in non-class forms of communal action, therefore is to conceive it as one among many of the possible forms of communal action. Class action cannot then be accounted for by reference to class interests since some further explanation is required of why those interests and not others provide the basis for communal action."

I would not agree that any classical sociologist's theory of 'community' was ever about a 'mass of individuals' (which is derived from the later paradigm of subject/society); but Hindess -and Hirst, et al, have identified correctly two problems of any theory of community. First, why this 'community' - class status group, class fraction, occupational community, religious group - rather than any other; second, what is the further explanation required?

In fact it was the 'non-class forms of communal action' that first began to interest me in my research into Glasgow and Liverpool. Why did workers in Liverpool see themselves as Protestants (when they attacked Catholic marches) or Catholics, or British (when they burned down German delicatessens in 1915) rather than workers (as in 1911 or 1921 or 1926)? 'Non-class forms of communal action' appeared to me to really exist in Liverpool in my period (and in less extreme forms in Glasgow) and I saw no reason to dismiss the problem simply because it had been discussed by Max Weber. (Other Marxists have been known to quote Spinoza).

The problem for me became understanding the relationship between the two 'communities' of the nation, of race, of religion and all other forms of non-class communities that existed in Glasgow and Liverpool to the potential 'community' of class. Hindess and Hirst et al

1. Cutler, Hindess, Hirst and Hussein "Marx's Capital and Capitalism Today" Vol. 1 op cit p.188.
are correct: a 'further explanation' is required if we are not to reduce all beliefs, all understanding of the world to some imputed position derived from the 'fact' of class, of the labour process, of occupation, of new technology etc. Fortunately, such a position can be found in the work, not of Max Weber, but of Antonio Gramsci.

The problems of all three traditions that have started from the problem of the 'community' appear to me to be similar. First there is an inability to deal with the problem of contradictory consciousness; second, there is an inability to deal the the problem of consciousness being determined by 'communities' that are not the ones chosen for study; thirdly, there is a lack of a separate discussion of the problem of ideology. Thus in all three positions the discussion of class consciousness or of images of society muddles together the discussion of the beliefs that people generally hold (in all their contradictions), the beliefs that are associated with their identification with a particular community, and the beliefs associated with a well-developed coherent ideological position. In fact the first and third problems are collapsed into the second.

I would argue that it is possible to construct an approach using Marx and Gramsci that is essentially within the same paradigm as the British Marxist historians and the Hegelian marxists but can deal with all three dimensions distinctly by developing Marx's and Gramsci's theory of ideology, Gramsci's theory of 'commonsense' thought, and Marx's and Gramsci's theory of consciousness separately.

The more, my problems came to be:

a. How to understand the creation of 'communities' that were not class communities.

b. The relationship of such 'communities' to a particular epoch, a particular mode of production (note, not an 'economy' or an
economic practice)

c. The relationship of such 'communities' to contradictory consciousness.
d. The relationship of such 'communities' to the class formation.
e. The influence of such 'communities' on the development and forms of class consciousness.
f. The sudden development of class action, of forms of class consciousness, in the midst of such 'non-class communities' ....the more I turned to Gramsci's paired concepts of the 'social organism' and 'commonsense thought'.
Chapter 2  Gramsci's solution

I. Marx and Gramsci: the problem of ideology, consciousness and Commonsense.

For Marx and for Gramsci the problem of ideology was extremely complicated. In discussing 'spiritual production' Marx points to the problem of distinguishing between the 'free spiritual production' of an epoch and the specific ideologies of a ruling class:

"In order to examine the connection between spiritual production and material production it is above all necessary to grasp the latter itself not as a general category but in definite historical form. Thus for example different kinds of spiritual production correspond to the capitalist mode of production and to the mode of production of the Middle Ages ... Further from the specific form of material production arises in the first place a specific structure of society, in the second place a specific relation of men to nature. Their state and their spiritual outlook is determined by both. Therefore also the kind of their spiritual production.

Finally, by spiritual production Storch means also all kinds of professional activities of the ruling class, who carry out social functions as a trade, the existence of these strata, like the function they perform, can only be understood from the specific historical structure of their productive relations.

Because Storch does not conceive material production itself historically ... he deprives himself of the basis on which alone can be understood partly the ideological components of the ruling class, partly the free spiritual production of this particular social formation."

Thus Marx is making a distinction between belief systems generated within a social formation, and beliefs created by the ruling class of that formation. He is also arguing that one must understand the role of the intelligentsia from the 'specific historical structure of their productive relations.'

Of all the later Marxists it is only Gramsci who comes to an almost identical understanding of the problem of 'spiritual production'.

as being determined by both the 'age' in which it is produced, and
the class relations of that age, simultaneously. Thus Gramsci's theory
of hegemony is much wider than Lukacs-Goldmann's theory of world
vision because for Gramsci any hegemony is organic to both a
specific mode of production and a specific class formation.

"The capitalist entrepreneur creates alongside himself
the industrial technician, the specialist in politics,
the organisers of a new culture, of a new legal system
... If not all entrepreneurs, at least an elite amongst
them must have the capacity to be an organiser of society
in general, including all its complex organisms of
service, right up to the state organisms, because of the
need to create the conditions most favourable to the expansion
of their own class; or at least they must possess the
capacity to choose the deputies (specialised employees)
to whom to entrust this activity of organising the
general system of relationships external to the business
itself. It can be observed that the 'organic' intellectuals
which every new class creates alongside itself and
elaborates in the course of its development, are for the
most part 'specialisations' of partial aspects of the
primitive activity of the new social type which the new
class has brought into prominence."¹

(my emphasis J.S.)

Gramsci also develops a distinction between 'traditional'
intellectuals - the Churchmen, university men - 'inherited' by the
capitalist ruling class and the new layer of intellectuals created
'organically' within the mode of production itself. He further
distinguished between those ideologies that are organic, and those
that are semi-organic (the creation of the 'traditional' intellectuasl
within the new mode of production).²

And Gramsci distinguishes between 'organic' ideologies, and
arbitrary ones.

1. A. Gramsci 'Selections from the Prison Notebooks' ed. by
Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith (1971) p.5
2. Ibid., p.5
"One must therefore distinguish between historically organic ideologies, those, that is, which are necessary to a given structure and ideologies that are arbitrary, rationalistic or 'willed'. To the extent that ideologies are historically necessary they have a validity which is 'psychological'; they 'organise' human masses, and create 'the terrain' on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle etc. To the extent that they are arbitrary they only create individual movements' polemics and so on". 1

Thus Marx and Gramsci's arguments on 'spiritual production' are considerably more complex and complicated than concepts such as 'world visions', 'working class culture' or 'Ideological State Apparatus'. Marrying them together one would have to distinguish between

1. 'The free spiritual production' of a particular social formation such as capitalism or feudalism.

2. Organic ideologies that are 'necessary' to a given mode of production and which presumably change as the mode of production changes. (Thus the difference between the hegemony of Liberalism in the middle of the 19th century and the hegemony of Conservatism in the middle of the 20th century. Such organic ideologies are clearly also related to the development of the ruling class but it is not necessary to relate every intellectual directly to that class.


5. Traditional ideologies that have remained available or have been transformed.

But this approach, although extremely complex, is not the whole story. For Gramsci there is a difference between the process

of formation of the hegemony of a dominant class - whose organic intellectuals can be born in the mode of production itself - and the process of formation of the organic intellectuals of a subordinate class.

The 'organic intellectuals' of the working class cannot be formed in a 'socialist' mode of production but have to be created in a socialist organisation. Gramsci's central questions concerned both the analysis of hegemony in the modern Italian state, and the creation of a proletarian 'collective will.' The starting point for this discussion was his analysis of 'commonsense' consciousness.
2. Gramsci's Theory of Consciousness

For Gramsci consciousness is as complex a problem as the problem of 'ideology' because it is the bits and pieces of many different 'ideologies' that make up the general state of consciousness. For Gramsci everyone is a 'philosopher' - albeit a chaotic one.

"It is essential to destroy the widespread prejudice that philosophy is a strange and difficult thing just because it is the specific intellectual activity of a particular category of specialist or of professional and systematic 'philosophers'. It must first be shown that all men are 'philosophers' by defining the limits and characteristics of the spontaneous philosophy' which is proper to everybody: This philosophy is contained in:

1) Language itself, which is a totality of determined notions and concepts and not just of words grammatically devoid of content;
2) 'common sense' and 'good sense';
3) popular religion and, therefore, also in the entire system of beliefs, superstitions, opinions, ways of seeing things and acting which are collectively bundled together under the name of 'folklore'.

Gramsci expands on this understanding. He argues that religion is but a part of 'commonsense' — a part of the chaotic and contradictory understanding of the world — and that commonsense is the 'uncritical' way of perceiving the world that is common in any epoch whilst good sense is the beginnings of critical thought.

"It is to be observed that religion and commonsense do not coincide either, but that religion is an element of fragmented commonsense. Moreover commonsense is a collective noun, like religion: there is not just one commonsense, for that too is a production and a part of a historical process".

If there are many 'commonsense's', if there are many ways of perceiving the world how do masses of people choose between them? Gramsci discusses this problem when he discusses the task of spreading a 'new philosophy' (i.e. socialism) among the masses. He argues in fact that it is the 'social group' to which a man belongs which

1. A. Gramsci SPNB op cit, p.323.
2. Ibid., p.325-6.
is decisive.

"... in the masses as such, philosophy can only be experienced as a faith. 
... On what elements, therefore can his philosophy be founded and in particular his philosophy in the form which has the greatest importance for his standards of conduct?
  The most important element is undoubtedly one whose character is determined not by reason but by faith. But faith in whom, or in what? In particular in the social group to which he belongs, in so far as in a diffuse way it thinks as he does. The man of the people thinks that so many like-thinking people can't be wrong, not so radically as the man he is arguing against would like him to believe; he thinks that, while he himself, admittedly, is not able to uphold and develop his arguments as well as the opponent, in his group there is someone who could do this and could certainly argue better than this particular man he has against him; and he remembers, indeed, hearing expounded, discursively, coherently, in a way that left him convinced, the reason behind his faith."

Because of this position Gramsci does not believe in the possibility of a stable working class culture, or working class 'images of society' which somehow resist the dominant beliefs of a society.

"... These considerations lead, however, to the conclusion that new conceptions have an extremely unstable position among the popular masses; particularly when they are in contrast with orthodox convictions (which can themselves be new) conforming socially to the general interests of the ruling class."

Thus Gramsci situates the task of the revolutionary party as forming a body of men of 'discipline and faith' whose ways of thinking are not commonsense but good sense, critical conceptions. Gramsci's concept of 'commonsense', like his concept of 'folklore' is not a concept of 'culture'; culture implies a much too unified

2. Ibid., p. 339-340
coherent, understanding. On the contrary 'commonsense' is contradictory, fragmented, individual men can participate in it differently. It is the task of the party - philosophers, the middle elements; and the men of faith - to intervene in the world of commonsense and to establish the 'faith' of socialism.

Thus the core of Gramsci's theory of philosophers and intellectuals is not their situation as great representative writers, the exponents of the maximum potential consciousness of a class (Goldmann), but their role as 'leaders'. He argues "The expression of the 'leader' is his 'action'. The leader in politics may be an individual but (may) also be a more or less numerous political body." This is true of both the leaders of the proletarian party and leaders of an earlier hegemony. He writes of Machiavelli,

"The active politician is a creator, an initiator; but he neither creates from nothing nor does he move in the turbid void of his own desires and dreams. He bases himself on effective reality, but what is this effective reality? Is it something static and immobile or is it not rather a relation of forces in continuous motion and shift of equilibrium? If one applies one's will to the creation of a new equilibrium among the forces which really exist and are operative - basing oneself on the particular force which one believes to be progressive and strengthening it to help it to victory - one still moves on the terrain of effective reality; but does so in order to dominate and transcend it (or to contribute to this). What 'ought to be' is therefore concrete; indeed it is the only realistic and historicist interpretation of reality, it alone is history in the making and philosophy in the making, it alone is politics." 2

Gramsci's thoughts on the role of the revolutionary party are paralleled by an understanding of 'false consciousness' which is also actively created. He develops a theory of 'legislators' of

2. Gramsci, SPNB, op cit, p.172.
society, men who create the 'parties' which impose norms of conduct on the masses.

"In general, it may be said that the distinction between ordinary men and others who are more specifically legislators is provided by the fact that this second group not only formulates directives which will become a norm of conduct for the others, but at the same time creates the instruments, by means of which the directives themselves will be 'imposed' and by means of which it will verify their execution. Of this second group, the greatest legislative power belongs to the state personnel (elected and career officials), who have at their disposal the legal coercive powers of the State. But this does not mean that the leaders of 'private' organisms and organisations do not have coercive sanctions at their disposal too, ranging even up to the death penalty. The maximum of legislative capacity can be inferred when a perfect formulation of directives is matched by a perfect arrangement of the organisms of execution and verification, and by a perfect preparation of the 'spontaneous' consent of the masses who must 'live' those directives, modifying their own habits, their own will, their own convictions to conform with those directives and with the objectives which they propose to achieve."

These legislators are active in relationship to both the social formation and on behalf of a specific social class. Gramsci returns again and again to the idea of 'private' social organisms, which, alongside of the state proper, organise the 'spontaneous' consent of the masses.

It is this 'spontaneous consent of the masses' which is at the heart of the process of false consciousness.

"I have remarked elsewhere that in any given society nobody is disorganised and without party, provided that one takes organisation and party in a broad and not a formal sense. In this multiplicity of private associations (which are of two kinds: natural and contractual or voluntary) one or more predominates relatively or absolutely - constituting the hegemonic apparatus of one social group over the rest of the population (or civil society): the basis of the state in the narrow sense of the government-coercive apparatus."

1. Gramsci, SPNB op cit.p.266

2. Ibid., p.264-265.
In other words the 'ideas and opinions' of each man is organised through the 'private associations' - both natural and voluntary - of which he is a member. Moreover these private associations have a direct function in the hegemonic apparatus of the ruling class constituting the moment of 'consent' in that rule, alongside the moment of coercion.

Gramsci was insistent on the importance of the understanding of ideology materially; he argued:

"Furthermore, another proposition of the philosophy of praxis is also forgotten: that 'popular beliefs' and similar ideas are themselves material forces."¹

and, elsewhere,

"Every philosopher is, and cannot but be, convinced that he expresses the unity of the human spirit, that is, the unity of history and nature. Indeed, if such a conviction did not exist, men would not act, they would not create new history, philosophies would not become ideologies and would not in practice assume the fanatical granite compactness of the 'popular beliefs' which assume the same energy as 'material forces' "²

His concept of 'social organisms', natural and voluntary, allows us to rethink the process by which 'popular beliefs' assume fanatical granite compactness, by means of understanding the creation of different 'men-masses' schooled in such beliefs.


2. Ibid., p. 404.
3. Gramsci's theory of the Social Organisms

In his essay "What is man" Gramsci argues that "it is necessary to reform the concept of man":

"... one must conceive of man as a series of active relationships (a process) in which individuality, though perhaps the most important, is not, however, the only element to be taken into account. The humanity which is reflected in each individuality is composed of various elements: 1. the individual; 2. other men; 3. the natural world. But the latter two elements are not as simple as they might appear. The individual does not enter into relations with other men by juxtaposition, but organically, in as much, that is, as he belongs to organic entities which range from the simplest to the most complex. Thus Man does not enter into relations with the natural world just by being himself part of the natural world, but actively, by means of work and technique. Further: these relations are not mechanical. They are active and conscious. They correspond to the greater or lesser degree of understanding that each man has of them. So one could say that each one of us changes himself, modifies himself to the extent that he changes and modifies the complex relations of which he is the hub. In this sense the real philosopher is, and cannot be other than, the politician, the active man who modifies the environment, understanding by environment the ensemble of relations which each of us enters to take part in. If one's own individuality is the ensemble of these relations, to create one's personality means to acquire consciousness of them and to modify one's own personality means to modify the ensemble of these relations. " 1

Here Gramsci is arguing that men must be conceived as a 'series of active relationships'; that individuals enter into relationships with other men, and not just in opposition to them; that, further all men enter into 'social organisms' of some kind from the 'simplest to the most complex'; and that the process of social change is best understood through the transformation of the whole complex of these relationships. Moreover such relationships are active and correspond to the lesser or greater understanding which the individual man possesses and man changes himself.

Further, in the 'Prison Notebooks' Gramsci distinguishes between understandings of the world which are 'mechanically' imposed by a person's environment and understandings of the world in which he participates. In the essay "The Study of Philosophy", Gramsci, having discussed the proposition that all men are philosophers, moves to the question of whether it is better than men should be 'unconscious' philosophers or 'critical ones'.

"In other words, is it better to take part in a conception of the world mechanically imposed by the external environment i.e. by one of the many social groups in which everyone is automatically involved from the moment of his entry into the conscious world (and this can be one's village or province; it can have its origins in the parish and the 'intellectual activity' of the local priest or aging patriarch whose wisdom is law, or in the little old woman who has inherited the lore of the witches or the minor intellectual soured by his own stupidity and inability to act?) Or on the other hand, is it better to work out consciously and critically one's own conception of the world and thus, in connection with the labours of one's own brain, choose one's sphere of activity, take an active party in the creation of the history of the world, be one's own guide, refusing to accept passively and supinely from outside the moulding of one's personality." 1

He then goes on to add in Note 1:

"In acquiring one's conception of the world one always belongs to a particular grouping which is that of all the social elements which share the same mode of thinking and acting. We are all conformists of some conformism or other, always man-in-the-mass or collective man. The question is this: of what historical type is the conformism, the mass humanity to which one belongs? When one's conception of the world is not critical and coherent but disjointed and episodic, one belongs simultaneously to a multiplicity of mass human groups. The personality is strangely composite: it contains Stone Age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all past phases of history at the local level and intuitions of a future philosophy which will be that of a human race united the world over." 2

2. Ibid., p.324.
Thus to understand 'commonsense' thought it is necessary to understand what Gramsci means by a 'particular grouping'.

Clearly Gramsci could mean to imply that one always belongs to the particular 'groupings' of social class. But given his arguments above, that men always belong to a 'party' and that there is never disorganisation because of the multiplicity of 'natural and contractual or voluntary' private associations, and that these private associations constitute the 'hegemonic apparatus of one social group over the rest of the population (or civil society), the basis for the state proper, it is more than likely that he is also referring to 'natural' private associations and 'voluntary' in the term 'groupings'. The ideologies/fragmented philosophies that men participate in thus become specific to the social organisms they participate in as well as to their social class. What then is the difference between 'natural' and 'voluntary' private associations which together make up 'civil society'? 
3a. "Natural" Social Organisms

Gramsci nowhere explores the question of 'natural' private associations, although he remarks on the consciousness of the child:

"But the child's consciousness is not something 'individual' (still less individuated), it reflects the sector of civil society in which the child participates, and the social relations which are formed within his family, his neighbourhood, his village etc." 

Thus Gramsci appears to see the social relations of 'family' and 'neighbourhood' as natural. A similar inference can be drawn from his argument that a 'mechanical' conception of the world is one imposed by 'the many social groups in which everyone is automatically involved from the moment of his entry into the conscious world.'

But the world of the 'natural' is much wider than this. Both Marx and Lukacs argued that the triumph of capitalism was to make the production relationships of capitalism appear 'eternal', 'natural', and Lukacs went further and argued that this process of 'fetishisation' by which commodity relations appear the 'natural' relations in society also affects sexual relations. But neither Lukacs nor Gramsci examined the family in the way that Marx had and therefore it is necessary to put together the work of all three to come to some understanding of the 'natural' social organisms of a society.

In his 'Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State' Engels quotes Marx's abstract of Morgan's "Ancient Society"

"According to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the final instance, the production and reproduction of immediate life. This, again, is of a twofold character: on the one side, the production of the means of existence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools necessary for that production; on the other side, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social organisation under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labour on the one hand and of the family on the other. The lower the development of labour and the more limited the amount of its products, and consequently the more limited also the wealth of the society, the more the social order is found to be dominated by kinship groups. However, within this structure of society based on kinship groups the productivity of labour increasingly develops, and with it private property and exchange, differences of wealth, the possibility of utilizing the labour power of others, and hence, the basis of class antagonisms: new social elements, which in the course of generations strive to adapt the old social order to the new conditions until at last their incompatibilities brings about a complete upheaval. In the collision of the newly developed social classes, the old society founded on kinship groups is broken up. In its place appears a new society, with its control centred in the state, the subordinate units of which are no longer kinship associations but local associations; a society in which the system of the family is completely dominated by the system of property, and in which there now freely develops those class antagonisms and class struggles that have hitherto formed the content of all written history."  

Here, Engels, in summarising Marx, is arguing that according to the materialistic conceptions of history both production and reproduction are the determining factors 'in the final instance'. Here Engels uses the term reproduction to refer to the reproduction of the species rather than the reproduction of a particular mode of production (as Marx uses it in 'Capital' and as Althusser uses it). For him reproduction (species) is bound up with the development of the family and as the development of labour advances so the family is more and more dominated by that development. I cannot here go into the

argument about the relationships of the family to different modes of production; what matters for his argument is the relationship between the family and the division of labour in the capitalist mode of production. Firstly, 'the system of the family is completely dominated by the system of property', but secondly, they are still distinct 'systems'. The family system is dominated by the mode of production but it is not reducible to an Ideological State Apparatus. Like the nation state the family develops as an integral part of the capitalist mode of production but can be seen as a necessary precondition not merely an effect.

Gramsci did not clearly discuss the transformation of the family from epoch to epoch except in his essay on 'Americanism and Fordism', and even in that essay the social organism of the family was not the framework of the analysis (the discussion on masculinity and femininity were the framework) but incidental to it. His own work assumes that the family is a framework for passing some forms of commonsense but does not examine this. Neither of course does Marx, but he does examine the 'natural' attitude in another context - the context of the division of labour.

In Capital Vol. I, Marx starts his analysis of capitalism from the analysis of the commodity. Part of this analysis is a discussion of how, when commodity production comes to dominate the totality of production, relationships between people cease to be understood in their true form: human beings no longer see themselves as relating directly to each other except through the

medium of objects. He argues that in feudal society labour appears in its true form as personal relationships between the feudal lord and the serf and the church and the serf (though totally distorted through religion). But in capitalist society labour appears in disguise as social relationship between commodities, the products of labour:

"The relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. There is a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes the fantastic form of a relation between things." 1

This argument - the argument of the fetishisation of commodities - is at the heart of Marx's understanding of the 'natural' attitude in capitalism. Only in capitalism is it 'natural' for men to conceive that relationships between things are real social relations i.e. that 'capital' builds a factory, rather than brickies, carpenters, plasterers, that 'money' is 'capital'.

"This I call the Fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities." 2

Gramsci does not share this understanding of the 'natural' attitude and I think this is for definite historical reasons. The

1. K. Marx, Capital (1961), Vol 1, Part 1, Section 4, pp. 71-83 "The Fetishism of Commodities and the secret thereof". This is the section in Capital most hated by the Althusserians precisely because it is where Marx relates the ideological forms of capitalism to the material conditions of production. See also R. Rosdolsky, "The Making of Marx's Capital" (1977), p. 439 on alienation, fetishisation and commodity production (not simply capitalist relations of production)

2. Ibid.
'natural' attitude, i.e. fetishisation, is not 'natural'. It is an attitude which the bourgeoisie must struggle to impose in the early stages of capitalist development.

For Gramsci living in Italy where the majority of the population did not live in towns, where the proletariat were only first or second generation workers, where the land was still an existing, if subordinate, mode of production in the South, then the 'fetishism' of commodities as a 'natural' attitude did not have the force that it had for Marx. Marx's studies of the 'market' theorists of political economy convinced him of the centrality of this process for all forms of ideology in advanced capitalist society. And this I would agree with. This too is Lukacs starting point in his essay "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat."

Lukacs also starts from the argument that commodity fetishism is a specific problem of the age of modern capitalism. That capitalism depends on the emergence of the "free" worker who is freely able to take his labour-power to market and offer it for sale as a commodity "belonging" to him, a thing that he possesses'. In other words already implicit in the whole process of commodity production is the way the free labourer sees himself both as a person and as a possessor of labour-power. Lukacs goes on "As emphasised above, the worker, too must present himself as the 'owner' of his labour-power, as if it were a commodity. His specific situation is defined by the fact that his labour-power is his only possession. His fate is typical of society as a whole in that this self-objectification, this transformation of a human function into a commodity reveals in all its starkness

1. G. Lukacs, "History and Class Consciousness" (1971), p.91 This argument on fetishisation is only applicable to capitalist societies.
the dehumanised and dehumanising function of the commodity relation."

But labour is not the only function which is transformed into a commodity - it also happens to the function of reproduction. Lukacs quotes Kant on the way the most 'natural' relation becomes deformed with the development of capitalist society, the qualitative shift into commodity production, and the reification of consciousness that therefore takes place. Kant writes:

"Sexual community is the reciprocal use made by one person of the sexual organs and faculties of another ... marriage is the union of two different people of different sexes with a view to the mutual possession of each other's sexual attributes for the duration of their lives."  

Thus for Kant sex/reproduction is a function that has also become a commodity and Lukacs links his argument to the way the process of fetishisation of commodities destroys all 'natural' relationships. Kant, Lukacs argues, is merely naively expressing the way that capitalism indeed does structure personal relationships. Sexuality is a 'thing' to be possessed.

Thus the 'natural' attitude that is imposed 'mechanically' upon a child and upon a human being does not have a totally arbitrary content as Gramsci would imply.

On the contrary, in the very structure of capitalist society which makes capitalist relations of production and of reproduction (species) appear 'natural' and 'eternal', there is an underlying set of presumptions for all ideologies of the dominant hegemony. The more organic those ideologies are the stronger the presumptions about the 'eternal' nature of the capitalist system and the capitalist family.

2. Ibid., p.100
Moreover these presumptions are given added validity by the fact that in capitalism it appears that each individual freely chooses their own employment, freely chooses their own sexual partner and freely chooses where to live. In capitalism the individual freely chooses their neighbourhood. The element of individual consent in these 'natural' social organisms is very strong and masks the structural reality of capitalism that everyone must be a free wage labourer, everyone must participate in a 'privatised' family system (even in a commune) and everyone must live in a 'neighbourhood'.

Starting from Gramsci's approach to the 'natural social organisms' it is possible to rethink the problem of 'traditional' working class 'culture' and working class 'communities'. There is a large body of historical and sociological literature which suggest that the process of creating and recreating belief systems is significantly different in small, one-occupation communities compared with large industrial towns. In many of these 'traditional' communities not only did the crisis-crossing relationships of work, family and neighbourhood take on the solidity of a 'culture' but also some of 'Voluntary' societies - such as the chapel in some Welsh mining districts - took on the appearance of 'naturalness' as well. In such communities it was necessary for almost an entire community to transfer allegiance from one set of politics to another - such as in the transformation that did take place before the First World War in the mining villages, from Liberalism to the Labour world vision.

But in a Liberal town like Glasgow it was perfectly possible for a working man in Glasgow to participate in any number of
voluntary societies none of which had a total appearance of 'naturalness', he could choose to be a friendly society member, a trade unionist, a freemason, a churchgoer - he could also choose passivity.

Although the understanding of 'natural' private associations is critical because, through them, universally, all men are organised into society, this study became interested in the 'voluntary' private associations that men joined and created. It is a study of how men interpret and change their world over short periods of time, rather than a study of the conception of the world 'imposed mechanically by external environment' and embodied in the language, popular folklore, commonsense and the 'natural' societies of the family, workplace and neighbourhood. In so far as these are discussed in Part II they are discussed in relation to the type of 'voluntary societies' and commonsense beliefs that existed in Glasgow and Liverpool.
3b. 'Voluntary' social organisms

For Gramsci the 'voluntary societies' through which the 'subaltern classes' participate, are critical to their formation as a class.

For the subaltern classes they take the place of the state. He argues:

"The historical unity of the ruling classes is realised in the State, and their history is essentially the history of States and of groups of States. But it would be wrong to think that this unity is simply juridical and political (though such forms of unity do have their importance too, and not in a purely formal sense); the fundamental historical unity, concretely, results from the organic relations between State or political society and 'civil society'."

But he goes on to add that for the subaltern classes their history is both intertwined with that of civil society and the state, and also the 'formations' of both the ruling class and their own formations:

"The subaltern classes, by definition, are not unified and cannot unite until they are able to become a 'State': their history, therefore, is intertwined with that of civil society, and thereby with the history of States and groups of States. Hence it is necessary to study: 1. the objective formation of the subaltern social groups, by the developments and transformations occurring in the sphere of economic production; their quantitative diffusion and their origins in pre-existing social groups, whose mentality, ideology and aims they conserve for a time; 2. their active or passive affiliation to the dominant political formations, their attempts to influence the programmes of these formations in order to press claims of their own, and the consequences of these attempts in determining processes of decomposition, renovation or neo-formation; 3. the birth of new parties of dominant groups, intended to conserve the assent of the subaltern groups and to maintain control over them; 4. the formations which the subaltern groups themselves produce, in order to press claims of a limited and partial character; 5. those new formations which assert the autonomy of the subaltern groups, but within the old framework; 6. those formations which assert the integral autonomy,...etc.""
definitions was the absence of such voluntary societies in the

Fascist State:

"It always happens that individuals belong to more than one
private association, and often to associations which are
objectively in contradiction to one another. A totalitarian
policy is aimed precisely: 1. at ensuring that the members of
a particular party find in that party all the satisfactions
that they formerly found in a multiplicity of organisation,
i.e. at breaking all the threads that bind these members
to extraneous cultural organism; 2. at destroying all
other organisations or at incorporating them into a system
of which the party is the sole regulator. This occurs: 1.
when the given party is the bearer of a new culture - then
one has a progressive phase; 2. when the given party wishes
to prevent another force, bearer of a new culture, from
becoming itself 'totalitarian' - then one has an objectively
regressive and reactionary phase, even if that reaction
(as inevitably happens) does not avow itself, and seeks
itself to appear as the bearer of a new culture.
"Luigi Einaudi, in Riforma Sociale for May-June 1931,
reviews a French work Les Societes de la nation, Etude sur
les elements constitutifs de la nation francaise, by E.M.
Saint-Leon in which some of these organisations are
studied - but only those which exist formally. (For example,
do the readers of a newspaper form an organisation, or not?,
etc)"

In Gramsci's theory such 'private associations' were also normally
created by the ruling class; they did not rely on the domination of
their culture alone:

"The state does have and requests consent, but it also
'educates' this consent by means of the political and
syndical associations; these, however, are private
organisms, left to the private initiative of the ruling
class."

Thus Gramsci's theory of 'private organism' is not only important
for his theory of consciousness - but for his theory of the State.
The 'social organisms' that working men participate in can be of very
many different kinds; they can both be created for him, or by him,
or are organic to his class situation or to the mode of production.

2. Ibid, p. 259.
Gramsci uses the terms 'private association' and 'social organism' interchangeably, and the latter term appears to have the same implications as the notion of an 'organic' ideology or 'organic' intellectuals - that is, that these private associations are inherent developments associated with a particular mode of production in a particular epoch. In Britain, the Friendly Societies could be seen in this way: after 1850 they were not merely associated with a particular strata of working men but were 'organic' to the self-regulating market economy of Liberal Britain.

Gramsci's concept of 'social organism' is thus a useful starting point for constructing an approach to deal with the problems of contradictory consciousness, of 'non-class' communities, and of constructing a non-reductionist theory of ideology. The existence of different sets of private associations could give rise to extremely contradictory consciousness - in Liverpool the Protestant associations were always an alternative to Labour associations. These different sets of private associations could construct different neighbourhoods into completely different types of 'communities'. Protestant communities, Irish communities, Welsh communities, rather than dockers' communities or railway communities etc. So the Govan area of Glasgow looked remarkably like an 'occupational community' while the Scotland Road and Kirkdale areas of Liverpool certainly didn't.

Using the concept of 'social organism' also avoids the necessity of postulating the existence of 'world visions' which are the necessary potential consciousness of all members of a social class from the great representative writers downwards, and it opens the question of how that consciousness was actually constructed.
I would argue that world visions did exist in Glasgow and Liverpool in terms of a 'commonsense' approach to the world: Liberal in Glasgow, Tory in Liverpool. But Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' is much wider than that of world vision and incorporates it in a much more complex set of determinations than just the simple one of class/world vision. One must also understand Liberalism as a world vision which was coherent with a particular stage of the development of capitalism in Britain and which was also associated with a particular set of societies and private associations.

Because of this extremely complicated triple interaction between different ideologies, different social organisms and different stages in the development of a mode of production, no determination is a simple one. Many social organisms need not be coherent with the purposes of the social classes from which they draw their membership, and they may be related to a particular epoch or a particular ideology. Similarly, many social organisms may transform themselves from period to period.

However, there are certain questions which must be asked about any social organism, ideology of group of intellectuals: firstly, how organic to the mode of production is this particular private association (ideology, intellectual) and how arbitrary? Secondly, what is the relationship of this social organism to a particular social class? And thirdly, what is the relationship between certain sets of social organisms (particular stage of a mode of production, particular social classes) and particular ideologies and groups of intellectuals? In Marxist analyses of ideology it has been common for the second question to do the work of all three. But Gramsci's theory of social organisms opens up the problem of the relationship between ideology and social structure and class formation in a new way.
4. The problem of the class formation

Gramsci lived and wrote on the 'other side' of Marxist scholarship, i.e. before the revival of interest in Marx's early writings (and the full publication of his analysis of the capitalist mode of production). But it is these works (particularly the mature work of 'Capital') which can provide an approach to the problems of the class formation that can be integrated with that of Gramsci.

Firstly, in exploring civil society Gramsci is returning to Marx's first problem. As many commentators on the young Marx have pointed out, Marx begins his break from Hegelianism by defining himself against Hegel's theory of civil society and the state.

"Hegel distinguished two separate spheres of contemporary life viz. civil society and the political state. In this division which Marx accepted, civil society was the totality of divergent particular interests, individual and collective - empirical daily life with all its conflicts and disputes, the forum in which every individual carried on his day-to-day existence. At the same time as a citizen he was participant in the organisation of the state. Hegel believed that the conflicts within civil society were held in check and rationally synthesized in the supreme will of the state, independent of particular interests. On this point Marx strongly opposes the Hegelian illusion. The division into the two spheres is real, but a synthesis between them is not possible. The state in its present form is not a mediator between particular interests, but a tool of a particular interest of a special kind."\(^1\)

It is in the Introduction to a "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right" that Marx poses against Hegel's conception of the Universalising State the conception of a universal class:

"Which has a universal character by reason of the universality of its sufferings, and which does not lay claim to any specific rights because the injustice to which it is subjected is not particular but general... It cannot liberate itself without breaking free from all the other classes of society and thereby liberating them also." ¹

Thus Marx's theory of class starts from the argument that there is one class which although being a particular community - can become a universal community, and thus potentially represents the interests of the whole of society, and the whole of humanity. It is on the reality of this potential that the rest of his work is developed.

But unlike Lukacs, Marx never assumes that the potential reality is the total reality. In his political writings he time and time again, returns to the analysis of the divergent political interests, individual and collective, which are manifested in every phase of class struggle. For Marx it was necessary to base his practice on both the potential reality (Hal Draper argues this for him was displayed in 1848 ²) and the present. The same is, of course, true of Gramsci. For both of them it was necessary to insert oneself in the total reality in order to be able to create the potential.

Thus in Marx there appears to be two bodies of writings on the problem of class formation: those writings contained in the four volumes of Capital, and his other 'economic' writings, and those writings contained in his political pamphlets, his journalism etc. Very largely the discussion on his theory of social class has actually divided into those who discuss the former and those who discuss the latter i.e. those who discuss the 'logical' writings of Capital where the development of the capitalist mode of production is presented in model form, and those who discuss the 'historical' ¹

writings of the pamphlets where *class struggle* is presented at a particular point in time. Although Marx and Engels stressed that both the logical presentation and the historical presentation were central to their analysis.¹

Those writers who have concerned themselves with the 'model' that Marx presents in *Capital* have concentrated on the way that classes are defined at the point of production. They have thus largely discussed the different 'typologies' of class that emerge from the analysis of the capitalist mode of production in *Capital* i.e. proletarian, petty bourgeois, bourgeois, wage-earners, rentiers, capitalists and concentrated on questions such as the relationship between productive and unproductive labour, socially necessary and socially useless work, the difference between the old petty-bourgeois and the new petty-bourgeois, nature of the peasantry, the lumpen-proletariat etc.

Those writings that have attempted to appropriate Marx 'historically' have tended to concentrate more on the political pamphlets, especially *The Eighteenth Brumaire* and on extremely diverse understanding of class that Marx displays there. It is obviously to such analyses that Gramsci harks back when he describes the type of detailed analyses of the class nature of Italy that must be done.²

But one of the problems of this thesis became the relationship between the types of analysis. Glasgow was a city where the 'proletariat' was classical - heavy productive workers (even Poulantzas would give them credentials). Liverpool was a dockers city, a city of transport, with a workforce split between transport industries and clerical industries.

2. Gramsci: SPNB, p.52-120 Notes on Italian History
It is necessary therefore to consider the class situation of workers in the process of 'circulation' and workers in the process of 'production'. Where the differences of ideas of the Liverpool and Glasgow workers related to these different 'objective' interests a la Lukacs? Or were these differences 'mediated' by the different sets of social organisms that existed in the two cities. Both Glasgow and Liverpool were cities of heavy Irish immigration but the Orange order had a much greater presence in Liverpool than in Glasgow proper (although the mining, iron and steel areas ringing Glasgow were another matter). What was the relationship of these 'social organisms' to the class situation of workers in those cities?
Marx's Theory of Social Class in "Capital"

The structure of Marx's Capital is, as is well known, a dialectical structure. He presents the process of production in Book I, the process of circulation in Book II, and the market (the relationship of I to II) in Book III. Throughout all three books he refers to social classes and class struggle but it is only at the end of Book III that he turns to deal with 'social classes' as such. There he writes:

"There are three great social groups whose members, the individuals forming them, live on wages, profit and ground rent respectively, on the realisation of their labour-power, their capital, and their landed property. However from this standpoint, physicians and officials e.g. would also constitute two classes, for they belong to two distinct social groups, the members of each of these groups receiving their revenue from one and the same sources. The same would also be true of the infinite fragmentation of interest and rank into which the division of social labour splits labourers, as well as capitalists and landlords."

Much argument has hinged on this paragraph and why the manuscript breaks off at this point. It has basically given rise to two different interpretations of Marx theory of class. One interpretation stresses this definition of class as a market definition of class, defining social classes according to their three great incomes, and thus agreeing that the major difference between Marx's analyses of class and Weber's analyses of class is the addition, by Weber, of the theory of status.

The second interpretation argues that in fact Marx's theory of class is a theory of relationships of production and here he is discussing the appearance of class in the market; thus Marx's definition of class as collectivities born in the process of production is completely the opposite of Weber's definition of social class as social relationships born in the market. Whereas the first set of relationships are simple relationships of co-operation or conflict, i.e. proletarian vs bourgeoisie, the second set of relationships are extremely diverse groupings which need not be communities.

But there is a third way of approaching the problem. Just as in 'Capital' Marx outlined his theoretical/logical model of the capitalist mode of production at the level of production (Vol. I) the level of circulation (Vol. II) and then synthesised and developed the analysis of the analysis of both in his analysis of market forces (Vol. III), so Marx's theory of social classes moves through the same process of determination. It is thus both a theory of social class formed in production and of the manifestation of this form in the market. In Vol. I Marx writes,

"Capitalist production, therefore, under its aspect of a continuous connected process, of a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relation; on the one side the capitalist on the other the wage labourer."

and in a footnote he refers to an article that he wrote in 1849 to support this position. Thus although elsewhere in Vol. I Marx refers

to the divisions within the working class and deducts from their numbers
a) the 'ideological' classes and b) the domestic servants\(^1\),
and also discusses the role of the petty-bourgeoisie,

essentially in Vol.I he presents a theory of the 'two great social
classes', and includes the unemployed in the working class.

In Vol. II however Marx writes,

"Capital as self-expanding value embraces not only class
relations, a society of a definite character resting on
the existence of labour in the form of wage-labour. It
is a movement, a circuit-describing process going through
various stages, which itself comprises three different
forms of the circuit-describing process. (i.e. commodity
capital, money capital, productive capital (JS)). Therefore
it can be understood only as motion, not as a thing at
rest."\(^3\)

He then moves on to consider the worker, 'a man who sells his labour',

in the sphere of the double transformation commodity/money

"In order to simplify the matter (since we shall not
discuss the merchant as a capitalist and merchant's
capital until later) we shall assume that this buying
and selling agent is a man who sells his labour. He
expends his labour-power and his labour-time in the
operations 'C-M and M-C. And he makes his living that
way, just as another does by spinning or by making
pills. He performs a necessary function because the
process of reproduction itself includes unproductive
functions. He works as well as the next man, but
intrinsically his labour creates neither value nor
product. He belongs himself to the faux frais of
production...His usefulness consists rather in the
fact that a smaller part of society's labour power
and labour-time is tied up in this unproductive function
....Whatever his pay as a wage labourer he works part
of this time for nothing.... But the two hours of
surplus labour he performs do not produce value any
more than his eight hours of necessary labour, although
by means of the latter a party of the social product
is transferred to him."\(^4\)

1. K. Marx, Capital I, op.cit, p.446
2. Ibid, p.628
3. K. Marx, Capital II, p.105
4. Ibid, p.131
and the same is true of the book-keeping function in this sphere but with this proviso:

"But there is a certain difference between the costs incidental to book-keeping, or the unproductive expenditure of labour-time on the one hand and those of mere buying and selling time on the other. The latter arise only from the definite social formation of the producers of production, from the fact that it is the process of production of commodities. Book-keeping, as the control and ideal synthesis of the process, becomes the more necessary the more the process assumes a social scale and loses its purely individual character. It is therefore more necessary in capitalist production than in the scattered production of handicraft and peasant economy, more necessary in collective production than in capitalist production. But the costs of book-keeping drop as production becomes concentrated and book-keeping becomes social."¹

Thus for the clerks of Liverpool one can understand them as part of the working class - as defined by themselves being wage-earners and owning no means of capital - but a part of the working class which is necessary to the reproduction of capitalism rather than in production itself.

It is clear that Poulantzas' argument that such workers constitute a new petty-bourgeois has no basis in Marx's Capital and in fact owes much more to post-1927 sociological theories of the formation of a 'new middle class', or a service class.²

Moreover Marx points out that although costs of circulation such as buying and selling time and book-keeping can not be considered

'productive', it is not true that other costs which appear to be circulation costs are not 'productive'.

"Costs of circulation, which originate in a mere change of form of value, in circulation, ideally considered, do not enter into the value of commodities. The parts of capital expended as such costs are merely deductions from the productively expended capital so far as the capitalist is concerned. The costs of circulation which we shall consider now are of a different nature. They may arise from processes of production which are only continued in circulation, the productive character of which is hence merely concealed by the circulation form. On the other hand they may be, from the standpoint of society, mere costs, unproductive expenditure of living or materialised labour, but for that very reason they may become productive of value for the individual capitalist, may constitute an addition to the selling price of his commodities...But all labour which adds value can add surplus-value and will always add surplus-value under capitalist production."¹

Marx then considers the difference between 'unproductive costs' i.e. some warehousing etc., and 'productive costs' and argues that

"The general law is that all costs of circulation which arise only from changes in the forms of commodities do not add to their value." ²

But that in the transport industry this general law is different,

"Within each process of production, a great role is played by the change of location of the subject of labour and the required instruments of labour and labour-power - such as cotton trucks from the carding to the spinning room or coal hoisted from the shaft to

2. Ibid, p.149.
the surface. The transition of the finished product or finished goods from one independent place of production to another located at a distance shows the same phenomenon, only on a larger scale. The transport of the products from one productive establishment to another is furthermore followed by the passage of the finished product from the sphere of production to that of consumption. The produce is not ready for consumption until it has completed these movements.1

Thus the docks and railway industries of Liverpool are part of the productive process of capitalism although that part of the production process which appears as the circulation process,

"The circulation i.e. the actual location of commodities in space, resolves itself into the transport of commodities. The transport industry forms on the one hand an independent branch of production and thus a separate sphere of investment of productive capital. On the other hand its distinguishing feature is that it appears as a continuation of a process of production within the process of circulation and for the process of circulation."2

Clearly Poulantzas' argument that productive workers are productive of material goods is not an argument of Marx.3

Furthermore it is also in Vol II that Marx distinguishes between Department I and Department II in the process of production, i.e. between production of the means of production and production of articles of consumption.4 Marx points out (p.508) that this may give the capitalists of Department II some advantages over the capitalist of Department I in that "its labourers have to buy back from it the commodities produced by themselves" thus not only can the capitalists depress wages

2. Ibid, p.152.
(as in Department I) but they can also use systems of falsification "by paying nominally the normal wages but grabbing, alias stealing, back part of them without an equivalent in commodities." But, of course, there is also another major difference, i.e. in the effects of the trade cycle from Department I to Department II.

Thus although Marx argues for the two great potential classes of wage-labourers and capitalists it is also true that the processes of production and circulation themselves create divisions within these two classes. And in *Capital* (Vol.III) he both makes quite clear the existence of the collective capitalist versus the collective labourer and the existence of class fractions within those classes based on differences within the producers of production, circulation and exchange. Both moments comprise the reality of the social totality.

First, in *Capital* (Vol.III) Marx does argue that the process of supervision of labour-power is a function of the collective capitalist as well as the collective worker — that it is part of the mystification of capitalism that it can be seen simply as wage labour:

"Due to the alienated character of capital, its antithesis to labour, being relegated to a place outside the actual process of exploitation itself appears as simple labour process in which the functioning capitalist merely performs a different kind of labour than the labourer. So that the labour of exploiting and the exploited labour both appear identical as labour. The labour of exploiting is just as much labour as exploited labour." The social form of capital falls to interest, but expressed in a neutral and indifferent form. The economic function of capital falls to profit of enterprise but abstracted from the specific capitalist character of this function."

Marx then distinguishes that labour of the 'functioning capitalist' that is necessary and that which isn't

"On the one hand, all labour in which many individuals co-operate necessarily requires a commanding will to co-ordinate and unify the process, and functions which apply not to partial operations but to the total activity of the workshop, much as that of an orchestra conductor. This is a productive job, which must be performed in every combined mode of production.

On the other hand - quite apart from any commercial department - this supervision work necessarily arises in all modes of production based on the antithesis between the labourer, as the direct producer, and the owner of the means of production. The greater this antagonism, the greater the role played by supervision. Hence it reaches its peak in the slave system. But it is indispensable also in the capitalist mode of production, since the production process in it is simultaneously a process by which the capitalist consumes labour-power just as in despotic states supervision and all-round interference by the government involves both the performance of common activities arising from the nature of all communities, and the specific functions arising from the antithesis between the government and the mass of the people." 1

This understanding clearly partially corresponds to Gramsci's understanding of the 'organic intellectuals' and Marx historicises it

"After every crisis there are enough ex-manufacturers in the English factory districts who will supervise, for low wages, what were formerly their own factories in the capacity of managers of the new owners, who are frequently their creditors." 2

It is, of course, only towards the end of 'Capital' (Vol III) that Marx deals with 'ground-rent' and the class of the owners of land, and

1. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. III, op.cit, p.376
2. Ibid, p.380
the question of agricultural workers. Previously he had made the point that it was important in the development of capitalism for there to be the prior existence of private property in land otherwise it was impossible for a class of property-less wage labourers i.e. 'free' wage labourers, to develop.

As in the quotation on the 'three great classes' (as above) Marx distinguishes the landowners from the capitalists,

"In so far as commodity-production and thus the production of value develops with capitalist production so does the production of surplus-value and surplus-product. But in the same proportion as the latter develops, landed property acquires the capacity of capturing an ever-increasing portion of this surplus-value by means of its land monopoly and thereby, of raising the value of its rent and the price of land itself. The capitalist still performs an active function in the development of this surplus-value and surplus-product. But the landowner need only appropriate the growing share in the surplus-product and the surplus-value without having contributed anything to this growth." ¹

Thus there is an objective distinction between the landowners' and the capitalists' role in the development of the productive forces. It is this, I would argue, that provides the material base for the credibility of a large part of the Liberal ideology of the 19th century, that was constructed around an anti-landlord agitation. The ideology had a 'real' element to it, although as a total understanding it was a distortion. But this distinction between landowner and capitalist does not create a similar distinction between agricultural worker and industrial worker.

¹. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. III, op.cit, p.621
Marx clearly sees the agricultural workers as being part of the working class in advanced capitalist societies where agricultural capitalism is the rule.¹ (He makes this distinction on P.610-611).

He argues

"Originally agricultural and industrial labour were not separated; the latter was an adjunct of the former. The surplus-labour and the surplus-product of the land-cultivating tribe, house commune, or family included both agricultural and industrial labour. Both went hand in hand. Hunting, fishing and agriculture were impossible without suitable tools. Weaving, spinning, etc. were first carried on as an agrarian side-line.

We have previously shown that just as the labour of an individual workman breaks up into necessary and surplus-labour, the aggregate labour of the working class may be so divided that the portion which produces the total means of subsistence for the working class (including the means of production required for the purpose) performs the necessary labour for the whole of society. The labour performed by the remainder of the working class may then be regarded as surplus-labour. But the necessary labour consists by no means only of agricultural labour, but also of the labour which produces all other products necessarily included in the average consumption of the labourer. Furthermore from the social standpoint, some perform only necessary labour because others perform only surplus-labour, and vice-versa.

It is but a division of labour between them. The same holds for the division of labour between agricultural and industrial labourers in general."² (My emphasis S3)

Thus when Marx comes, at the end of 'Capital' Vol.III (p.861) to write of "The owners merely of labour, owners of capital, and land-owners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground-rent, in other words, wage-labourers, capitalist and land-owners, constitute the three big classes of modern society based upon the capitalist mode of production"³ he has already explained how that difference in sources of

revenue is grounded in differences in relationship to the mode of production.

"Whatever may be the disparity of these relations in other respects, they all have this in common: Capital yields a profit year after year to the capitalist, land a ground-rent to the landlord, and labour-power, under normal conditions and so long as it remains useful labour-power, a wage to the labourer." 1

This, of course, is quite the opposite of Weber's individualised theory of the origins of social classes in the market, as collectivites of individual income earners and property owners.

But at the same time it is possible to see in Marx's discussion of the process of production, circulation, and then the 'process of capitalist production as a whole' (Vol.III) the basis for class fractions within the working class - class fractions which appear to be the total reality (differential income, productive/unproductive workers, skilled/unskilled, workers of circulation, lumpen-proletariat, three types of unemployed etc. etc.) at the surface of the capitalist mode of production but which mask the essential reality of the opposition between the capitalists and the working class. However in any political analysis, i.e. historical analysis, of the class struggle then these class fractions must be at the centre of the analysis alongside an understanding of the potential conflict of the 'proletariat' vs the bourgeoisie.

This understanding is very important for the question of the development of class consciousness. As I argued in Chapter 1 the central starting point for the understanding of consciousness came to be, for me, the understanding of the question of the creation of

'communities'. Weber had argued that classes were not communities, but that status groups were. But if Glasgow or Liverpool workers had been asked 'with whom do I Act in common' the answer might have varied from - with other protestants, with other freemasons, with other skilled workers, with all other workers, etc. In other words in reality there was a collection of social organisms through which workers could identify (freemasons' lodges, friendly societies, etc.) as well as objective distinctions between workers. Goldmann is correct in arguing that world visions express the 'potential' reality of a social class, but it is not true that only social classes provide a socio-economic basis for the creation of 'communities'. Within the class formation there are socio-economic bases for communities which are not class. These 'communities' are not of the same order as social classes but can be partly founded on fractions within the working class, and can also create such fractions.

These divisions necessarily develop and change as the capitalist mode of production itself develops. Before 'the Second Industrial Revolution' (the machines that made machines) the existence of a skilled labour force was critical for the development of capitalism as a whole. Marx argued that potentially capitalism would increasingly need average labour power but at that point in time the British capitalists were most concerned at retaining a British skilled labour force. During the 19th century a whole series of private associa-
tions/social organisms were born on the distinction between skilled workers and unskilled.

Braverman has explored this transformation of a differentiated working class into a homogenised working class possessing average labour power. He demonstrated the process by which the skilled engineers were desksilled as the planning, supervising part of their labour was transferred to draughtsmen in offices. He has also outlined the process by which these draughtsmen are themselves becoming 'average' labour power as increasingly their own functions become computerised. Furthermore as 'average' labour power becomes the prime requirement of the capitalist mode of production it is possible to supplement the 'private' reproduction of labour power within the family with the reproduction of labour-power by the welfare state. A new workforce is created, 'homogeneous as to skill, but divided according to its functions (whether hospital workers reproducing the working class, or toolmakers, or dockers) and as Marx argued for the agricultural workers it is but a 'division of labour' within the working class. The period 1880-1930 sees all these trends in motion.

But can all the different forms or 'communities' that I discovered in Glasgow and Liverpool be reduced to the existence of this or that class fraction within the spheres of production, circulation, or the process as a whole. Can they be reduced to the particular stage of capitalist development? Certainly it is a very good explanation for the development of the social organisms associated with the existence of the 'aristocracy of labour' but what of the social organisms associated with Protestantism, or the Freemasonry?

Clearly they cannot be so reduced. The approach at the heart of the second Marxist paradigm - that it is possible to understand all aspects of capitalism through approaching it through the class formation - must be modified. It can certainly be argued that in the birth of capitalism it was the development of class forces that were crucial, and that the mode of production, the nation state, and the family were all critically remade in a society founded on a new type of class formation: the free wage labourer versus the capitalist. But once the mode of production, the nation, the family are all established they cannot be reduced to the class struggle any longer. Neither the approach which related the state directly to its class base, nor the new approach which relates it to the development of capital, is sufficient on its own. The same is true for the family. It can be argued that both the nation state and the family are in an organic relationship with both the class formation and the capitalist mode of production, and the development of the former is not reducible to that of the latter.

The existence of both the nation and the family is very important. Both are 'real', both present alternative lived 'communities' for workers to identify with. But, of course, these aren't the only social organisms; Gramsci's writing on the concept of social organisms is as rich as that on intellectuals, and probably the same typology should be used. All of these social organisms both determine men and are determined by men.

Because of these many determinations it is impossible to argue, as Anderson does against Thompson, that class is a structural fact and not also a question of consciousness. On the contrary, people

can exist structurally in many different relationships, and it is a question of consciousness, of choosing the 'we' of 'with whom do I act in common'. This question then becomes: how is that choice made? Is it chosen through the prism of the societies of the labour aristocrats, or through the society that Marx attempted to construct among those aristocrats, the First International? Marx and Gramsci both understood the importance of creating such societies and of challenging the commonsense of working men.

Further, Gramsci's own work on class consciousness makes a clear break with this kind of structuralism (on the one hand) and hegemony (on the other). Gramsci discusses class consciousness in terms of a triple problem:

"A subsequent moment is the relation of political forces; in other words, an evaluation of the degree of homogeneity, self-awareness, and organisation attained by the various social classes. This moment can in its turn be analysed and differentiated into various levels, corresponding to the various moments of collective political consciousness...

The first and most elementary of these is the economic-corporate level: a tradesman feels obliged to stand by another tradesman, a manufacturer by another manufacturer, etc., but the tradesman does not yet feel solidarity with the manufacturer...

"A second moment is that in which consciousness is reached of the solidarity of interests among all the members of a social class - but still in the purely economic field. Already at this juncture the problem of the State is posed - but only in terms of winning politico-juridical equality with the ruling groups: the right is claimed to participate in legislation and administration, even to reform these - but within the existing fundamental structures.

"A third moment is that in which one becomes aware that one's own corporate interests, in their present and future development, transcend the corporate limits of the purely economic class, and can and must become the interests of other subordinate groups too. This is the most purely political phase, and marks the decisive passage from the structure to the sphere of the complex superstructures; it is the phase in which previously germinated ideologies become 'party', come into confrontation and conflict, until only one of them, or at least a single combination of them,
tends to prevail, to gain the upper hand, to propagate itself throughout society - bringing about not only a unison of economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all the questions around which the struggle rages not on a corporate but on a 'universal' plane, and thus creating the hegemony of a fundamental social group over a series of subordinate groups."

Thus for Gramsci, class consciousness is both spontaneous at one level and constructed at another. It is not enough to strike for one's own demands, or even for a generalised demand. It is necessary to also raise in the midst of such strikes the demands on behalf of other groups - whether they are the demands of the Irish for independence or of women before the First World War for the suffrage.

In Part III the socialist ideologies in Glasgow and Liverpool are therefore examined for their approaches to Ireland and to women as well as for their attitude to the industrial struggle and the state.

In Gramsci the problem of consciousness is clearly linked to the problem of the social organism and the types of societies which were organic both to a mode of production and to the class situation of the men who constructed them. What this leads to is an approach to the social formation which is extremely complex: an approach which could be described as an 'organic totality'.

5. The Problem of the "Base and Superstructure"

In an article dealing with the problem of the "base and superstructure" metaphor, Raymond Williams says that it is with reluctance that he discusses the problem in this way at all: his preferred starting point for the discussion of this problem is Marx's other famous statement, "social being determines consciousness" which appears in the 1859 Preface to the "Critique of Political Economy":

"In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which legal and political superstructures arise and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness."¹

However the quotation from the Critique goes on to add

"At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production or - what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological - forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out".²

---

2. Ibid.
It is this half of the quotation which has become the starting point of the entire base-superstructure discussion.

Williams has argued that there are three positions on the base-superstructure debate which explicitly begin from this metaphor. First, there has been the reflection argument which assumes 'the reproduction of the reality of the base in the superstructure in a more or less direct way'. (Even if this theory is made more sophisticated by means of a 'time-lag' argument it essentially remains unchanged.) Second, there have been those theorists who seek to understand the relationship of base to superstructure via a notion of mediation. Third, there is the theory of 'homologous' structure, "in which there is an essential homology or correspondence of structures". ¹

Williams argues that because of the difficulties associated with the base and superstructure metaphor Lukacs developed the idea of a social totality. Williams argues:

"This totality of practices is compatible with the notion of social being determining consciousness, but it does not understand this process in terms of a base and a superstructure. Now the language of totality has become common, and it is indeed in many ways more acceptable than the notion of base and superstructure. But... It is very easy for the notion of totality to empty of its essential content the original Marxist proposition."²

He then goes on to argue that the theory of totality can lead to abandoning the notion of determination

"For if we come to say that society is composed of a large number of social practices which form a concrete social whole, and if we give to each practice a certain specific recognition, adding only that they interact, relate and combine in very complicated ways, we are at one level much more obviously talking about reality, but we are at another level withdrawing from the claim that there is any process of determination."³

1. R. Williams, Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory, New Left Review 82, p.4-5.
2. Ibid, p.7
3. Ibid, p.7
Lukacs' theory of totality was an attempt to drive away from a theory of the economy versus the superstructures but it is not true to say that his theory did not contain a determinancy. Unlike those of the Frankfurt school who have used the concept of totality, and unlike Goldmann, Lukacs' theory was not simply, from the whole to the parts, from the parts to the whole. He clearly had taken from Hegel a notion of the concrete concept - the concept that is universal and rational, and thus expresses the whole within its part - and for him the concrete concept of capitalism was the commodity. In this he follows Marx's approach in 'Capital' where the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production are explored from an initial discussion of the nature of the commodity.¹

Lukacs' problem is different: in relating class consciousness and reification to the commodity structure of capitalism his theory became too deterministic. Williams is therefore correct when he goes on to add that it is necessary to start from this notion of totality but also to transform it.

Williams attempts to do this by inserting a notion of intention:

"Intention, the notion of intention restructures the key question or rather they key emphasis. For while it is true that any society is a complex whole of such practices, it is also true that any society has a specific organisation, a specific structure, and that the principles of this organisation and structure can be seen as directly related to certain social intentions, intentions by which we define the society, intentions which in all our experience have been the rule of a particular class"² (My emphasis JS)

But again the question is raised - what of non-class "intentions"?

2. Williams op cit., p.7.
Williams also seeks a way through the problem via Gramsci's theory of hegemony:

"It is Gramsci's great contribution to have emphasised hegemony and also to have understood it at a depth which is I think rare. For hegemony presupposes the existence of something truly total which is not merely secondary or superstructural, like the weak sense of ideology, but which saturates the society to such an extent, and which as Gramsci puts it, even constitutes the limits of common sense for most people under its sway, that it corresponds to the reality of social experience very much more clearly than any notions derived from the formula of base and superstructure. For if ideology were merely the result of specific manipulations, of a kind of overt training which might be simply ended or withdrawn, then the society would be very much easier to move and to change than in practice it has ever been or is. This notion of hegemony as deeply saturating the consciousness of society seems to be fundamental. And hegemony has the advantage over general notions of totality, that it at the same time emphasises the facts of domination." 1

In this I would agree with Williams but my understanding of hegemony is somewhat different from his. He discusses it in terms of cultures - residual and emergent. But I would wish to reject the terms of this discussion and discuss the concept of hegemony in terms of social organisms and their cultures. In order to do this it is necessary to relate Gramsci's concept of hegemony to his theory of social organisms and to the concept 'civil society'.

Gramsci, writing on the intellectuals, presents a theory of the superstructure divided into 'civil society' and of 'political society'/'the state':

"The relationship between the intellectuals and the world of production is not as direct as it is with the fundamental social groups but is, in varying degrees, 'mediated' by the whole fabric of society and by the complex of superstructures, of which the intellectuals are, precisely, the 'functionaries'. It should be possible both to measure the 'organic quality' of the various intellectual strata and their degree of connection with a fundamental social group, and to establish a gradation of their functions and of the superstructures from the bottom up to the top (from the structural base upwards). What we can do, for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural 'levels':

1. Williams op cit. p.8
the one that can be called 'civil society', that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private', and that of the 'political society' or 'the State'. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of 'direct domination' or command exercised through the State and 'juridical' government. The functions in question are precisely organisational and connective. The intellectuals are the dominant group's 'deputies' exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government. These comprise:

1. The 'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production.

2. The apparatus of state coercive power which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively. This apparatus is, however, constituted for the whole of society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command and direction when spontaneous consent has failed."

Here, clearly, is the origin of Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses and of Repressive State Apparatuses. But two points must be noted. First, this argument must be linked in which Gramsci's other discussions on the 'ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private'. Althusser's rigid Ideological State Apparatuses born in the separate production/practice of Ideology bear very little relationship to Gramsci's discussion of social organisms, 'both natural and voluntary'. Such social organisms can have many different relationships to the 'structure' and one must reinterpret his writings on the social organisms using the guide he gave us in his writings on the 'intellectuals'.

Secondly, it is clear from this quotation that Gramsci at the very least, has a homologous theory of the relationship of base and superstructure, in terms of the relationship of the productive forces to civil society. He argues that the 'spontaneous' consent is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the

dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production. Thus Gramsci appears to develop a threefold understanding of the relationship of base and superstructure — production — civil society/'social hegemony'/ state domination — in which the second is homologous with the first. Elsewhere of course he also argues that the second is homologous with the third, that these private associations constitute the 'hegemonic apparatus of one social group over the rest of the population (or civil society)' the basis for the state proper. 1

Althusserian interpretations of Gramsci (like other interpretations) have often focussed on his concept of the 'historical bloc' to discuss his approach to the base and superstructure. 2 Gramsci writes

"Structures and superstructures form an 'historical bloc'. That is to say the complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructures is the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production. From this one can conclude: that a totalitarian system of ideologies gives a rational reflection of the contradiction of the structure and represents the existence of the objective conditions for the revolutionising of praxis. If a social group is formed which is one hundred per cent homogeneous on the level of ideology, this means that the premises exist one hundred per cent for this revolutionising: that is the 'rational' is activaly and actually real. This reasoning is based on the necessary reciprocity which is nothing other than the real dialectical process." 3

Again we are faced on the surface at least with a 'reflection' theory. But what is critical to note is the definition of the base (or the structure) as 'the ensemble of the social relations of production'.

2. A Showstack Sassoon: Gramsci's Politics (1980), P.119-125, points out that Gramsci only uses the term 9 times in the whole notebooks. Moreover, the last 2 sentences are clearly referencing Hegel.
Gramsci's theory of the 'structure' clearly bears no relationship to mechanistic/technological theory of the base (or structure) nor to Althusser's separate practice. Indeed, he argues that to say otherwise is to pose the machines in themselves as producers of value 'independent of the man who runs them'. Thus Gramsci's understanding of the 'structure' is very similar to Williams' understanding of the 'base' and to the one that I would wish to adopt i.e. that within the 'base' there are both the forces of production (and labour is itself a force of production) and the basis for the formation of the relationships of production (class relationships of co-operation and conflict).

Elsewhere Gramsci's argument appears close to a time-lag theory, and also to a theory of a 'unity' (although different from that of Althusser):

"Unity is given by the dialectical development of the contradictions between man and matter (nature - material forces of production). In economics the unitary centre is value, alias the relationship between the worker and the industrial productive forces (those who deny the theory fall into crass vulgar materialism by posing machines in themselves - as constant and technical capital - as producers of value independent of the man who runs them). In philosophy (it is) praxism, that is, the relationship between human will (superstructure) and economic structure. In politics (it is) the relationship between the State and civil society, that is the intervention of the State (centralised will) to educate the educator, the social environment in general. (Question to be gone into in depth and stated in more exact terms)"

Thus although each sphere of economics, philosophy and politics has its own 'unitary centre' of contradiction (value, praxism, state/civil society contradiction) the 'unity' of the whole is given in the 'dialectical development of the contradictions between man and matter (nature -

2. Ibid, p. 402-3
material forces of production) and thus any world vision must have an answer to the central questions of all three "If these three activities are the necessary constituent elements of the same conception of the world, there must necessarily be, in their theoretical principles, a convertibility from one to the others and a reciprocal translation into the specific language proper to each constituent element. Any one is implicitly in the others, and the three together form a homogeneous circle."1 (My emphasis, JS) Not only do they form a 'homogenous circle' in thought, but they also form a 'homogenous circle' in the real world. Gramsci's constant reference to 'organic' relationships between the state, civil society, private organisms, the mode of production, etc, presents a quite different theory of unity than that of either Lukacs or Althusser - a theory of an organic totality.

Whereas Lukacs stressed both the concept of 'totality' and the concrete concept (practically, though not theoretically, in his works via his discussion of the commodity), Althusser has claimed to have discovered a quite different kind of 'unity totality' where the concepts of 'relative autonomy' and over-determination play quite specific roles. Ben Brewster summarised this theory in the Glossary to For Marx:

"Practice, economic, political, ideological and theoretical... Althusser takes up the theory introduced by Engels and much elaborated by Mao Tse-tung that economic, political and ideological practice are the three practices (processes of production or transformation) that constitute the social formation (q.v.). Economic practice is the transformation of nature by human labour into social products, political practice the transformation of social relations by revolution, ideological practice the transformation of one relation to the lived world into a new relation by ideological struggle. In his concern to stress the distinction between science and ideology (q.v.), Althusser insists that theory constitutes a fourth practice, theoretical practice, that transforms

1. Ibid, p. 403.
ideology into knowledge with theory. The determinant moment in each practice is the work of production which brings together raw materials, men and means of production - not the men who perform the work, who cannot therefore claim to be the subjects of the historical process. Subsidiary practices are also discussed by Althusser, e.g. technical practice...

It is not a theory anyone with a theory of 'organic' developments can relate to and thus it is no surprise that while Althusser uses the term conjuncture to denote a specific 'moment', Gramsci uses it in quite a different way:

"...in studying a structure it is necessary to distinguish organic movements (relatively permanent) from movements which may be termed 'conjunctural' (and which appear as occasional, immediate, almost accidental)."

Gramsci cannot be assimilated to any Althusserian 'unity totality' and this is seen in his writings on history and on man - which to any Althusserian would merely mark him as a historicist and as a humanist.

2. Gramsci, SPNB, p. 17.
As early as 'The German Ideology' Marx had signalled his break not from Hegel, but from all philosophy, and announced that his philosophical premises, his understanding of 'what is man' demanded its realisation in historical studies. He argues:

"Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life."

Thus, to the Young Hegelians he is saying – Philosophers have defined what men are by their consciousness, by their religion etc. but my problem is the question how have men defined who they are? He then immediately enters the discussion of the development of different forms of the division of labour, and different forms of ownership. This was a discussion he was to remain interested in all his life and which he constantly transformed as his own analysis became more sophisticated and other anthropological and historical studies became available to him and Engels.

Marx therefore transforms the question 'What is Man?' from one where individual philosophers give their answer into one which has to be studied from the history of mankind itself. Thus, whereas Althusser has argued that 'It is man who makes history' is an argument that runs counter to the argument of the class struggle, quite clearly it is not. Althusser, building John Lewis as a straw-marxist humanist,

argues

"John Lewis's Thesis: It is man who makes history. Thesis of Marxism-Leninism: It is the masses who makes history; the class struggle is the motor of history."¹

In fact this might be the thesis of Maoism (Marxist-Leninism). It is only part of the argument of Marx. Marx, by transcending the question of what philosophers argue about man, by studying what man is and what man does unites both the problem of men producing their lives (i.e. their history) and the problem of class struggle.

The rejection of this form of humanism in Marx (a form shared by Gramsci)² leads to the abandonment of history and to the notion for which Marx criticised Smith and Ricardo, of the 'eternal' man. In Althusser 'eternal' man appears in the guise of 'subject':

"By this I mean that, even if it only appears under this name (the subject) with the rise of bourgeois ideology, above all with the rise of legal ideology, the category of the subject (which may function under other names: e.g. as the soul in Plato, as God etc.) is the constitutive category of all ideology, whatever its determination (regional or class) and whatever its historical date - since ideology has no history."³

Although the subject is in Althusserian theory interpellated differently by the Feudal Church-family couplet than by the Capitalist Family-Education couplet, both the subject and ideology retain their place in the system. Neither Marx nor Lukacs believed this. Unlike Althusser they both argued that the Feudal social formation had a qualitively different relationship between 'spiritual' production and 'material' production than did the capitalist mode of production.⁴

2. Gramsci, SPNB, op cit, p. 351.
Thus Althusser's 'process without a subject' has a subject— an eternal subject. As Marx had written "This illusion has been common to each new epoch to this day". It is an illusion which neither he nor Gramsci shared. And it is an illusion which has immediate consequences for any theory of consciousness. The differences between an Althusserian theory of the interpellated subject and Gramsci's theory of consciousness can be seen in a) comparison of their writings on the development of a child, and b) Gramsci's argument that 'All Men are Philosophers'.

Althusser writes on the child:

"That an individual is always-already a subject, even before he is born, is nevertheless the plain reality, accessible to everyone and not a paradox at all. Freud shows that individuals are always 'abstract' with respect to the subjects they always-already are, simply by noting the ideological ritual that surrounds the expectation of a 'birth', that 'happy' event. Everyone knows how much and in what way an unborn child is expected. Which amounts to saying very prosaically, if we agree to drop the 'sentiments' i.e. the forms of family ideology (paternal/maternal/conjugal/fraternal) in which the unborn child is expected: it is certain in advance that it will bear its Father's Name, and will therefore have an identity and be irreplaceable. Before its birth, the child is therefore always-already a subject, appointed as a subject in and by the specific familial ideological configuration in which it is 'expected' once it has been conceived. I hardly need add that this familial ideological configuration is, in its uniqueness, highly structured, and that it is in this implacable and more or less 'pathological' (presupposing that any meaning can be assigned to that term) structure that the former subject-to-be will have to 'find' 'its' place i.e. 'become' the sexual subject (boy or girl) which it already is in advance." 2

1. See below p. 81.

This 'plain reality, accessible to everyone' is not shared by Gramsci, who argues,

"But the child's consciousness is not something 'individual', (still less individuated), it reflects the sector of civil society in which the child participates, and the social relations which are formed within his family, his neighbourhood, his village, etc."¹

Note that for Gramsci the child participates in formed 'social relationships' of his family, his neighbourhood and his village, and that he had also written that such a village might be formed by the "intellectual activity of the curate or the patriarchal old man whose 'wisdom' is law, of the 'crone' who inherited the knowledge of the witches" Here is a world in which real human beings live and work not 'hailed' subjects, or subjects busy recognising 'the other', but subjects who, as Gramsci argued, "participate in social organisms, from the simple to the most complex" alongside other men.

The reason that Althusser misreads the question "What is Man?" for the question "Man makes history" is because he has already rejected the idea that Marx solves any problem historically. Althusser's denial of the statement "Man makes history", does not free his work from the unexamined question "What is Man?". On the contrary it allows him to maintain a theory that Marx (in the above quotation) has rejected. In For Marx Althusser writes in parenthesis -

"Man is an ideological animal by nature"² - and this is not a slip. The whole of Althusser's arguments of ideological practice/production being a permanent feature of life is predicated on the theory that man is an intellectual being.

1. Gramsci, SPNB, op cit, p. 35.
2. Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy, op cit, p. 160, where Althusser references his previous statement in For Marx.
The reason for this development of Althusserian Marxism is that unlike Classical Marxism proper, i.e., Lukács, Lenin, Gramsci, he does not start from the question— who is the community? For him society is a 'process without a subject' but, also, a process which determines subjects. Therefore he understands the question of class struggle in the abstract but it does not play any role in his work outside of the sphere of politics. In ideology, theory, it merely appears as proletarian class instinct.

The special problem that the recent adoption by many sociologists of Althusserian categories poses is an amazing interpretation of Gramsci. Because Althusser has attacked humanism, historicism and hegelianism, Gramsci has been subjected to schizophrenic commentary. Those who support Gramsci quote Althusser as saying he is the only Marxist to have followed Marx's insights, attempt to defend him against the charge of historicism, and reduce Gramsci to a 'regional' theorist of the Political (the State) or Ideology (the ISAs) or both. The central place in Gramsci's thought of a theory of consciousness, a theory of history, and concrete historical studies, is pushed aside in favour of the discussion of concepts like hegemony, historic bloc, national-popular, passive revolution, ripped out of historical context.

Yet what it is important to stress is that Gramsci does have a theory of man which is the same as Marx, and yet goes beyond Marx. That the reason his work is the closest to that of Marx is that he takes Marx's road out of the problem, i.e., the historical road.
Marx consistently made the argument that it was false to conceive of human nature as the same, i.e. eternal bourgeois individuals, throughout history. Against the classical economists, particularly against Ricardo, he argued that Robinson Crusoe was a myth.

"Smith and Ricardo still stand with both feet on the shoulders of the eighteenth-century prophets, in whose imaginations this eighteenth century individual (i.e. Robinson Crusoe JS) - the product on the one side of the dissolution of the feudal forms of society, on the other side of the new forces of production developed since the sixteenth century - appears as an ideal, whose existence they project into the past. Not as a historic result but as history's point of departure. As the Natural Individual appropriate to their notion of human nature, not arising historically, but posited by nature. This illusion has been common to each new epoch to this day." 

Gramsci's argument that man is a process and that he modifies and changes himself "to the same extent that he changes and modifies the whole complex of relationships of which he is the nexus" allows us to think through the problem of the difference between the domestic handloom weaver, and the factory worker, between the Freemason and the Protestant Orange Lodge member, between the man and the woman. It allows us to think through these problems both quantitatively and qualitatively. It allows us to think through the total transformation of those nexus of relationships which is the transformation of feudalism to capitalism, or capitalism to socialism.

This is the first point about Gramsci's theory of "What is Man?". His argument that man enters into relationships with nature through work and techniques, that he enters into those relationships in an 'organic'

2. Gramsci, SPNB, op cit, p. 352; quoted on p. 32 above.
unity with other men, and that this process reflects his own individu-
ality, gives us a way of understanding the transformation of conscious-
ness for periods within the capitalist epoch. Whilst the permanent
features of capitalism remain (accumulation, free wage labour, etc.)
it is possible still to understand the transformations of work and
techniques, and the transformations of social organisms, that are the
gulf between Britain in the 1860s and Britain in the 1930s.

Second, Gramsci's theory of "What is Man" transcends the base/
superstructure model just as Marx did. For Gramsci men become members
of 'social organisms' of all kinds - some in the base, i.e. actively
through work, and some in the superstructure, the 'private associations'
that he refers to elsewhere. For Gramsci such 'social organisms' are
not confined to the regions of politics, or the region of ideology, but
are indeed 'organic to the mode of production. Within these social
organisms both work techniques and social relationships meet. How
could it be otherwise? The economic foundation stone of capitalism
is the free wage labourer - it is he who makes the spinning jenny capital,
and the free wage labourer is free in a double sense. He is free from
owning the means of production (therefore he makes history not in
circumstances of his own choosing) but he also is not a slave - he is
free to create 'private associations'. It has been known for these
subjects, these "trajers", to build trade unions, and revolutionary
parties, and to have ideas about such building whilst they are at work
performing their economic function as wage labourers. In other words,
they were not individual subjects at all but men for whom the 'we' - the
'with whom do I act in common?' was the critical question.
In arguing this Gramsci, without knowing it, is echoing Marx who argued:

"Man himself is the basis of his material production, as of any other production that he carries on. All circumstances, therefore, which affect man, the subject of production, more or less modify all his functions and activities as the creator of material wealth, of commodities. In this respect it can be shown that all human relations and functions, however and in whatever form they may appear, influence material production and have a more or less decisive influence on it." ¹

Thus Man, - the collective community, not the individual subject - is both subject and object of history. It was Gramsci's achievement to have so grounded his arguments in specific historical analysis that he drove out teleological historicism, without driving out humanism. If all men are at the centre of a web, a nexus of societies, which are organic to a particular mode of production, then those men themselves collectively transform those societies but not in circumstances of their own choosing. Gramsci makes it possible to think of the relationship of ideology to both the social formation (following Marx above) and to the class formation. The societies men build have an organic relationship with a particular epoch of capitalism (e.g. the Friendly Societies of the 1850s onwards) but they also have a relationship with the purposes of a particular group of working men (labour aristocrats who accepted the permanence of capitalism and came to accept Liberalism as their own ideology).

Third, Gramsci's theory of consciousness and his theory of ideology, becomes one where there is constant negotiation. There is not one 'true' consciousness, but instead proletarian consciousness depends on the understanding of the proletariat, through the revolutionary party, of their

¹ K. Marx, Theories of Surplus Value, op cit, Vol I, p. 288.
hegemonic role vis-a-vis other classes, particularly in relation to the peasantry and the intellectuals, as well as on the understanding of their own class situation. Class consciousness is thus not 'inherent' in the situation of the worker but is an understanding won and fought for by the 'organic intellectuals' of the working class. The revolutionary party does not merely 'mediate' but must create a collective will. This is the fundamental difference between Lukacs and Gramsci.

Further - false consciousness is not unitary - it exists in many forms. Gramsci argued that the PCI shouldn't follow the 'will' of the masses because the masses had as many wills as they had ideologies influencing them. This is an important understanding. There was a massive political difference between a Glasgow freemason, Liberal, or Orange working man, despite the fact that all three working men shared a similar "fetishised" vision.

Gramsci's marxism, therefore, is a humanist marxism - placing man, the subject of history, at the centre of marxism. Such a marxism - shared by Marx and Lukacs, as well as Gramsci - undoubtedly does have the possibility of two theoretical tendencies within it. On the one hand it can tend to historicism - i.e. in the sense of the teleological argument that Man (rather than God) is working his purpose out as year succeeds to year - or it can tend to a non-historicist historical materialism. I would argue that both tendencies were present in Marx, that Lukacs took up the former and Gramsci, correctly, the latter.

In Marx's 'Theories of Surplus Value' one can see both tendencies present. In Marx's argument that capitalism is the highest form of human society, preparing the way for the highest

1. This definition of historicism as being a teleological historicism is quite different for the Althusserian. Their definition of historicism includes both teleological historicism and almost any form of historical materialism. See C. Buci Glucksman, op cit, p.341.
development of humanity, there is undoubted teleological overtones.

"Ricardo, rightly for his time, regards the capitalist mode of production as the most advantageous for production in general, as the most advantageous for the creation of wealth. He wants production for the sake of production and this with good reason. To assert, as sentimental opponents of Ricardo's did, that production as such is not the object, is to forget that production for its own sake means nothing but the development of human productive forces, in other words the development of the richness of human nature as an end in itself. To oppose the welfare of the individual to this end, as Sismondi did, is to assert that the development of the species must be arrested in order to safeguard the welfare of the individual, so that, for instance, no war may be waged in which at all events such individuals perish.... Apart from the barrenness of such edifying reflection, they reveal a failure to understand the fact that, although at first the development of the capacities of the human species takes place at the cost of the majority of human individuals and even classes, in the end it breaks through this contradiction and coincides with the development of the individual; the higher development of individuality is thus only achieved by a historical process during which in the human kingdom, as in the animal and plant kingdoms, individuals, because the interests of the species coincide only with the interests of certain individuals, and it is this coincidence which constitutes the strength of these privileged individuals."

It is arguments such as these - everywhere present in Marx - that form the basis of Lukacs theory of the 'class-subject' not Lukacs relationship to Weber.

But there is also an alternative form of humanism in Marx, one that is not historicist. It is to be found in those passages where he argues for a concrete analysis of society.

"In order to examine the connection between spiritual production and material production it is above all necessary to grasp the latter itself, not as a general

category but in definite historical form. Thus for example different kinds of spiritual production correspond to the capitalist mode of production and to the mode of production of the Middle Ages. If material production itself is not conceived in its specific historical form, it is impossible to understand what is specific in the spiritual production corresponding to it and the reciprocal influence of one on the other. Otherwise one cannot get beyond inanities. Further: if the specific form of material production gives rise in the first place to a specific structure of society, in the second place to a specific relation of men to nature. Their state and their spiritual outlook is determined by both. Therefore also the kind of their spiritual production. Finally, by spiritual production Storch means also all kinds of professional activities of the ruling class, who carry out social functions as a trade. The existence of these strata, like the function they perform, can only be understood from the specific historical structure of their production relations.

Because Storch does not conceive material production itself historically - because he conceives it as production of material goods in general, not as a definite historically developed and specific form of this production - he deprives himself of the basis on which alone can be understood partly the ideological component part of the ruling class, partly the free spiritual production of this particular social formation. He cannot get beyond meaningless phrases. Consequently the relation is not so simple as he presupposes. For instance, capitalist production is hostile to certain branches of spiritual production, for example, art and poetry.

It is clear that passages such as these embody an approach which is not necessarily teleological. It is this approach that is at the heart of Gramsci’s constant sketches, in prison, of the concrete historical researches that must be done in order to understand the circumstances in which the revolutionary party of the Italian proletariat must insert itself.

Lukacs also saw this:

"This critical philosophy (of Marx 35) implies above all historical criticism. It dissolves the rigid, unhistorical, natural appearance of social institutions; it reveals their historical origins and shows therefore they are subject to history in every respect including historical decline. Consequently history does not merely unfold within the terrain mapped out by these institutions. It does not resolve itself into the evolution of contents, of men and situations, etc., while the principles of society remain eternally valid. Nor are these institutions the goal to which all history aspires, such that when they are realised history will have fulfilled her mission and will then be at an end. On the contrary, history is precisely the history of these institutions, of the changes they undergo as institutions which bring men together in societies. Such institutions start by controlling economic relations between men and go on to permeate all human relations (and hence also man's relations with himself and with nature, etc.)

This is clearly not a teleological historicism. But further on in his essay on Class Consciousness Lukacs argues that "class consciousness consists in fact of the appropriate and rational reactions 'imputed' to a particular typical position in the process of production". Further, "historic and systematic typology of the possible degrees of class consciousness" would require "an exact study of the point in the total process of production at which the interests of the various classes are

2. Ibid. p. 51.
most immediately and vitally involved". Thus for Lukacs the totality is an "essential" totality ("expressive" in Althusserian terminology), it is a 'totality of production' and in his theory production is nothing in pre-capitalist societies, everything in capitalism. Following on from this "only with capitalism does economic class interest emerge in all its starkness as the motor of history" and proletarian consciousness - both true and false - must be grounded in the commodity structure of capitalism.²

In many ways this is not totally removed from Gramsci's arguments on the factory councils in the same period, 1919-1920. The upsurge of struggle in that period did lead revolutionaries to look for the objective basis of class consciousness within the proletariat themselves, rather than within a proletarian party. It was Gramsci's achievement to face up to the problems of such a theory and attempt to re-analyse the role that they had given the factory council in the light of Lenin's theory of the revolutionary party. It is in the period 1923-26, and the period of the Prison Notebooks that Gramsci's theory of class consciousness becomes one that is fully open - embracing the problems of creating 'the collective will' and the problems of 'commonsense thought', rather than false consciousness. Only then is both class consciousness and false consciousness seen as questions of the historical process, rather than givens of the historical process.³

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. It is in this period that the concept of hegemony becomes central to Gramsci's thought as a way of understanding both the form of bourgeois domination and of necessary working class organisation.
7. Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony'

It has been Gramsci's concept of hegemony that has been most often used by British historians and in British cultural studies. It is through this concept many writers have found it possible to think of the 'epochs' of British capitalism in a much less determinist fashion. As with so many of Gramsci's concepts the interpretation of 'hegemony' has depended on which school of Marxism you belonged to: Hegelian Marxist—those Marxists who have operated with a conception of 'totality' (for Thompson the category of 'experience' does the work of totality); or structuralist Marxist—where most see Althusser's concept of 'relative autonomy' and his theory of overdetermination as critical.

The former tradition has tended to interpret Gramsci in the Lukacs/Goldmann framework. But at its most sophisticated, such as Williams' interpretation of Gramsci's concept of hegemony, this view links hegemony to 'experience' and discusses that 'experience' as both consciousness and domination. It is possible, I think, for this interpretation to come to terms with Gramsci's statement on the 'new' society of America:

"Hegemony here is born in the factory and requires for its exercise only a minute quantity of professional politicians and ideological intermediaries. The phenomenon of the 'masses' which so struck Romier is nothing in which the 'structure' dominates the superstructures more immediately and in which the latter are also 'rationalised' (simplified and reduced in number)."

It is very doubtful, however, whether the more 'structuralist' interpretation of Gramsci could accommodate the above understanding.

2. See above, p. 70.
This tradition tends to interpret Gramsci's concept of hegemony as one that united the superstructural levels of ideology and politics. This tradition in Britain includes writers who would be sympathetic to most of the Althusserian project, as well as some who would only be sympathetic to parts. Anderson's interpretation of hegemony is not far removed from Stuart Hall's or from Showstack-Sassoon: all three see Gramsci primarily as a theorist of the superstructure and see his concept of hegemony as being the primary means through which a theory of the superstructures is developed. They therefore see the term hegemony as including both the moments of 'political hegemony' and 'hegemony in philosophy'. Gray, who used the concept of hegemony in his study of the labour aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh, also uses the concept in this way.

The question is, however, whether Gramsci's concept of hegemony is used by him purely to refer to the political and ideological processes of bourgeois rule through consent (whether it is a concept which is referring to the 'superstructures') or whether it is a concept which is referring to the processes of consent which take place both within the base and the superstructure.

In the above quotation, Gramsci sees a particular form of hegemony (which I have called Modern Conservatism in Britain, but which has also been called Mass Society) being born in the 'structure' rather than the 'superstructure' and argues that it dominates the superstructures 'more immediately'. Thus, although he preserves the distinction between


base and superstructure, one of his key concepts, hegemony, transcends it. Rule by consent can be born in the factory and through the creation of 'rationalised man' as well as in the spheres of the superstructure. Moreover, there is no suggestion of 'structural causality'. It is merely that in America the infrastructure dominates 'more immediately', but not in a different way.

Such arguments as these are ignored in Anderson's discussion of Gramsci which argues that "Gramsci's binary oppositions of 'State and Civil Society' and 'coercion and consent' are the central elements of Gramsci's discourse". Anderson adds,

"It is evident, in effect, that the whole range of directly economic constraints to which the exploited classes within capitalism are subjected cannot immediately be classified within either of the political categories of coercion or consent - armed force or cultural persuasion. Similarly a formal dichotomy of State and Civil society, however necessary as a preliminary instrument, cannot itself yield specific knowledge of the complex relations between the different institutions of a capitalist social formation (some of which typically occupy intermediate positions on the borders of the two. It is possible that the analytic issues with which Gramsci was most concerned in fact need to be reconceptualized within a new order of categories, beyond his binary landmarks."

Such conclusions, I would argue, follow from a specific political/ideological reading of Gramsci which argues that his central problematic was the understanding of the state. (In Anderson's analysis this becomes the argument that his central problematic was the East-West discussion on the nature of revolution.)

But Gramsci's "discourse" was about consciousness, about the social organisms of human lives, about the state and about revolution. In his own work one can find a "new order of categories" beyond Anderson's "binary landmarks" which were never the sum of his work.

He did not produce a separate theory of "economic constraints" because in his theory the state and civil society and the mode of production were organic.

Writing of the process by which the working class could become hegemonic, Gramsci argued:

"For though hegemony is ethico-political, it must also be economic, must necessarily be based on the decisive function exercised by the leading group in the decisive nucleus of economic activity."

Gramsci never stressed this argument when he wrote of bourgeois hegemony, but did he have to? Throughout his writings there is an argument that the process by which the bourgeoisie takes power is quite a different process from that by which the proletariat takes power.

In his *Prison Notebooks* he merely refers to the fact that the bourgeoisie can establish their economic ascendency - through the towns, through developing merchant capital, through the guilds, etc - long before establishing their 'ethico-political' hegemony. In other words, for the bourgeoisie the process by which they established hegemony could take several centuries. In the above quotation Gramsci is merely underlining the opposite side of this point: that it is impossible for the proletariat to establish an 'ethico-political' hegemony without exercising the 'decisive function' at an economic level. All it can do short of exercising this economic control is to operate a hegemonic strategy towards its class allies.

Thus Gramsci's concept of hegemony is not merely one that cuts across the 'practices' of the political, the ideological and the theoretical; it is also a concept that cuts across the 'practice' of the economic. I would argue this becomes very clear in his own proposals for concrete study. In his proposed study of America he never uses the term hegemony to designate the superstructural elements as compared

with the economic; the list of elements he finds interesting
moves progressively from the study of finance capital through to
psycho-analysis and rotary clubs and Freemasonry:

"A catalogue of some of the essentially most important
or interesting problems, even if at first sight they do
not appear to be in the forefront:
1. The replacement of the present plutocratic stratum by
a new mechanism of accumulation and distribution of finance
capital based directly on industrial production.
2. The question of sex.
3. The question of whether Americanism can constitute an
historical 'epoch', that is, whether it can determine a
gradual evolution of the same type as the 'Passive
revolution'...or an upheaval on the French pattern.
4. The question of the 'rationalisation' of the
demographic pattern of Europe.
5. The question of whether this evolution must have its
starting point within the industrial and productive world,
or whether it can come from the outside, through the
cautious but massive construction of a formal juridicial
army which can guide from the outside the necessary
evolution of the productive apparatus.
6. The question of the so-called 'high wages' paid by
Fordised and rationalised industry.
7. Fordism as the ultimate stage in the progress of
progressive attempts by industry to overcome the law of
the tendency of the rate of profit to fall.
8. Psychoanalysis and its enormous diffusion since the war,
as the expression of the increased moral coercion exercised
by the apparatus of the State and society on single individuals,
and of the pathological crisis determined by this coercion.
9. Rotary clubs and freemasonry."

Gramsci also argues that the "whole life of the nation" revolves around
production in America.

It is hard to imagine any other Marxist who would have created
such a rich starting point for any analysis - even Trotsky who wrote a
book on Freemasonry (which was destroyed) and also wrote on women and
the family, would have missed the problem of the organic relationship
between those social organisms and the particular epoch.

My problem was to attempt a less rich, more structured analysis
of Glasgow and Liverpool in the period 1900-1920. This, I discovered,
was not an easy task. It involved:

a. Comparing the different industrial and neighbourhood structures, the different sets of 'societies' that existed and the different patterns of commonsense beliefs and class consciousness in Glasgow and Liverpool and their surrounding areas.

b. Comparing the different types of 'socialist' 'societies' and 'ideologies' which developed in these two towns as a response to the commonsense thought, and the industrial structure of the towns, as well as to the 'fact' of class.

Comparing the different patterns of political activity that developed in Glasgow and Liverpool. Glasgow, home of the most advanced working class in Britain (in this thesis 'Britain' does not refer to Ireland) was not the home of the riot, while Liverpool undoubtedly was.

c. Comparing the transformation of 'commonsense thought' in these two cities over a twenty year period which saw the erosion of Liberal 'commonsense'. The 'taken for granted' worlds of Glasgow and Liverpool were not only different from each other in 1910, but were transformed in quite a different way between 1910 and 1930 within the total transformation of commonsense beliefs in British society in this period.

This third problem proved to be one that could only be undertaken after one had also studied it from the other 'side', that is, from a study of the origins of Modern Conservatism in the 1930s and in the 1940s. It was clear that in Glasgow and Liverpool the 1920s were a period of transformation. But much of men's understanding of what was happening to them could only be understood in terms of the previous 'commonsense' they had developed. Thus the 1920s have to be
studied from both the perspective of the 1930s and from that of the 1910s. And it could not be done in the confines of this thesis.

This thesis had to establish the argument of Gramsci's approach being one of 'organic totality' through a comparative study. The third problem could only be tackled as a separate study after a study had been made of the structure of the Modern Conservative hegemony, that is after examining the transformation of the state, family and work in the 1930s and 1940s. This should have been no surprise given that, as Marx and Hegel argued, "the key to the anatomy of the ape is the anatomy of man". But it was a surprise, and therefore makes necessary a limited background introduction to Liberalism, Socialism and Conservatism.
Chapter 3 Liberalism, Conservatism and Socialism

Liberalism

In terms of understanding the 'commonsense' thought of the Liberal working man the most important historical works have been those of Vincent and Hanham. In his Formation of the Liberal Party, Vincent set out a framework for understanding Liberalism that stood in the tradition of Halevy, and has been the framework of analysis for a whole generation of historians. He argues about the meaning of Liberalism for the individual:

"For the nineteenth century man, the mark or note of being fully human was that he should provide for his own family, have his own religion and politics and call no man master. It is as a mode of entry into this full humanity that the Gladstonian Liberal Party most claims our respect...

"Over whole areas to vote Liberal was closely tied to the growing ability of whole new classes to stand on their own feet and lead independent lives. The great great moral idea of Liberalism was manliness, the rejection of the various forms of patronage, from soup and blankets upwards, which had formerly been the normal part of the greatest number. Thus being a Liberal (rather than just promiscuously recording a Liberal vote) was something which could not come about without great changes in the circumstances and horizons of classes hitherto outside the political nation - changes creative of moral pressure which overflowed into a traditional parliamentary culture, full of banality, and very little ready to be moralised. That is the paradox of Liberalism...

"The discrepancy between intention and profession, and results, between what a Nonconformist writer called the 'party of Christ' and the actual ordinariness of what that party did, is a great fact, far too great to be bridged by throwing down the plank of hypocrisy. It is a problem which brings us up against the limitations both of our imaginations and of theirs." 1

But particularly of ours. Vincent goes on to argue that the working class could also be Liberals in the same way:

"The possibility that, propaganda apart, the working class was genuinely Liberal in the same way - and with the same complications from religious and social causes - as the middle class has not been sufficiently considered. Indeed the attractiveness of Liberalism to both was much the same. The middle class lived under the shadow of personal economic disaster as much as did the working class... Liberalism did nothing to solve the problem of personal security for these people - what it did, in a mild way, to add to the general prosperity of the country, affected the middle class."

The working class that Vincent writes of is the skilled craftsman; he says of the working class elector:

"His religious views and habits are obscure, but his occupation is not. He was a skilled craftsman differing from the 'middle class' shopkeeper or clerk not in his wealth so much as in the fact that he worked with his hands. In borough after borough, the main groups of the working men are the same - tailors, shoemakers, building groups, craftsmen, and metal workers of various kinds. On this rock the Liberal majority in the borough and in the nation was based... What was less important was unskilled labour."

Thus Vincent's argument is not one that contradicts the argument about the 'labour aristocracy', but complements it. As does Hanham:

"The strength of the Liberal position was that Liberalism was something much wider than the Liberal Party. The Liberal movement embraced a wide variety of organisations from the non-conformist churches, the friendly and co-operative societies, and the movement for popular education, to a whole host of radical organisations like the Free Land Society, the Financial Reform Association and the Peace Society. Thus even though many prominent Liberals disapproved of trade unions, it was natural for trade union leaders to think of the trade union movement as one wing of the much broader Liberal movement."

The 'social organisms' of Liberalism were many, ranging from those built out of the 'purposes' of working men, friendly societies, trade unions, co-operatives, to 'ideological' or 'political' societies. Moreover it was also a wider question of consciousness, of living in

1. Ibid, p.77.
2. Ibid, p. 81. See also his sections on 'popular Liberalism' in Rochdale, Whitby and Leeds where he proves this assertion, pp 97-124.
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Thus Vincent's argument is not one that contradicts the argument about the 'labour aristocracy', but complements it. As does Hanham:

"The strength of the Liberal position was that Liberalism was something much wider than the Liberal Party. The Liberal movement embraced a wide variety of organisations from the non-conformist churches, the friendly and co-operative societies, and the movement for popular education, to a whole host of radical organisations like the Free Land Society, the Financial Reform Association and the Peace Society. Thus even though many prominent Liberals disapproved of trade unions, it was natural for trade union leaders to think of the trade union movement as one wing of the much broader Liberal movement." 3
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a Liberal commonsense. Hanham points to "the place of political pottery and other political objets d'art in working class life":

"For those who could afford the higher class of cottage ornaments there was Lord Salisbury set in pansies... Joseph Chamberlain in petunias, and Gladstone in forget-me-nots. For the common man there were the cheaper, more simple portraits of the great political heroes, Gladstone, Disraeli, Bright, Joseph Chamberlain, Parnell, Lord Randolph Churchill, Lord Salisbury, and Lloyd George, which were issued by several firms of potters in very large numbers... "Not that the potters were alone in the field the Birmingham metal workers supplied horse brasses of politicians, metal plaques, and even pepper pots and salt-cellars shaped to resemble Gladstone or Disraeli busts- the silk manufacturers of Coventry produced silk portraits (silkies); and the Welsh tile manufacturers produced tile-portraits of the current political heroes. Later there were cigarette-cards featuring the leading members of the House of Commons."

In other words, politicians were the footballers, film stars and pop singers of their age.

What were the central beliefs of men who hung Gladstone and Bright on their walls (as opposed to those who hung Disraeli)? One of the central beliefs was in the existence of an enemy, a real enemy: the landed aristocracy. The Gladstonian party may have been built on a particular accommodation of the working class on trade union and social issues\(^2\), and also on campaigns such as those over the Bulgarian atrocities, but at the heart of their beliefs by the mid-1880s was a theory of the 'class' against the masses. As Gladstone said:

"...you are opposed throughout the country by a compact army and that army is the case of the class against the masses. I am thankful to say that there are among the classes many happy exceptions. I am thankful to say that there are men wearing coronets on their heads who are as good, as sound, as genuine Liberals, as any working man who hears me at this moment. Still, as a

1. H.J. Hanham, Politics and Community Life, (Thanet Press, Margate) p. 5-6. I am grateful to Professor Hanham for sending me this pamphlet.

general rule, it cannot be pretended that we are supported by the duke or by the squires, or by the established clergy, or by the officers of the Army, or by any other body of very respectable persons. And what I observe is this, when a profession is highly privileged, when a privilege is publicly endowed, it is in these cases you will find that almost the whole of the class and the professions are against us. But if I go more to open professions, if I take the Bar... if I take the medical profession... in these open professions I am thankful to say that we make a very good and respectable muster indeed... Still... I am sorry to say, there is class against the mass, classes against the nation.

This attitude was to remain the heart of Liberalism and to carry into the ILP up until the First World War.

Besides the identification of an enemy, there were two affirmative slogans of Liberalism: 'Free Trade' and the old Whig slogan 'Peace, Retrenchment, Reform'. In all the speeches made by the Liberal politicians in Glasgow these two slogans dominate. Particularly in the speeches of John Bright - a 'philosopher' in Gramsci's sense of the term, a man who spread an understanding among masses.

In his speech at the receiving of the Freedom of the City in Glasgow in 1883, Bright spoke of the three great social issues of Liberalism: repeal of the corn laws, parliamentary reform and the land question:

"The Lord Provost referred particularly to that question in which I had been associated with my lamented friend, Mr Cobden and many others (applause) in endeavouring to strike off the shackles on trade, and to enable all our population to buy their food in the most open, and therefore in the cheapest market. (Applause)... "There was nothing that was revolutionary about it... It didn't touch the Church... the House of Lords... the Crown... "But there were two classes of people who were greatly opposed to us. The landlords, no doubt, thought that our policy might reduce rents- and, no doubt, in the reduction of rents they considered that the great interests of the

country would be endangered. The farmers thought, naturally enough, that the price of their fields would be reduced, and they were not quite certain whether they could obtain a corresponding reduction in their rents, and therefore, of these two classes it may be fairly said that a strong and overpowering view of their own self-interest, and a fear of what might happen to them, combined them in league against us."

On parliamentary reform, Bright said:

"There are many persons here present, I dare say, who remember my being in Glasgow in 1866... At that time, in that very year, the Government of Lord John Russell and Mr Gladstone (applause) had brought in what I should class, though I supported it with whatever influence I had, a very feeble measure. It proposed to lower the County Franchise somewhat...

"They said 'By reducing the Borough Franchise from £10 to £7...you will introduce such a mass of the working people and such a mass of ignorance, such a mass of everything that is undesirable to see or to think of, that the respectable and intelligent electors will be entirely swamped'... they had a considerable effect on the fears of some men on the other side of the House—and they, joined together, upset this feeble Bill and upset the Government that proposed it.

"...And what happened is most extraordinary, and ought never to be forgotten in our political history. It is not politics I am talking, it is history (Laughter). Well the very Government that had conspired with others to destroy the preceding Government, because admitting those between £10 and £7 rental would swamp the respectable classes— they got rid of the £7 barrier altogether, and went down to £1, or to the very lowest sum at which any house in the burgh in Great Britain is rated to the relief of the poor...

"The result is this—that even the opponents of these measures have learned so much that they have learned to discover that the terror which alarmed them was, after all, nothing but a hobgoblin, that no man in his sense ought to be afraid of."

After making the same argument as to the inconsistency of the 'classes' on the land question, Bright ended his speech on two different, but complementary notes: the Liberal advocacy of "the peaceful movement of the people" and the vanishing of party politics as "there

2. Ibid.
do not seem very many questions now on which great conflicts can arise".

During the same visit to Glasgow Bright spelt out his view of history to an audience of university students:

"Now in this great political field I have spoken of, history tells us one thing very distinctly, that amongst civilised and Christian nations, the civilised and Christian world, there are going to be changes, even peaceful revolutions, which have a great bearing on human events for all future time, and I should like to indicate two or three of what appears to me points of departure of these changes...

"Declaration of Independence of the British Colonies in America
"French Revolution
"1832 Reform

"Henceforth the fate of nations will not depend upon emperors and kings nor upon the corruption and prolifigacy of statesmen. It will depend upon the degree of intelligence and morality amongst the people (cheers)."

Bright added that this was especially true in the sphere of foreign policy, and he went on to discuss the French Revolution, the Civil War in America, Ireland and the Crimea. On each topic his position was the same: these disasters could have been avoided by men of good will thinking rationally and with the full co-operation of an enlightened people providing checks on 'class' government. The real enemy was ignorance, passion and 'class' government.

Having reaffirmed the old Liberal political tradition, Bright went on to discuss "the question of the future". Talking of India, he revealed the Liberal dilemma:

"It has been said that a Great Empire that has been conquered by breaking all the Ten Commandments cannot be retained upon the Principles of the Sermon of the Mount (laughter and cheers) - and that, therefore, you must make no concession to that great two hundred millions of people. But if you are teaching them your language and allowing them to read your books and teaching them your

1. J. Bright, Speeches in Glasgow, March 22 1883, Glasgow Collection, Mitchell Library.
science, do you mean to say that you can hold these people always mainly and only by the sword, and that when you enter the Suez Canal in Egypt, or when you pass the Cape of Good Hope, you must throw overboard your New Testament, for they have no meaning in the British Empire? (Cheers)"

The contradictions for old Liberals in the possession of an Empire which everyday was demanding the reforms which were so successful in Britain are obvious. Either they have to begin to emphasise the intrinsic differences between the British nation and the rest of the world, or they have to turn their backs on the Empire. The former position leads Liberalism past Adam Smith type nationalism (i.e., progressive nationalism) to Conservative chauvinism; the latter position leads Liberalism past Reformism bolstered by the free trade empire to a consideration of what is the economic base of that empire, i.e. Labour. These two positions exist side by side without any attempt to resolve them in Bright’s final words to the Glasgow students:

"Our soldiers have died on every coast (cheers)... Her flag courts every breeze; but what of our population at home amongst whom we dwell, and in whom our interest ought to be warmest, and for whom we ought to feel the deepest and most lasting concern. What can be more marvellous than the industry of our population. We know that whatever has been done under the English crown the world over - much that is good and much that is bad - has been done by the sweat and the labour and the sufferings of the great body of our people. (Cheers) It must be admitted... that if we go back a few years after the termination of the great war, say, for the last fifty years, we shall find that the condition of the people of our country at home has steadily and greatly improved. Labour has been more constant, and more steady, and more highly remunerated... The food of the people has been more abundant, more cheap, more healthful- their clothing is more comfortable, and healthy and becoming. Of their education I need scarcely speak. In Scotland you are more familiar with these questions than we are in England... every worker can have of an evening his half-penny paper... "We have then, I think, a greater regard for law and a greater content in the minds of the people. The people are more political and becoming more political... by becoming more political they become more moderate; the rich become less disliked and the poor become less distrusted."

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
Bright recognised the continuing problem of poverty:

"41 out of 100 families in Glasgow lives in houses of only one room, another 37 per cent lives in houses of two rooms... 78 per cent therefore live in houses of one or two rooms... Now Scotland is the best educated portion of the Kingdom, and also is renowned for its thrift, so how does this come about?"

Bright's answer to this question is the traditional Liberal one, taxation:

"If you are to add up all the expenditure in this country since the beginning of the century... it comes to the sum of £4,414 millions sterling of taxes...

"How much has the real government, the civil government of the country cost during the same time? It has cost £1,012 millions being one fifth of all expenditure has been expended on civil questions- more than four fifths has been expended in wars past and wars prepared for the future...

"I want to ask any sensible body of men... whether it should be necessary that the wealth, the labour, the means, the comfort, the happiness of the population of thirty-five millions of people in these islands should be taxed to the amount of this tremendous and inconceivable expenditure (No and cheers)."

This reply, pointing out that the welfare of the people demands the drastic curtailment of Imperial expenditure, illustrates the breaking point in the old Liberal world view which was based on the unification of the interests of the manufacturers (the 'middle classes') and the labourers. For the manufacturers would certainly not support any proposal to surrender the Empire and its markets to increasing United States and German competition.

From this period, the mid-1880s, Old Liberalism breaks within itself allowing the development of other working class beliefs of which Labourism comes to dominate. The break occurred then because of the challenge posed to liberalism by the economic depression of 1879 and the exhaustion of the reform platform in 1884.

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
At the heart of Liberalism was a particular view of history. At the level of systems of thought, it is the self-created versions of history that give men their clearest answer to the question: With whom do I act in common? i.e., who are 'we'? Both Vincent and Hanham argue that liberal consciousness was above all created through a particular view of history, and this view of history can be seen to change radically after 1885 to embody the interests of the working class. Vincent writes of the predominant view before 1885:

"The really important attitudes had nothing to do with the industrial revolution, much to do with the English Civil War, and a change in difference extending far outside the areas of industrial progress, had caused these attitudes to flourish as never before... When their moment of historical opportunity came, leaders of the radical rank and file were prepared and confident, because their collective outlook had been two centuries in preparation."¹

After 1885 a fundamental change takes place. The watchwords of Liberalism which come to the fore, which enable them to recapture their old position within the working class after 1895 (but not within the middle class) are the watchwords of the English working class during the previous period, all of them connected with reform. As Hanham writes,

"Parliamentary reform loomed so large in the consciousness of contemporaries that it is not surprising that in the generation after 1885 history was usually written in terms of the triumph of reform. The 1832 Act, in particular was seen as the measure of current politics."²

Elsewhere Hanham summarises the Liberal 'commonsense' view which dominated political thought in the late 19th century:

"Except perhaps during the nineties the dominant pattern of political thought in the country as a whole was

established by Liberal thinkers. And the distinctive 'liberal' principles such as 'progress', free trade, international peace, justice for the oppressed, economic development by private enterprise, the harmony of social classes, the reorganisation of the land system, social amelioration through education and self-help, and the restraint of sinister interests such as the drink trade, were almost universally accepted by working men as well as by spokesmen of the Liberal Party."

How do we know that the speeches of men like John Bright actually affected the 'commonsense' consciousness of working men and their leaders? Occasionally we can catch glimpses of such commonsense - particularly at the moment of the first challenge to it.

1884 saw the last of the great reform demonstrations and the end of the 'Great Depression'. The existence of the Great Depression posed a severe theoretical problem for Liberals. Previous to 1879 no trade depression had been world wide, and it had always been possible to argue local causes for each depression - a class or classes striving to put their interests above those of the 'nation', or the free workings of the free trade system. In particular, the usual explanation was the existence of 'land laws', that is, the special privileges of the landed aristocracy and their monopoly against the interests of the rest of the 'nation'.

In 1884 the Glasgow United Trades Council circularised "all known Trades Councils in the British Isles" for their opinions on the causes of the Great Depression of 1879.\(^2\) So deeply had the Liberal explanation bitten into 'commonsense thinking' that the unanimous opinion returned by all the Trades Councils circulated was that yet again it was the 'land laws' which were responsible. The commonsense beliefs of the Trades Councils of Great Britain were therefore predicated on the assumption there could be nothing inherently wrong with the capitalist system.

1. H.J. Hanham, "Liberal organisations of Working Men", op cit
2. Glasgow Trades Council, Minute Book, 1884-1885
The Glasgow Trades Council, however, discussed these returns over three consecutive meetings. They finally rejected the 'land laws' argument as the sole explanation because, as John Battersby argued, it did not explain the depression in the United States, a country without land laws. Clearly the members of the Council were puzzled and in the end they included the existence of land laws as part of their explanation along with overproduction (whose remedy was emigration) and other factors.

In reading the Minutes of the Glasgow Trades Council's arguments, one can see that all men are indeed philosophers, and that there is no event which cannot be interpreted differently according to one's philosophy.

It also means that we must slightly alter Gramsci's theory. Gramsci had distinguished between a commonsense thought and good sense thought on the basis of the critical and coherent nature of the latter. But he had also assumed that this was the difference between false consciousness and class consciousness. In fact, it is clear that men like Battersby were 'good sense' thinkers of the Liberal world vision, thinking critically and with coherence. The world visions of Liberalism and Conservatism are not necessarily less rational (i.e. critical) being built on the actual existence of a market and a national capitalist state.

The understanding of the 'real' progressive nature of Liberalism is very important. Recently Tholfsen has argued there is a continuation between Chartism and Radicalism because of the existence of democratic egalitarian values among working class Liberals:

"It was during the most militant and class-conscious period in their history that the English working classes became firmly committed to the values which were to provide the basis of mid-Victorian consensus and equilibrium."

But this is a strange approach. It wasn't that old radical working class values survived in a sea of middle class Liberalism, but that the middle class were also committed to democracy and egalitarianism. The difference between the two Liberalisms was between the pluralism of the working class - who fought for their organisational rights - and the individualism of the middle class who were quite prepared to support the Master and Servant Acts on the basis that only individuals should be contracted.

Thus the real difference between the two social groups lay in the creation of a different set of 'private associations' or 'social organisms' by the skilled craftsmen, alongside the Liberal political and ideological ones: the friendly societies, the craft trade unions, the co-operatives - societies which expressed the purposes of Liberal working men. All these societies had existed before the 1850s, as had the skilled craftsmen themselves, but their heyday was from the 1850s on. It was only after the defeat of Chartist that all skilled craftsmen had to defend themselves individually through the spreading of their 'market' societies.

Hanham has argued, following Thompson, that the 'basic unit of social life' in the early 19th century was the local 'club or lodge'. Of course, any local club or lodge could become associated with almost any politics, according to the local political flavour. But the aim of the 'new' societies created by and for one strata of the working class in the 1840s and 1850s was quite different. As Gosden has written of the Oddfellows:

"The aim was to make an Oddfellow working in a cotton mill in Accrington feel that he had more in common with an Oddfellow working in Portsmouth dockyard than he had with another Accrington cotton worker who was not an Oddfellow."

Of course there were friendly societies, craft trade unions, temperance societies, etc, before the 1850s. But the importance of the 1850s was that such societies were created as national communities which cut across local loyalties and workshop loyalties. These 'national' societies were not just part of a culture of a pre-existing labour aristocracy; they were part of the national creation of that class fraction.

The ASE and other craft unions changed their organisational structure. The Rochdale pioneers remade co-operation in production as co-operation in distribution. The friendly societies ceased to be local societies and became national organisations based on sound actuarial principles. And all these organisations and others like them (temperance, dissenting churches) together formed a network of a particularised, individualised world where the individual found and created his own place with others who were also capable, while those who were not capable were morally unfit.

The largest of all these societies were not the trade unions but the friendly societies. The Friendly Society Movement began from the 1760s and faced the authorities with a major problem - on the one hand such societies were useful for reducing the poor rate, but on the other hand they were politically dangerous. In 1815 one million people belonged to the Friendly Societies and they were all in local societies, often meeting in pubs, overlapping with trade union organisation (the returns for friendly societies and trade unions were not separated until 1871).

The split inside the Friendly Society Movement came in 1845 with the move by the major societies to establish sound actuarial principles

following the economic crisis of the 1840s. They also stopped
local lodges from meeting in pubs and having liquor funds (some went
on to form exclusive Temperance Friendly Societies with their own
halls in all the major cities in Britain); and they banned political
discussions.

Despite the split the major large societies not only remained
massive but grew: the Manchester Oddfellows had 426,000 members and
the Ancient Order of Foresters, 388,871. In 1872 while the trade
unions had 217,128 members and the co-operative movement 301,157,
the friendly societies had 1,857,896 - of which the large amalgamated
societies had 1½ million.

The Friendly Society Movement was important for four reasons: firstly,
it was the largest and the one which could most easily grow. There
were many different kinds of societies, like the Manchester ones and
the large amalgamated ones with all the trappings of ritual societies
(rituals were inherited from the early societies and borrowed from the
Freemasons). These societies were bound up with fellowship, and
a fairly high standard of living was necessary to keep up permanent
payments. There were also other societies which were less financially
demanding: for example six, like the Hearts of Oak, did not require
any financial commitment to fellowship.

The Friendly Societies were also very adaptable to local
conditions. There was almost a different 'set' of friendly
societies for each town. In Liverpool many of them were tontines,
dividing societies, which could therefore be easily attached to a
local Protestant church or the local Orange lodge.

Thirdly, the Friendly Society Movement was coherent with
Liberalism - on the one hand with the Liberal principle of providing
for oneself; and on the other with the Liberal economy. No social welfare system built on these kinds of insurance principles could have been created without the belief in progress. In addition, there was no major depression drawing on the funds from the 1840s to 1879 (the 1866 crisis didn't last long enough to create a crisis capable of destroying the basis of private social insurance). Nor could the societies have been created without the existence of a particular social strata - the labour aristocracy.

The fourth reason for their importance is that although the friendly societies couldn't have been created without the labour aristocracy they also became the means by which a 'respectable' working class could stand out against a 'rough' working class. There is no need to pose the rough/respectable distinction against the existence of a Labour aristocracy; it was membership of the 'societies' of the Labour aristocrat which came to define the 'respectable' worker.

All these societies - friendly, temperance, co-operative, trade union - bear some relationship to the market position of their membership. Liberal working men believed in protecting themselves against illness, hard times and death; they believed in not 'wasting' their resources on drink; they believed in organising to protect their skills in the market; and they believed in organising to buy collectively within the market. These societies of working class Liberalism were collective market societies. They distinguish working class Liberalism from working class Conservatism.

Given the political impact of the Freemasonry, it would be wrong to assume that any society that had labour aristocrats as members necessarily had a relationship to a single 'labour aristocrat culture'.


But writers on the Volunteer Movement in the late 19th century have assumed that membership of the Volunteers is equal to membership of one of the 'market' social organisms of the period. ¹ This stems from an approach which sees a 'culture' as a neighbourhood phenomena or an 'expression' of a class interest. But at the very least it is necessary to distinguish between 'market' societies like the Friendly Societies, the craft trade unions and the co-operatives, who were organic both to the stage of development of the mode of production (i.e. still dependent on workshop skills before 1880) and to the existence of a class fraction. societies that were organic to the Liberal state (Volunteers) and societies that were organic to political and ideological beliefs (Temperance). With the latter there was also the possibility of a large development of other alternative societies. Indeed, in the post-1867 period the Conservative Party attempted to construct its base out of such alternative societies - whether political clubs or the Orange Order.

It was possible for such alternative social organisms to grow within each neighbourhood because Liberalism was genuinely a 'beehive'. The only societies that were necessarily linked to Liberalism were the 'market' societies. Other societies - political and ideological - could be developed on the basis of different belief systems. The structural foundation for such belief systems could be found in the existence of the nation (Conservatism) or the potentially united class of workers (Socialism).

¹. R.Q. Gray, op cit, p. 102-103.
Because it was a beehive, each town's social structure could be, and was, different. Glasgow's Liberalism was not structurally the same as Sheffield or Manchester or Leeds. Furthermore, it was possible for Conservative towns like Liverpool and Birmingham to develop as well, and even their structural underpinnings were different from each other.

It was studying the 'societies' of the labour aristocracy that first brought home to me the importance of Gramsci's theory of social organisms. It became clear that these 'societies' - craft unions, Friendly Societies, co-ops, etc - were not merely the 'culture' of the labour aristocrats, but were in fact part of the definition of being a labour aristocrat. In a very real sense, the creation and recreation of these societies in the 1850s had established a class structure that was quite distinct from that of the 1840s. Many writers have argued that labour aristocrats existed prior to the 1850s - that is true. But it is only after the 1850s that their existence and the existence of the typical 'societies' belonging to them defines other workers not as factory hands, but as unskilled workers. The existence of labour aristocracy alters the definition of other workers in this period.

Hobsbawn's definition of the labour aristocracy is a 'market' definition. But Engels' definition was different:

"A permanent improvement can be recognised for two 'protected' sections only of the working class. Firstly the factory hands. The fixing by Act of Parliament of their working day... has restored their physical constitution and endowed them with a moral superiority, enhanced by their local concentration. They are undoubtedly better off than before 1848... Secondly, the great Trades Unions. They are the organisations of those trades in which the labour of 'grown-up men' predominates, or is alone applicable. Here the competition neither of women and children nor
of machinery has so far weakened their organised strength. The engineers, the carpenters and joiners, the bricklayers are each of them a power, to that extent that, as in the case of the bricklayers and bricklayers’ labourers, they can even successfully resist the introduction of machinery. That their condition has remarkably improved since 1848 there can be no doubt and the best proof of this is in the fact that for more than fifteen years not only have their employers been with them, but they with their employers, upon exceedingly good terms. They form an aristocracy amongst the working class; they have succeeded in enforcing for themselves a relatively comfortable position, and they accept it as final. They are the model working men of Messrs. Leone Levi and Giffen, and they are very nice people indeed nowadays to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general.

"But as to the great mass of the working people, the state of misery and insecurity in which they live now is as low as ever, if not lower. The East End of London is an ever spreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work and degradation, physical and moral when in work. As so in all other large towns - abstraction made of the privileged minority of the workers- and so in the smaller towns and in the agricultural districts. The law which reduces the value of labour-power to the value of the necessary means of subsistence, and the other law which reduces its average prices as a rule to the minimum of those means of subsistence: these laws act upon them with the irresistible force of an automatic engine which crushes them between its wheels.

"This then was the position created by the Free Trade policy of 1847 and by twenty years of the rule of the manufacturing capitalists."

The 'aristocrats of labour' are here contrasted with both the factory hands and the mass of the unorganised unskilled workers. This contrast is very important. It has often been assumed that the labour aristocrats were merely contrasted with the unskilled, and it has been forgotten that the period from the 1830s on saw a significant shift from a factory-based industrial capitalism to a workshop-based industrial capitalism, from Department II (the consumer goods of cotton, textiles, etc) to Department I (iron and steel, engineering).

This distinction of Engels between factory hands, skilled

Workers and unskilled workers is very important. It locates the 'aristocracy' before the second industrial revolution of machinery and the deskilling of labour, not merely in the market appearance of this phenomena. Both Engels and Hobsbawm's definitions are valid and despite recent criticism of the concept of the labour aristocracy, it is impossible to think the history of the 19th century without it. It has been the organising concept of most of the research into the 19th century Labour Movement.

Engels' distinction is also important because it enables us to locate the history of Lancashire. Two important works have appeared specifically concerned with Lancashire: P.F. Clarke, Lancashire and the New Liberalism, and Patrick Joyce, Work, Society and Politics. In the former, Clarke argues that the rise of a 'New Liberalism' on a quite different appeal to the working class than that of old or 'classical Liberalism' (i.e., the Vincent/Hanham variety) was based on welfare demands. But this was not the appeal that I found important in Glasgow. On the contrary, as late as 1909 the Budget Demonstration was an anti-landlord demonstration. Moreover, Paul Thompson in his study of London Liberalism and its revival after 1906 has also argued that the revival of Liberalism was based on the 'old' Liberalism of nonconformity.

It might therefore be necessary to postulate that Lancashire was special because it did still contain a sizeable factory labour force. Certainly, Joyce has discovered a quite different hegemony.

1. See Bulletin for the Society of Labour History, 1980, which includes Hobsbawm's summary of a paper dismissing Musson, Pelling etc. No. 40.
of Conservatism in the factories of Lancashire.¹

To summarise, I would argue that in the 1860s-1880s the commonsense view of the world available in Victorian England is transformed in the prism of Liberalism in many ways.

First, the commonsense view of the world of Liberalism is an active view of the world. Liberalism is not based on patronage, deference or passivity. The common radical analogy for Liberalism was that of a 'Beehive'. People were expected to participate. Radicals believed in progress.

Second, Liberalism was a 'local' society. People attempted to reform their lives in their immediate environment and they created local societies to do so. The municipality had a presence. Whereas they were fiercely against 'State' spending they were prepared to fund local spending - sanitation, fever hospitals, etc, derive from this. The origins of Liberal 'pluralism' may even be found here in the period before 1867. Vincent argued that Rochdale not only was more lenient on the poor law but was also committed to 'municipalism'.²

Third, there was general dislike of both economic and political 'monopolies'. They were against the monopoly of land, of mineral resources. They were also against the monopoly of the Church of England, and were for Disestablishment. They were against the monopoly of the House of Lords by the landed interest and the Bishops.

Fourthly, there was a general 'trust the people' position. The people had been right against the 'class' interests in the past. As Bright said,

"Whenever I speak on these questions, and wherever I have spoken, for forty years, I have always advocated the peaceful movement of the people in the direction they wished to go.³"

2. Vincent, op cit, p. 110.
Fifth, England was undoubtedly the greatest nation in the world because of Free Trade and Reform. Tyranny had been removed from its shores and it was fitting to support the struggle of other nations for their freedom. Gladstonian Liberalism was built on the Bulgarian atrocities agitation more than anything else.

Finally, because of Free Trade and Reform, permanent progress was assured. The 'people' do not sacrifice themselves for the 'nation' - on the contrary. Liberalism in short was a 'progressive ideology'. As social forces changed, it changed.

There were two problems with the Liberal commonsense view of the world. Firstly, it is unlikely that the majority of the British working class ever participated in it except at third hand - if then. Gramsci has argued that it is necessary to extend the organisational links deep into society in order that all members participate, even minimally, in a common understanding. The trade union movement only organised a tiny minority of workers in this period, the reformed franchise of 1884 still did not enfranchise a majority.

But it is true that in many localities totally unorganised workers did participate at third hand. The Liberal commonsense of organised, enfranchised workers did set some kind of 'commonsense horizon' for more than just themselves. In the crisis of 1866-1867 only 60,000 workers marched in the Glasgow Reform demonstration, but 200,000 looked on. Of course, in localities where an organised enfranchised working class barely existed, for example in London or Liverpool, Conservative hegemony replaced Liberal.
Conservatism

In the 19th century Conservatism developed in the shadow of the Liberal hegemony, first opposing, then adopting its central tenets, before ever finding its own 'natural' stance. Harris has argued:

"For the Tories and Conservatives, there were two major phases of transition, which transformed both the party and British society. The first - the transition from a predominantly agricultural society, governed in the main by the owners of land, the aristocracy, with assistance from merchants, bankers and traders, to a society primarily engaged in urban industrial activities and governed by an entrepreneurial 'middle class' - was obviously much the more dramatic and radical change. From the middle years of Burke to the middle years of Disraeli, Tories grappled with the implications of the transition. Toryism, particularly towards the end of this long period, was in disarray; contradictory purposes surfaced, breaking up the old coalition and, on its margins, creating both those dedicated to the destruction of existing society and those who were scarcely to be distinguished from the Whigs and the Liberals. Indeed it became increasingly unclear what Toryism was, what was the 'status quo' which was to be defended."

What this meant for the Tories was, as Vincent argued about the magistracy:

"As in other fields of action, the Tories could only keep up with the Liberals by sailing close to the wind: in doing so they unintentionally enhanced the reputation of the Liberals as the party of pure and just administration."  

Smith has argued that in 1872 Disraeli's programme was an Imperialist one, not one of Tory Democracy, and that it was constructed around three great objects: defence of the constitution, maintenance of the Empire, the elevation of the condition of the people.  
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the third element and Disraeli's reforming ministry of 1874-1880, Smith argues:

"The basic theme in the evolution of modern Conservatism... is not rapprochement with the masses in the spirit of the Disraeli ideal, but the assimilation of the bourgeoisie."  

But these two elements are not necessarily antithetical, except during the hegemony of Liberalism. Under Liberalism it was necessary for the Conservative Party to prove that it would do something for the working class: under Modern Conservatism it merely had to appeal to the people.

Because Liberalism was an active hegemony it was necessary for the Conservatives to organise working men's clubs and Conservative Working Men's Associations after 1867 in order to organise the working men's votes. In the 1880s new forms of 'active' societies flourished directly related to Imperialism - clubs and societies that supported Imperialist ideals, and youth organisations that attempted to inculcate them. Anti-socialist societies were also founded in the 1880s. In the 1900s, during the rise of New Liberalism, a whole host of Conservative labour organisations developed in Lancashire.

Because Liberal Britain was a society of local, municipal beehives, the Conservative cities of Liverpool and Birmingham could develop quite different webs of societies that supported their own peculiar Conservatism. But at the same time there was the development of an alternative basis for a hegemony that would ultimately become the basis of Modern Conservatism: the leisure industries of mass society. From the 1880s the rise of football clubs, music halls and then cinemas in small shops, provided a quite
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different focus for activity - a more passive form of activity. It is no accident that Liberal working men despised this mass culture.

Only one writer has really looked at the transition from the active voluntary societies of Liberalism to the passive mass societies of Conservatism (without actually using this framework) and this is Yeo.¹ Yeo's book is a study of only a small town, Reading, but what he sees in Reading is very suggestive of processes that were occurring elsewhere:

"Two features stand out in the contemporary ecology. First, and most distressing from the activists' point of view, most people are not actively involved in any organisation at all. A home-centred culture has replaced a work-centred culture or one involving organised voluntary activity...

"Secondly in the total spectrum of voluntary organisations, a large space is occupied by three distinct types... consumer-conscious organisation... sect... pressure group."

In arguing that most people are not actively involved, Yeo is excluding the 'natural' societies of work, neighbourhood and family. Yet I suspect that these are precisely the 'societies' through which people are now involved in a hegemony that is much more passive, the Modern Conservative hegemony of mass society. The voluntary societies we see are those that cluster around these great 'natural' societies, whereas the 'voluntary' societies of the working men of Liberal Britain had a life of their own.

The development of Modern Conservative hegemony on the basis of the 'natural' societies and mass culture had many effects. One of the most important was the rise of a 'youth' culture. Whereas the voluntary societies distinguished on the basis of income, not age, the societies of Modern Conservatism are often age-based. One of the
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most striking phenomena in Glasgow was the meteoric rise of the dance hall gangs in the inter-war years: Glasgow, the most predominantly skilled workers' city before the First World War, may well have experienced the transition to Modern Conservatism more sharply than most. Privatisation became a phenomenon of mass society during the privations of the inter-war years; it was not restricted to the affluence of the 1950s.

This is, of course, speculation. Without a detailed study of the structure of Modern Conservative hegemony, it must remain at the level of an idea - although one that perhaps fits a vast and increasing literature on 'mass culture'. It also fits the one work that has been concerned with the 'commonsense' thought of Modern Conservatism, Policing the Crisis. Its authors argue:

"We turn, first, to the notion of respectability... Respectability is the collective internalisation, by the lower orders, of an image of the 'ideal life' held out for them by those who stand higher in the scheme of things- it disciplines society from end to end, rank by rank. Respectability is therefore one of the key values which dovetails and inserts one social class into the social image of another class. It is part of what Gramsci called the 'cement' of society.

"Work is not only the guarantee of working-class respectability, it is also a powerful image in its own right...

"Another social image with special importance... has to do with the need for social discipline - and with England as a disciplined society...

"The traditional idea of social discipline is closely linked, on the one hand, with notions about hierarchy and authority...

"...in English culture the preferred forms of discipline are all internalised: they are forms of self-discipline, self-control...

"It follows that the three social image clusters we have so far discussed - respectability, work and discipline - are inextricably connected with the fourth image: that of the family...

"The next image is rather different... It is the image of the city..."
"Overreaching these social images and holding them together is the only image of the totality which sometimes seems to have achieved anything like universal currency: that of England... two dominant facets. The first is internal: it relates to all those things which, it is felt, the English 'do well'... The second aspect of 'England', however, is external. It is formed in relation to the superiority of the English over all other nations on the face of the globe. This is basically an imperial image - its myths and ideological power are rooted in the policies and populist justifications of the high noon of British imperialism...

"The final image we must deal with here is that of the law... The law appears as the only institutionally powerful defence of the other aspects of Englishness."¹

Clearly in this section the authors are identifying elements of a 'commonsense' that are coherent with a hegemony constructed on the 'natural' societies of work, neighbourhood and family, and also on the nation. Although their work is concerned with society in the 1970s, I would argue that it is probably true of the Modern Conservative hegemony that was established in the 1930s.

During the First World War many voluntary societies ceased to meet, friendly society lodges which had met for half a century stopped doing so; ties were broken. The 'social organism' base of Liberalism, however, disappeared before remnants of its commonsense - these were still important until the General Strike, the 1929 re-organisation of local government and the 1931 reorganisation of national government. From then on the natural societies, which had been becoming increasingly important as carriers of social images, came as did a mass culture to dominate people's lives.

This argument cannot be proved at this point of time. But one recent work² has attempted to suggest that the structure of

'natural' societies, particularly the society of work, was important for the establishment of Conservatism in Lancashire. Moreover, he contrasts the society of work and the powerful hold that work had over the factory workers of Lancashire with the alternative, conflicting hold of the voluntary societies, which were, of course, the creation of the labour aristocrats at the national level.

He argues:

"...in the factory North it was the social effect of the capitalist workplace that mattered most. This was the case because so many of these other aspects - education, religion, leisure, the family, and so on - were not in fact discrete areas of experience but had their most profound effect on class relations in so far as they were aspects of the culture of the factory. The degree to which the late nineteenth factory dominated the world of the operative can hardly be exaggerated..."

"The institutions of working class self-help, from the trade union to the co-op, represented a cultural autonomy and class identification that were in tension with the world of the factory. Similarly the world of the factory was itself shot through by ambiguity and contradictions."

The other 'society' that Joyce concentrates on is that of the family. The one problem is that although Joyce is aware of the ambiguities and contradictions, the framework he puts forward - class solidarity and cultures of subordination - becomes a theory of 'class consciousness' on the one hand and 'deference' on the other.

Many writers have used the concept of deference to discuss Conservatism, so it is necessary to say something about it. Mackenzie produced a definition of deference for his study of working class conservatives in the 1950s. He summarised the major elements of this concept as follows:

1. Deferentials prefer ascribed, socially superior political leadership.
2. Deferentials prefer power to originate from the elite, rather than from the mass franchise.

1. Ibid. p. xv-xvi.
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"3. Deferentials view political reforms benefiting the working class as indulgent or paternalistic acts by the elite, not as flowing from the machinery of government, or the economy.

"4. Deferentials form and express political judgements in terms of the intrinsic characteristics of leaders, not programatically in terms of issues or outcomes of policy.

"5. Deferentials prefer continuity to change.

"6. Deferentials view the Conservative Party as more patriotic than the opposition."

The inadequacy of this framework for the study of working class Conservatism becomes immediately apparent from the evidence. Nordlinger's 'deferential' conservatives were only 28 per cent of his sample- McKenzie had similar difficulties. Yet both studies continued to define deference as the only content of Conservatism. Nordlinger divided working class conservatives into 'deferentials' or 'pragmatists' (i.e., non-deferentials) and McKenzie's division was between deferentials or 'seculars' (i.e., non-deferentials). The reason the concept of deference was reduced to a tautology in both studies is that in any study of a widespread social phenomenon, psychologistic explanations are inadequate.

The alternative, I would argue, is to see working class Conservatism as essentially a rational phenomenon, derived from the particular world vision that these working men held. The basis of working class Conservatism is two-fold: firstly, the structured reality of Britain as a nation-state and the potential vision of the British people as one people, undivided, with common interests; and secondly, the existence of organisations embodying working class Conservative principles of 'one people'. These two are, of necessity, interlinked.


This means that Point 6 in the McKenzie typology is more important than it seems. The reason that working class conservatives are sometimes deferential (if Nordlinger is to be believed, 28 per cent of them) is that the 'we' with which they identify, the 'we' of the one, nation, has for its heroes the Great Men of the nation. Their potential answers to the question - 'with whom do I act in common?' - are all in terms of the British people and the nation. There is no fragmentation of interests as there was with working class Liberalism. And these potential answers are found in the structured reality of Britain's Empire, the threat of political, military and economic competition from other nation states, and the existence of racially and religiously inferior minorities in Britain. Of these the most pressing reality was the existence of a large Irish minority and it is for this reason that working class Conservatism developed in Liverpool on the basis of militant Protestantism and the Orange Order. It was a testimony to the strength of Liberal hegemony among the skilled working men that a similarly large Irish minority in Glasgow was not also the basis for strong working class Conservatism.

The 'societies' of working class Conservatism experienced great changes during the period 1884-1931. First, there were the Conservative Working Men's Associations (largely fostered through anti-Irish prejudice) which were active from the 1840s on and reorganised from the 1870s. Then there were the organisations created out of, and reinforcing Imperial sentiment, largely among youths - the Boys' Brigade, the Boy Scouts, the Empire Day Movement - which were built in the late 1890s and early 1900s. After 1931 all the organisations among adult working men become less important. They were necessary during a period of transition when the ideas of Conservatism battled with those of Liberalism and Socialism, but in
the late 1920s and early 1930s they were needed no longer: they either died or were destroyed (as in Liverpool in 1927 when the Conservative Working Men's Association was closed down after the defeat of the General Strike). The youth organisations continued but without the specific ideological task that had been envisaged for them by Smith, Meath and Baden-Powell.

The Conservative Working Men's Associations were largely related to the phenomenon of anti-Irish prejudice in Lancashire. These societies embodied the 'we' of British Protestants against the 'them' of the Irish Catholics. The essential precondition for this view to take hold was that these societies could offer a stronger alternative conception of reality than that of the work experience. Thus in Liverpool, where one-third of all workers were employed on work relating to the docks, and were, by definition, casual, the 'we' of the British Protestants was more real than the 'we' of other working men. In Glasgow, however, with industries like engineering, shipbuilding, iron and textiles, this definition of 'we' was only real in the shipyard craft of boilermaking where the men had originally came from Belfast, and in the foundries where many Irish labourers were employed. The Glasgow skilled men interpreted the social, political and economic problems of their social existence through the world view of Liberalism, where the Irish Catholic was a poorer, more misguided rank of the unskilled labourer.

It was in the late 19th century that the societies of Imperial Conservatism were founded. The raison d'être of these societies was to create and sustain a world vision which saw the Imperial mission of Britain as a common mission, overriding any internal differences of classes, sects or ranks. To be a British
working man was to be better than, and to have a higher destiny than a French aristocrat. This view was posed as an alternative world view at precisely the time when the radical strand of Liberalism emerged with the view that the working class was the 'nation' because all other classes were self-seeking and self-interested.

Joyce discusses the concept of deference via Newby's approach to the problem in his study of agricultural workers.¹ But although Newby's variant is a much more sophisticated one, it cannot break from the problems inherent in the approach itself; the ambivalent class images' approach is simply not as useful as Gramsci's concept of contradictory consciousness.

Gramsci's understanding of consciousness and his concept of social organism allow us to think through the changing pattern of Conservatism over time. This understanding can incorporate discussions of the farm as 'community,'² but is also much richer than this.

To date no-one has produced a study of the formation of the Conservative hegemony in the 1930s to equal that of Vincent's for the Liberal hegemony of the 1850s and 1860s. It was a formation that was not particular to Britain; it was international. Gramsci discussed 'Americanism and Fordism' for precisely this reason. It was through the American experience that it was possible to understand mass society. The enormous literature on the theory of 'mass society', summarised by Giner³, also demonstrates the fascination that this epoch has had for sociologists over the last forty years.

2. Ibid.
Although the total formation has not been studied in Britain, two books have attempted to come to terms with the world vision that was Modern Conservatism. Middlemas, in particular, sees its beginnings in the crisis of the First World War:

"During the First World War, the relationship between the state and its citizens, between the 'political nation' and the real nation, altered profoundly. The implicit contract between them was sharply redefined in circumstances of extreme crisis as, in order to avoid defeat in war, the government imposed first military conscription and then industrial discipline of unprecedented severity. Over and above the venerable debates about the nature of compulsion in society, the political nation was faced with a distinct conflict between its conception of the national interest and what it discovered public opinion desired- and, to avoid political breakdown, was consequently forced to find ways of maintaining its authority, and the national interest which that implied, by fresh compromises."  

I would put it differently: the Government confronted a working class whose consciousness, whether Liberal, Labour or even Tory, had great elements of a 'Liberal commonsense' to which conscription and compulsion were anathema; yet the 'national interest' demanded a negotiated settlement, not just personal self-sacrifice.

The great historian of Liberalism, Halevy, also reacted against the First World War in a very similar way to some other Liberals:

"The era of tyrannies dates from August 1914, that is, from the time when the belligerent nations turned to a system which can be defined as follows: (a) In the economic sphere, greatly extended state control of all means of production, distribution and exchange- and at the same time, an appeal by the governments to the leaders of workers' organisations

1. Harris, op cit; K. Middlemas, Politics in Industrial Society, the experience of the British system since 1911, (1979)
to help them in implementing this state control - hence syndicalism and corporatism along with 'etatisme'.

(b) In the intellectual sphere, state control of thought, in two forms: one negative, through the suppression of all expressions of opinion deemed unfavourable to the national interest; the other positive, through what we shall call the organisation of enthusiasm."

Indeed, the 'organisation of enthusiasm' was most important in using the organisations of mass culture (football grounds and music halls) to recruit to the Army.

Although the First World War was a decisive break it would be wrong to see it, and the crisis of 1919-1920, as finally destroying all the elements of Liberal commonsense. Strands appear to continue up until the defeat of the General Strike and the establishment of the National Government.

It appears strange to suggest that there was a process of transition lasting fifty years from one hegemony to another: from the 1880s to the 1930s. But this is what I believe was the case. Liberalism did not collapse, but merely crumbled. The crumbling took a long time and was punctuated by the emergence and re-emergence of the 'organic' crisis as well as crises of the conjuncture (which for Gramsci were arbitrary, willed and accidental).

One of the major organic crises was provoked by the First World War and the 1916 Easter Rising, and they played a decisive role in establishing Modern Conservative views and in shaping the form of the Labour Movement. We are concerned here, however, not with the structure of the Modern Conservative hegemony, but with its impact on the Labour Movement. It is to the question of Socialism as a world vision we now turn.

Much of Part III of this thesis is concerned with the different forms of Socialist ideology that developed in the Labour Movements of Glasgow and Liverpool. This section therefore is intended to provide the outline of a framework for the later discussion.

From the beginning of the rebirth of socialism in Britain in the 1880s there were two tendencies within both the 'evolutionary' socialists (the ILP and the Fabians) and the 'revolutionary' socialists (SDF and then the Socialist League). There were those who were much closer to the Radical Liberal tradition, such as Keir Hardie of the ILP and William Morris of the SL; and there were those who were much closer to an 'organic' model which predated Modern Conservatism, such as Ramsay MacDonald and Hyndman of the SDF.

The relationship between the Radical Liberal tradition and one form of the Labour world vision - adopted by the Glasgow ILP - was very close, and this is discussed at length below. This relationship was not unique to Glasgow; the programme on which the national ILP was launched was as much indebted to Liberal commonsense as was the Scottish Labour Party, founded five years earlier.

But the 'organic' evolutionary socialist approach which dominated the ILP and the Fabians was extremely isolated in Glasgow. And in Liverpool, although the Fabian Society was relatively strong, the Labour Movement itself was very weak and hence the ideology did not develop fully. Thus this tendency must be mentioned here.

The essence of the socialists who saw socialism as a development necessary and organic to capitalism was summed up by Ramsay MacDonald in the first issue of The Socialist Review:
"The discovery which belongs to the British School of Socialists is that the changing organism of Society produces the forces which make for its own readjustment, and that it is the Socialist's business to organise these forces and give them a form of political expression. Dogmatic and theoretical Socialism defines and describes the tendencies making the Socialist state inevitable; political Socialism devises means for using those tendencies and the forces which they call into being for constructive work. For, from the evolutionary and political point of view, forces making for the destruction of any existing order must have as complements forces making for the construction of a new order. When one order has fulfilled itself and is not merely ending in chaos but in a new order, its decay is marked by the release of motives and influences which created the new state of things, and the politician's duty is to reorganise these new forces and to find for them a medium of expression which can be used also by the more idealist tendencies making for the same ends. Thus the duty of the Socialist now is to select from the complexity of social movements those tending towards collective organisation and to marshall them for political purposes; and this duty becomes more and more imperative and pressing as the propaganda for the Socialist idea becomes more and more successful. This organisation of Socialist tendencies obviously cannot be labelled 'Socialist'. It may be Socialistic, but not being fully conscious of the Socialist ideal, it must be accepted as the expression of a tendency and not violated into that of an absolute idea."

As Lewis Grassic Gibbon commented in his essay "The Wrecker - James Ramsay MacDonald", in this view of evolutionary socialism, of society evolving organically.

"We catch a faint glimpse through yellow fogs of verbosity of an idea that the great lizards of the Mezoic suffered no deep or terrible calamity with the coming of the ice-caps. Did the stegosaurus freeze in his swamps and pass from the world for ever? Not at all. The stegosaurus looked about him and said: 'The cold comes on space. I must discard my scales and grow me some hair.' And this the good stegosaurus did, mislaying scales, claws, reptilian intestines and reptilian nature, and was presently a mammoth...

"(Quoting MacDonald) 'Socialism is no class movement. Socialism is a movement of opinion not an organisation of status. It is not the rule of the working class; it is the organisation of the community.'

"Surely it was very plain. The stegosaurus was on the move, shedding its vertebrate spikes, abandoning its carnivorous diet, and realizing, appalled, that hitherto its constituent cells had been quite unorganized.""
The development of the idea of a socialism that would necessarily arise within capitalism can be traced in the Fabian Facts for Socialists, published by the Fabian Society. The 1895 edition featured both a section entitled "The Classes versus the Masses" and a section entitled "The Two Nations" in which it argued both a Liberal and a Tory position:

"Socialists affirm that the evil can never be remedied until the 'two nations' are united by the restitution to public purposes of rent and interest of every kind, and by the growth of social sympathy promoted by the accompanying cessations of class distinction."

By June 1906, the new edition of Facts for Socialists had separate sections on "The Classes", "The Masses" and "The Two Nations", and it had a section on "The Competitive Struggle" which replaced one called "The Class War", although it dealt with the same problems such as infant mortality. A new section had also been added on "Some steps already taken towards Socialism" and it dealt with municipalisation - the establishment of works depots and direct employment of labour which was "yearly transforming hundreds of workers into State servants", death duties and differential income tax:

"By these and similar means, very greatly extended, the emancipation of the workers from the burden of private monopoly will slowly but surely come."

In January 1913 a Fabian pamphlet on John Stuart Mill argued:

"The Socialist movement today, or rather, the evolutionary section, stands far from the field of combat selected by its progenitors."

But these attitudes were barely present in the Glasgow ILP. Moreover, they were probably not as widely spread nationally as has been

2. Ibid, (1906)
supposed. A Liberal commonsense lingered in Labour ideologies for many years. In 1921 the *People's Year Book* wrote,

"That war-time, and a more or less long time afterwards, should be a time of difficulty is a proposition to which we all agree— but a definite charge may be sustained to the effect that in means taken to alleviate the consequences of the war, the classes, or some classes have been favoured in comparison with the masses."

Throughout the First World War a series of pamphlets produced by Liberals, Radicals and ex-Liberals criticised the war from the standpoint of the 'Peace, Retrenchment and Reform' slogan of classical Liberalism. But the idea that was most important in keeping alive some elements of Liberal commonsense was that of Free Trade.

From the study of two local societies in the First World War it is possible to see how the different structures of the cities influenced the type of socialist ideology that developed most strongly. The structures of the two conurbations of Glasgow and Liverpool are examined in Part II.

PART II

Introduction

The second half of the 19th century saw the final emergence of the huge industrial conurbations of the world's most advanced capitalist society. Each conurbation had its own particular set of industries, its own particular community structure and its own place in the British economy. Unlike the urban growth of the 1930s the growth of these conurbations was dependent on their particular place in the industrial structure, rather than their proximity to markets. The fascination of the great industrial conurbations lies in their uniqueness and much of that uniqueness depends still upon that 19th century development.

Part Two compares two of the great conurbations, Glasgow and Liverpool, with respect to their industrial structure, their community structure, the beliefs that workers who lived in those towns held and the 'societies' they joined.

Obviously, it would have been possible to compare conurbations that were more alike: to compare Glasgow and Tyneside (the great shipbuilding centres); Lancashire and West Yorkshire (the great textile centres); the West Midlands and Sheffield (small scale artisan workshops); East London and Liverpool (the great shipping and docking centres) and all these comparisons would have been fruitful in many different respects. But, as C. Wright Mills, argued:

"Often you get the best insights by considering extremes ... You will find that shuttling between attention to these dimensions to the concrete types is very illuminating. This technique is also logically sound, for without a sample, you can only guess about statistical frequencies
anyway: what you can do is give the range and major types of some phenomena, for that it is more economic to begin by constructing 'polar types', opposites along some dimensions" I

and I chose to study two 'polar types' that had been constructed before the First World War - a heavy industrial conurbation and one almost wholly concerned with transport and shipping. I was particularly interested in Glasgow and Liverpool because of the extremely different versions of 'commonsense' that were available and the extremely different versions of 'class consciousness' that developed. In Glasgow the ideologies of municipal socialism and revolutionary socialism developed against a backcloth of Liberal commonsense, while in Liverpool the ideology of syndicalism developed amidst a 'common-sense' dominated by Tory Democracy and Irish Nationalism. And yet in both towns it was possible to find stunted versions of an alternative commonsense and an alternative socialist ideology that never fully developed.

It would of course have been possible to compare Glasgow and Birmingham - that other city of Tory Democracy - but Glasgow and Liverpool were alike in one respect that Birmingham did not share - the large number of Irish immigrants. High Irish immigration into both Glasgow and Liverpool served to highlight the different ways that a particular experience could be handled according to the types of 'societies that men joined, the kinds of beliefs they held. A comparison between the Tory democracies of Liverpool and Birmingham, however, remains something that must be done elsewhere.

### 1911 Census

#### Population of Glasgow & Liverpool conurbations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Male population</th>
<th>Total M + F</th>
<th>Female population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glasgow conurbation</strong>*</td>
<td>492,205</td>
<td>1,008,487</td>
<td>516,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>381,304</td>
<td>784,496</td>
<td>403,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan</td>
<td>45,617</td>
<td>89,605</td>
<td>43,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partick</td>
<td>32,470</td>
<td>66,849</td>
<td>34,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* City of Glasgow as extended in 1912 to include the Police Burghs of Govan and Partick from Lanarkshire, and the Burgh of Pollockshaws, Cathcart, Scotstoun and Yoker from Renfrewshire

**Source:** Census of Scotland 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Male population</th>
<th>Total M + F</th>
<th>Female population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liverpool conurbation</strong></td>
<td>491,470</td>
<td>1,025,585</td>
<td>534,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool City</td>
<td>358,080</td>
<td>746,421</td>
<td>368,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootle</td>
<td>34,408</td>
<td>69,876</td>
<td>35,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>63,601</td>
<td>130,794</td>
<td>67,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallasey</td>
<td>35,381</td>
<td>78,504</td>
<td>43,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The sum of the City of Liverpool and the County Boroughs of Bootle and Birkenhead and the Municipal Borough of Wallasey

**Source:** Census of England and Wales 1911
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Chapter 4  The Glasgow Conurbation

I  Industrial Structure

The history of Glasgow before and during the First World War is quite distinct from its subsequent history. It is not possible to argue that pre-First World War Glasgow shared a 'Peripheral' relationship (along with the rest of Scotland) to the core of British metropolitan capitalism. ¹ On the contrary, in the twenty years before the First World War, Glasgow had the best claim to being the Second City of the British Empire, a claim built on its central position in the engineering and shipbuilding industries. Before the slump of 1920-1921 it was the casual poor of London and the South-East, or of Liverpool, that concerned the Royal Commissioners, not the booming heavy industrial districts of the North of England and the West Coast of Scotland.

Glasgow occupied a distinct position in Scotland. Its heavy industrial structure was quite different from the towns of the East Coast- Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen - while it shared the same political and administrative structure. It was a peculiarly Scottish and British city, sharing some political concerns with the other Scottish towns but also looking towards the other great industrial conurbations of Britain, particularly the other shipbuilding conurbations of Belfast and Tyneside, and the shipping centre of Liverpool.² It was a more cosmopolitan city than Edinburgh,


²  Asa Briggs, Victorian Cities, (Pelican Books 1968), p34-5, quotes Patrick Geddes, Cities in Evolution and argues, "To Geddes Glasgow and Edinburgh were far remoter in type and spirit than the small railway distance between them suggested: they were really the respective regional capitals of East and West Scotland, far apart in many ways - 'geographical, meteorological, racial and spiritual'." For Geddes, Glasgow was the true Victorian city of Scotland.
with a Russian and Polish Jewish settlement as well as the huge settlement of the Irish (both Protestant and Catholic) and the Highlanders.

In the development of Glasgow, Victorian Liberalism appeared to have fulfilled its promise of 'progress' for the 'North Britons'. First, both the middle classes (immediately) and the working classes (eventually) had been enfranchised by the great Reform Acts of 1832, 1868 and 1884 compared with the 'rotteness' of its parliamentary representation pre-1832. Second, during the era of Free Trade and 'Peace, Retrenchment and Reform', Glasgow had been transformed from a growing textile and printing centre, into the most massive shipbuilding, iron and steel, and engineering conurbation of the British Isles - a city of world wide industrial significance.

This transformation restructured the city of Glasgow:

"In Glasgow's early phase of industrialisation based upon cotton textiles (in turn succeeding linen) it was in the east end, and along the river at Anderston, that both factories and workers' homes were built. The elements of industry held tightly together in a group, in Anderston, in Bridgeton and further east. With the great ascendency of Clydeside shipbuilding from the 1850s onwards immense development took place westward, down-river. Shipbuilding not only revolutionised the economy of Glasgow, it reorientated the city in space. In the great age of iron and steel, marine engineering and shipbuilding, Glasgow had two dominant relationships, the one with the coal and iron fields of the east and the other westward with the shipbuilding yards."

1. See below p. 190.
Govan was transformed from 1864 from a 'rural community' separated by a considerable distance from the neighbouring city of Glasgow, and Kinning Park and Tradeston were built up, as was Partick when the shipyards were constructed.

By 1911 the Census of Scotland of that year presents a picture of two Glasgow economies: one in the 'old' city of Glasgow in which iron manufacture, transport industries, the preparation and sale of provisions, and housebuilding predominates; the other in the 'new' areas of Govan and Partick in which shipbuilding predominates (see Table 2). This difference was important because the coal and iron industry had begun a long-run decline while shipbuilding was booming.

It would be wrong to assume, as both contemporary observers and subsequent historians did, that greater Glasgow was a highly diversified economy. Glasgow's expansion before the First World War was entirely in the new areas of production and this output grew prodigiously. Treble writing of 1891-1914 argues:

"During these years Glasgow's prosperity depended to a considerable extent upon the fluctuating fortunes of the engineering, iron and steel and shipbuilding trades - and this despite the fact that until the absorption of the burghs


2. Charles Taylor Partick, [Glasgow 1902], p88 puts Partick's population at 5,000 in 1852 (its foundation) 17,000 in 1872 45,000 in 1896 and 54,272 in 1902.


4. P.P. 1908: Cost of Living of the Working Classes: Enquiry by the Board of Trade into working class rents, housing and related prices together with standard rate of wages, Cd 3864: The Town report on Glasgow p.531-536 argues that occupation tables derived from 1901 Census of Scotland show Glasgow is a 'great railway centre, a great port, a great engineering-shop, and that it occupies a prominent place in the textile trades' see p.531 onwards. W. R. Scott and J. Cunnison The Industries of the Clyde Valley during the War (Oxford 1924) argues that 'what distinguishes the industry of Glasgow from that of other towns is that ... no important industry which was once established has been suffered to disappear... Thus the peculiar character of the industry of the Clyde Valley is its diversity'.
### Table 2
Numbers engaged in principal industries of the City of Glasgow, the Burgh of Govan and the Burgh of Partick in 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Govan</th>
<th>Partick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron manufacture</td>
<td>49,140</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations and sale of provisions</td>
<td>22,665</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>1,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House building, decorating</td>
<td>17,201</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government service</td>
<td>14,283</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway service</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping and docks</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and furniture</td>
<td>9,417</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road transit</td>
<td>7,329</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal manufacture other than iron</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>10,235</td>
<td>7,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census of Scotland, 1911, Vol. 1, Tables XXIV, XXIVb(3), XXIVb(6).*
of Partick and Govan in 1912 the city possesses no major shipyards within its municipal boundaries. For if these industries covered a vast range...the local economy in these fields was nonetheless, with one or two prominent exceptions, an essentially integrated structure in which a decline in orders in one sector would have adverse multiplier effects over the whole spectrum.1

The immediate result of the enormous expansion of Glasgow's heavy industry before the First World War was to produce an occupational structure in which the skilled worker - in a broad definition - dominated the male workforce. In order for the Clyde to produce a third of the British tonnage, half of the engine power, 18 per cent of world shipbuilding and to equal the entire output of the German yards 2 there had to be an enormous concentration of shipbuilding skills and marine engineering skills in one area.

The impact the iron trades and shipbuilding had on the occupational structure of Glasgow and the Glasgow extension can be seen in Table 3.

In the city of Glasgow itself, nearly a quarter of all males were employed in occupations in the metal, machines and implements category, whereas in the Glasgow extension (areas added in 1912, see map) 41.8 per cent were so occupied and in the Govan and Partick areas of the Glasgow extension it was 48.9 per cent and 42.5 per cent respectively. In Greater Glasgow as a whole, 28.51 per cent of occupied males over the age of 10 were employed in the metals, machines, implements category and 16.39 per cent in transport (conveyance).


A. Slaven, "The development of the West of Scotland 1750-1960" London 1975, p177-184
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Glasgow conurbation* of which:</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Glasgow Extension* of which</th>
<th>Partick</th>
<th>Govan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. x.</td>
<td>Metals, Machines, Implements ...</td>
<td>92,588</td>
<td>62,707</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>14,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. vi.</td>
<td>Conveyance ...</td>
<td>53,221</td>
<td>43,312</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. v.</td>
<td>Commercial ...</td>
<td>27,410</td>
<td>21,764</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. xx.</td>
<td>Food, Tobacco, Drink, Lodgings</td>
<td>26,589</td>
<td>21,685</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. xii.</td>
<td>Building ...</td>
<td>23,539</td>
<td>18,861</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. xix.</td>
<td>Dress ...</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. xiii.</td>
<td>Wood, furniture, fittings etc.</td>
<td>10,526</td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.xviii.</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>10,391</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. iii.</td>
<td>Professional ...</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.xvii.</td>
<td>Paper, prints, books, stationary</td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ix.</td>
<td>Mining ...</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. i.</td>
<td>Government ...</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. xv.</td>
<td>Chemicals, oil, grease, soap ...</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. xxi.</td>
<td>Gas, water, electricity ...</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued .......

Table 3: Summary Occupational Structure - Males, 10 years old & over - 1911
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Glasgow conurbation* of which Glasgow,</th>
<th>Glasgow extension* of which Partick</th>
<th>Govan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. Other, general &amp; undefined</td>
<td>15,882</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>13,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All occupied</td>
<td>324,733</td>
<td></td>
<td>253,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 15 orders listed as % of total occupied</td>
<td>95.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 1912 the City of Glasgow’s boundaries were extended to include Govan, Partick, Pollockshaws, Cathcart and Scotstoun & Yoker. The figures given here are of the population living in the area of the extension at the time of the 1911 census.

Source: Census of Scotland 1911
City of Glasgow in 1912

Shaded area shows City extension incorporated within boundaries in 1912.
Treble has attempted to identify those occupations in Glasgow which can clearly be identified as being "the preserve, or containing an element, of unskilled male labour" and his figures estimate only 27.16 per cent of occupied males as being unskilled in the Municipal Burgh of Glasgow in 1911.¹ Even adding other minor occupational categories to Treble which I consider unskilled, the total proportion of unskilled in the male labour force in Glasgow was only 30.91 per cent, and in the Glasgow extension was 28.63 per cent.²

This very rough guide may still be an underestimate of the number of unskilled workers, (in particular, it cannot identify the growing category of the 'handyman' between the skilled and unskilled worker) but it does suggest how far removed the Glasgow labour force was from the situation described by Hobsbawm where the labour aristocracy was a small minority of the workforce.³

The question is, how far can these skilled workmen be considered a 'labour aristocracy', 'respectable workers', or the precursors of the modern working class by 1911. In terms of Hobsbawm's six criteria for a labour aristocracy - the level and regularity of earnings, security, conditions of work (including the way he was treated by foremen), relationship with upper and lower social strata, general

conditions of living and the prospects for advancement for children\(^1\) - then the experience of the skilled workmen of the Clyde prior to the First World War was decidedly mixed. Table 4 compares certain skilled and unskilled wage rates in Glasgow in 1908.

**Table 4** Wages in some of the Principal occupations in the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trades</th>
<th>Principal Occupations</th>
<th>Weekly Rates of Wages at October, 1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building*</td>
<td>Bricklayers, Carpenters, and Joiners, and Plasterers</td>
<td>40s. 4½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masons, Plumbers and Painters</td>
<td>38s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>23s. 4½d. to 25s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitters and Turners</td>
<td>35s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>34s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Boilermaking (new work)</td>
<td>Patternmakers</td>
<td>37s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Platers (heavy)</td>
<td>41s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(light)</td>
<td>38s. 4½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivetters and Caulkers</td>
<td>36s. 1½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shibuilding*</td>
<td>Platers</td>
<td>36s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivetters and Caulkers</td>
<td>33s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Compositors</td>
<td>34s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing</td>
<td>Cabinet Makers</td>
<td>29s. 9d. to 42s. 6d.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upholsterers</td>
<td>36s. 1½d.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French Polishers</td>
<td>34s.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are the rates for a full ordinary week in summer, viz., 51 hours. In winter, when the hours worked are shorter and the work intermittent, the weekly earnings are less.

*These are standard rates of wages recognised by the trade unions concerned.

**Source:** P.P. 1908 Cd. 3864 op cit.

1. E. Hobsbawm *ibid.* p273
Although there is clearly a wide wage differential between skilled workers and unskilled workers in Glasgow in terms of the regularity of these earnings, the period 1895-1914 was contradictory for the skilled working men of the Clyde.

Treble identifies two periods of good trade - 1885-1902, 1911-1913 - and two periods of prolonged crisis - 1903-1905, 1907-1910 - in the twenty years before the war for the engineering and shipbuilding trades of Glasgow. Overlaid on this was a separate building cycle such that in 1892-3, the building trade was active when shipbuilding was down. In 1895, it was down because of sub-zero temperatures when engineering and shipbuilding were picking up, although this was merely a break in the upswing of speculative building from 1892-1901, while from 1903 on, building began to decline. The prolonged crises of 1903-5 and of 1907-10 were therefore crises in which engineering and shipbuilding slumps crossed with a dump in house building. Not surprisingly, by 1908 not only was the Trades Council conducting a survey into unemployment, but the socialist societies were organising massive unemployed demonstrations.

1. P.P. 1908 Cd. 3864 Op cit. See also J. H. Treble, op cit, p. 129. Unskilled wage rates fluctuated and these wage rates did not take into account short time working or 'holidays'. Surface men and plateayers on the North British Railway Co. earned 18s. - 20s. a week in 1899-1911. Dock and Quay Labourers on Allan Steamship line, 7d an hour (these would be 'preference' men's rates JS). Shipbuilding and boilermakers labourers 4½d. an hour. Railway Carters 23s. for a 75 hour week up to 1908. For the skilled workers, particularly in the shipyards, these wage rates did not include overtime payments which could be high for Sunday working, or night work. Forward January 1 1916 "Wages on the Clyde" compares pre-war and wartime wages in this respect and shows a decline in earnings of some trades because the Ministry of Munitions had stopped Sunday working.


3. See below p. 322 passim.
Seasonal cycles also affected trades differently. This meant that many unskilled workers and some skilled workers were prone to lay-off at some time in the year. Treble identifies three major seasonal industries. First, the consumer orientated industries, with May to August as the peak employment months for 'sweated' dressmaking. Winter was the peak employment period for labourers in the gasworks and deliverers of domestic coal supplies, and makers of boots and shoes. Second, the building trades were often severely affected by weather and were also affected by the yearly 'house-letting' activity boom in May closely followed by slack months. Third, there were the 'Class Three' dockers and quay workers.

Further, the experience of certain craftsmen like the carpenters and joiners was a different one from that of skilled men associated purely with shipbuilding and engineering. They were the ones faced most strenuously with the question of 'independence' in terms of frequent changes of employment, affected as they were by all three cycles.

But for all skilled men the experience of the 1900s was not a happy one, faced as they were with two trade cycles on top of each other in a period of constantly rising prices. Checkland has argued that in bad times employers attempted to keep on their best skilled workmen but by 1908-9, this clearly was no longer the experience of the skilled workmen of the Clyde.

1. J. Treble "Seasonal demand for adult labour in Glasgow" op cit.
2. S. Checkland, *The Upas Tree*, op cit, p.15.
Similarly, their working conditions and the respect they had from the foremen, were contradictory. On the one hand foremen were usually members of the appropriate union and even the skilled engineers asserted their independence in various forms: in engineering for example, the ceremony of 'tossing the brick' to decide whether to take an extra day's holiday at the end of the Fair and at the end of New Year was common.\(^1\) On the other hand, there was the fear of layoffs (especially for socialists)\(^2\) and the hiring power of the foremen.\(^3\) Often they might also be in the same organisation - such as the Freemasonry and the Churches.

Moreover, the working situation for skilled men was largely that they were not in charge of their own labourers, but called up a labourer as and when they were needed.\(^4\) Even in those trades in the shipyards which paid their own 'helpers' when on piece work (principally, the jobbing platers and the 'Big Squad' patternmakers), it was a team of skilled men, with helpers, who worked together.\(^5\)

In terms, therefore, of the level and regularity of their earnings, the security, and conditions of work, the experience of the skilled workmen on the Clyde was different from that of the unskilled. But it was an experience which stressed collective aims rather than just individual ones.


2. *Ibid* p44.

3. S. Checkland *The Upas Tree*, op cit, p.3


5. *Forward* January 1 1916
Hobsbawm's other criteria - the relationship with upper and lower social stratas, general conditions of living and the prospects of advancement for their children - do not show such marked differences. The 'typical' private associations of Glasgow skilled men - friendly societies, Co-operatives and temperance societies\(^1\) - were all ones in which social contacts beyond the working class were possible, but not ones where such social contacts were thought to be part of the 'purposes' of the associations.\(^2\)

The 'conditions of living' were largely determined by the 'tenement' system of building in Glasgow. The tenement system ensured that artisan areas were not separated from areas of unskilled workers (blocks of one-room tenements were built near to two or three roomed tenements), that Glasgow 'artisans' were an extremely mobile workforce who did not own their own housing, and that both skilled and unskilled workmen were physically separated from the middle classes who had already moved to the areas of housing in the West End and Pollockshaws.\(^3\) Moreover in such an overwhelmingly working class city the question for a working class boy was not what occupation he aspired to but what trade. Harry McShane worked with boys from 'middle class' backgrounds in Howdens who were there to learn the engineering trade before becoming professional engineers.\(^4\)


2. Social contact through the Presbyterian churches and the Freemasonry were liable to be more 'deferential' and individual engineering and shipbuilding employers attempted to promote such social contact through 'soirées' which survived until the early twentieth century, but such contacts were not critical. In Glasgow a Liberal commonsense, founded on the premise of the 'classes versus the masses', protected the skilled artisan from deference.


4. H. McShane and J. Smith \textit{op cit} p.18-20
The whole city was dominated by the skilled trades.

According to Hobsbawm's criteria the skilled workmen of the Clyde were a labour aristocracy, but one which was part of the working class. They were not a minority who had to defend their craft privileges in a sea of unskilled labour. Moreover their 'commonsense' - predominantly Liberal - could prompt some to identify politically with the Irish and the Highlanders, against the landlords and some later to support organisation of the unskilled workers of their city. Additionally, one critical criteria of a 'labour aristocracy' that was not discussed by Hobsbawm - the relationship to the means of production - firmly placed them on the same side as the unskilled workers, unlike Birmingham.

In Birmingham it was possible for an artisanate of engineers who worked alongside their 'masters', in small workshops, to aspire themselves to being masters. In such a situation, it was possible for a whole set of societies (such as Volunteers) to be developed in a way that constructed a form of Tory democracy out of Liberal Unionism (a quite different position from that of Liverpool) within the Birmingham engineers.

In Glasgow however the size of the workshops and engineering shops by the 1890s, precluded any possibility of an engineering shipyard or iron trade worker aspiring to be a small 'master'. The only trade where such aspirations were possible was the building trade where for different reasons there was the strongest support of Liberal commonsense in Glasgow.

1. See below p. 187 passim.

2. Michael D. Blanch Nation, Empire and the Birmingham Working Class University of Birmingham, Ph.D. Thesis 1975, p12-13. Although these were larger factories in new industries, brass and non-ferrous metal industries employed 45,000 in small workshops, the jewellery industry employed 80-80,000 in small workshops.

3. Ibid p100-103, p247 on.
Although not an artisanate, the Glasgow working men were still a labour aristocracy of skilled workers who relied upon their individual possession of craft skills as much as their membership of a craft union. Again this criteria relates to their situation in production rather than in the market, and it is critical. The shipyards of the Clyde constructed custom-built ships in which the numbers of plates and the feet of angle-iron varied from type of ship to type of ship: the trade of the plater was one that could not be diluted. Moreover as shipbuilding developed so the number of trades involved in shipbuilding proliferated:

"... the multiplicity of crafts and unions active in the shipyards was the result of the technical revolution and not an anachronism which had somehow survived despite the good sense of the workers and their employers ... While subsequent changes in the technology of shipbuilding tended to blur the boundaries between the trades and resulted in inter-union strife, the stratification of the industry along craft lines remained on balance the most appropriate way of organising the highly skilled workforce and its trade unions." 2

Even in engineering where machinery had long threatened the engineer with dilution by 'handymen' and semi-skilled workers the situation varied widely. Before the First World War Harry McShane worked in Butter Brothers where there "was very little machinery in the works, and the engineers had to do everything by hand"; 3 also in Weirs,

1. Forward, January 1 1916, describes the piece rate system in operation, where men would individually negotiate the individual price for a particular ship.


3. H. McShane and J. Smith op cit p41: "You were given a wheel and the shaft and the keys for the big cranes and they all came still black from the blacksmith's, not even polished; you had to cut the key-way in the shaft and in the barrel by eye, with a candle at the other end. The key had to be tapered to an eighth of an inch so that it wouldn't slip out, and you had to do that without drawings. Butter Brothers did many jobs like that, with no machinery." It was on this depth of skill that the labour aristocracy had been constructed in the 1850s and 1860s and had been vitally necessary to the development of the productive forces in that period.
"a modern factory with men working their own bays at their own benches ... the jobs were so ridiculously simple anyone could do them."¹

The possibility of being a sea-going engineer was also present in Glasgow as most Glasgow engineers would have had experience of actually building the engines for shipping:

"The engineers were labour aristocrats on board ship. We ranked as officers, had our own galley and ate separately from the crew, and we each had a separate room and could bath in the engine room ... Any Glasgow engineer was welcome because Glasgow was a centre for marine engineering."²

Above all, such craftsmen developed a particular attitude to their tools³; their 'tools' were both economically important and also an important extension of themselves as 'independent Men', as was the idea of moving from branch to branch of their industry in order to become all round skilled craftsmen.⁴

¹. H. McShane and J. Smith op citp.59.
². ibid p.70.
³. Departmental Committee on House-Letting in Scotland. Evidence of Mr. Ross (Q. 1680-1682 p42-42) against the law of hypothec which allowed landlords to seize all goods including tools, wearing apparell and necessary furniture. Evidence of Mr Cox (Q. 4018 p.95) "Would you put it out of the power of a man to pawn his tools, because that happens sometimes? - He will not be a very sound man, or will be very desperate before he does that." P.P. 1907, Cd 3715.
⁴. H. McShane and J. Smith op citp.41.
II. The 'natural' societies

The work unit of the Glasgow working man - the quintessential phenomena of the British working class to use Hobsbawm's phrase - differed widely according to skill and to trade, as we have discussed above. For the skilled man it was a work unit which could still reinforce his belief in his own 'independence' without placing him in a situation where he necessarily controlled other, unskilled workers. The work units of the skilled working men of Glasgow were primarily units where a group of skilled men worked together and thus their attitude to their 'independence' reinforced attempts at a collective organisation rather than undermined them. Shop stewards developed in engineering in order to check whether a man was a member of the union and also to check whether he had served his time. Foremen were also members of the union.1

Patronage was not an important avenue to work for unskilled working men in Glasgow until after the First World War and those firms that discriminated against Catholics were a minority.2 Because that was true for the skilled working men it also dominated the attitude to hiring of the unskilled working men. As Treble has argued, both the Irish and the Highlanders were distributed throughout all the unskilled occupations.3

2. H. McShane and J. Smith op cit p. 56.
3. Treble, The market..., op cit, p. 121-122.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Glasgow conurbation which:</th>
<th>Glasgow of Extension* which:</th>
<th>Partick</th>
<th>Govan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>iv. Domestic ...</td>
<td>28,870</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>23,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>xix. Dress ...</td>
<td>25,721</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>20,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>xviii. Textiles ...</td>
<td>18,621</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>15,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>xx. Food, Drink, Tobacco, Lodgings</td>
<td>17,308</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>14,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>v. Commercial ...</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>8,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>xvii. Paper, prints, books, stationary</td>
<td>8,275</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>7,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>iii. Professional ...</td>
<td>8,091</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>6,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>vi. Conveyance ...</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>xiii. Wood, furniture, fittings ...</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>xv. Chemicals, oil, grease, soap ...</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>i. Government ...</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** All occupied women 135,920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Partick</th>
<th>Govan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>111,603</td>
<td>24,317</td>
<td>7,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.12</td>
<td>92.64</td>
<td>93.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 11 orders listed above as % of total occupied women 93.04

**All occupied women as % of all women aged 10 years +**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Partick</th>
<th>Govan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>35.05</td>
<td>27.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nos. of women in no occupation or unspecified (Order 23) 269,565
Similarly, the family was a 'natural' society which reinforced the skilled workingman's attitude towards 'independence': he expected to be able to provide for his family. The proportion of married women working was much lower in the Glasgow conurbation than in Liverpool, it was also lower in Govan and Partick than in Glasgow city.

In 1911, in Glasgow city 5.5 per cent of married women were occupied (comprising 6.31 per cent of all occupied women), 2.3 per cent in Govan (3.90 per cent), and 2.19 per cent in Partick (3.20 per cent). Unlike Lancashire, there was no tradition of married women working and they didn't despite the fact that employment outside domestic service was more readily available than in Liverpool.

Table 5 shows a greater spread of female occupations in Glasgow than occurred in Liverpool, and skilled men would move in order to find suitable employment for their sons and daughters. The highest proportion of domestic servants among occupied women over 10 years is to be found in Partick (which, of course, included the West End of Glasgow), then Glasgow City and a very low rate in Govan (28.2 per cent, 20.9 per cent, and 13.5 per cent respectively).

In both Govan and Glasgow City female employment in dress and textiles together employed more women than domestic labour (18.8 per cent and 14.1 per cent in Glasgow City and 24.8 per cent and 11.2 per cent in Govan). Similar percentages are found for domestic service employment among Liverpool women as are found for dress and textiles in Glasgow.

Nor is there any area in Glasgow where domestic labour employs such proportions as in Birkenhead and Wallasey.

1. Census of Scotland 1911
2. Departmental Committee on House-Letting in Scotland.
The 'family' was undoubtedly an oppressive institution in Glasgow for women, but no one suggested that this varied according to whether it was a skilled worker's family or an unskilled. The major difference for the women of Glasgow was to be found in the type of tenement that the family inhabited - one room, two rooms, or for the few, three rooms.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of pop. in houses with no. of rooms</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Govan</th>
<th>Partick</th>
<th>Glasgow 1912 ext.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of persons living 1 or 2 to a room</th>
<th>44.3</th>
<th>37.3</th>
<th>50.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2+ to a room</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ to a room</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ to a room</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>754,534</td>
<td>87,954</td>
<td>66,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of inhabited houses with:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 windowed room</td>
<td>32,606</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>75,536</td>
<td>10,910</td>
<td>6,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>30,775</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>10,817</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>13,054</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inhabited houses</td>
<td>162,788</td>
<td>18,373</td>
<td>14,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Census of Scotland 1911
Three points must be stressed. First, the tenement system of housing meant that even skilled workers could be found living in housing conditions that were worse than the East End of London:

"Of the 26,794 dwellings built in Glasgow between 1866 and 1874, half were of two rooms and a quarter only one; in 1911, 20 per cent of Glasgow's families were still living in one room, 46.3 per cent in two rooms; of these one-room families, 57 per cent were living three or more to a room - not counting lodgers. Glasgow and Dundee were respectively about one-half and one-quarter as bad again, in percentages of population living more than two to a room, as the worst London boroughs, Bethnal Green, Stepney, Shoreditch, and Finsbury - the populations of which were, of course, nothing like so large. On the other hand it may reasonably be suspected that a Scottish family in a new 'single-end' were likely to be immeasurably better off than any English family in a made-down single room."¹

The rents on such tenements were room for room more costly than in England (for small terrace houses)² and the greater number of 'houses' that could be squeezed into one tenement, the higher the profitability. Whereas, in England and Wales, the building society movement had enabled some artisans to buy their own homes and in Liverpool some building trade workers built homes for letting out, in Glasgow the tenement system precluded this. Tenements were owned by small investors - tradesmen, provision dealers, widows of such men - and not by artisans.³ In Glasgow skilled and unskilled workers were all in the same housing market.

Second, although it was the unskilled who inhabited the single-ends and the bottom end of the housing market in Glasgow - the 'lodging houses', the 'farmed houses' and the 'ticketed houses', some could inhabit the two-roomed houses that were the predominant housing for the skilled worker. And, in periods of bad trade it was quite possible for all workers in the Glasgow conurbation to economise by moving into worse housing conditions.  

Third, plans for building single apartment housing units peaked as late as 1901. Tenements of single-ends were being constructed at the same time as two-roomed apartments and often in blocks in close proximity. Not only did this mean that skilled workers and unskilled workers lived in the same neighbourhood it also produced a situation where, very rapidly, 'new' areas of Glasgow could become problem areas.  

In 1886, Russell (Medical Officer of Health) identified four major areas within the city of Glasgow, using comparative crude mortality rates, illegitimate and legitimate child death rates, district insurance of lives in friendly societies (a sign of the 'respectable' working class), size of house and occupants per room,

1. John Butt, "Working Class Housing in Glasgow, 1851-1914", p.76-82, in (ed) S.D.Chapman, The History of Working Class Housing, 1971, describes the system of 'farming' out where one tenant would rent to many sub-tenants, the 'ticketed' houses whereby houses were ticketed according to the numbers allowed to live there, and 'lodging houses' provided by the municipality.

2. John Butt, "Working Class Housing in Glasgow 1900-1939" p.146 in Ian MacDougall ed. "Essays in Scottish Labour History"(1976), "...by 1910, 19.95 per cent of the total housing stock was uninhabited. Undoubtedly, this was one outward manifestation of a wages and unemployment problem in the city which became most acute after 1905". The houses that lay empty were the small houses while overcrowding increased.

3. S. Checkland "The Upas Tree" op cit p.19
rate of consumption, lung and infection diseases. The best area he asserted
was the West-End, containing 'a large admixture of the middle class and
the best of our working class population' (Blythwood, Exchange,
Woodside and Kelvinhaugh, Sandyfield); next came the 'new Glasgow'
built under the police act of 1866, including those areas constructed
around the expansion of the railways (Springburn and Maryhill,
St. Rollox) and those around that of engineering (Greenhead and Dennistoun)
and Kingston and Hutchinson Square. Then came the 'old village'
centres; (Port Dundas, Barrowfield, St Enoch Square, Anderston proper,
and Laeuston) and finally came the High Street and Closes,
- St Andrews Square, Calton Proper, Broomfield, Bridgegate,
and Wynds, Cowcaddens and Gorbals of which he wrote:

"These will be recognised as the worst districts of
Glasgow, both morally and physically. They comprise almost
the entire area of the operation of the Improvement Trust".¹

Before the First World War, the same deterioration that had
affected the 'old' districts of Glasgow were now affecting the
second area that Russell described as 'new' and also those districts
like Govan that had not even been considered by Russell:

"... it would thus appear that the movement towards
decentralisation is one affecting the whole community,
the people formerly on the outskirts having moved beyond
the boundary and their places being taken by the persons
from the centre ... the adjoining burgh of Govan and
Partick are even more densely populated than the city,
and the displacement from the centre emphasise the necessity
for town planning in the suburban area so that existing
conditions may not be repeated."²

1. J. B. Russell in A. K. Chalmers ed; "Public Health Administration
in Glasgow: A Memorial Volume of the writings of James Burn Russell"
(1905)

2. "Census 1911 - Report on Glasgow and its Municipal Wards" by
"a similarity of influence is to be observed in the Burgh of Govan which during the decade lost fully half its natural increase; while the former police burgh of Kinning Park, which adjoins it, and which now forms the Twenty-sixth ward of the city, lost 1,000 persons out of barely 14,000 in 1901, apart from any surplus in its births during ten years".1

Whilst some of the central areas of old Glasgow became sufficiently depopulated to start being more healthy; some of the areas of 'new' Glasgow and Govan became sufficiently populated to start becoming more unhealthy.

In Glasgow everybody agreed that the reason for the increasing overcrowding and unhealthy state of the population was the existence of single-end and two-roomed houses, and this was as true of the engineering and shipbuilding area of Govan as for the rest of the city. There was also great resentment at the system of yearly lets by which a house had to be taken from May 28th one year to May 28th the next.2 This particularly applied to skilled workers because practically all houses let at over £10 per annum were let on yearly rents, and as one Glasgow Trades Council member put it:

1. Ibid.
2. In his evidence to the Departmental Committee on House Letting in Scotland, op cit. Carson, Secretary to the Trades Council replying to a question of how long they had felt a grievance on yearly lets said, paras. 1513, 1514 p.38
"I cannot recollect the time, when we had not it before us, but in my precis I have put it at twenty five years. I can tell you that some eighteen years ago we formed a Tenants Defence Association ... The grievance at first was the long term of lets, being tied up to a house, - precisely the same grievance as there is now."
"I would say that the best of people live in yearly houses. There is a certain amount of stigma attached to a monthly house at present, and our people are generally above that."

"There will be exceptions among some of your labourers? They will be monthly tenants?"

"Yes" 1.

The yearly let system was considered detrimental to both labour mobility and also labour stability by the Glasgow Trades Council members and other trade unionists. They argued both that men could not readily shift their home when they needed and also that:

"When the letting season comes on in Glasgow there seems to be a fever among the women. If the flitting was spread over the year, then they would not shift so much as they do at present." 2

They also argued that it had adverse affects on the building trade in terms of creating a highly busy season and then a slack one, 3 as well as pointing out that the rents were higher per room than for accommodation in England. 4

A further aggravation for all Glasgow workers was the law of hypothec by which the landlord could seize the goods

1. Ibid, paras 1530, 1531.
2. Ibid, p.38 paras 1526-1529 identified £4 rents as being paid monthly or weekly, between £4-10 mostly yearly, above £10 all yearly. Par 1506: the rents paid by craftsmen would be £12-16. Some would go above £20 as far as £25. Weekly rents were:
   one room 2s.4d. to 2s.10d
   two rooms 3s.11d to 4s.5d.
   three rooms 6s. to 7s.4d.
   Ibid p.40 para 1589. Evidence of Mr Ross, Glasgow Trades Council
3. Ibid, p43 para 1722, Evidence of Mr George B Craig, General Secretary of the Operative Masons Trade Union and p.95 para 4031 Evidence of Mr Alexander Stark, General Secretary of the Carpenter and Joiners Society.
4. Ibid p.40 para. 1617. Evidence of Mr Danes, Glasgow Trades Council "I have lived in London, Cardiff, Leicester and other places, and I find that the rents here in Glasgow taken per room, are from 25 to 30 per cent higher than in any place I have ever lived in England". Some Committee members attempted to put forward the notion that present agitation was founded by English workmen agitating among the Scots.
of those who did not pay their rent:

"We do not think that the landlord should have a preference over and above any other person." 1

The importance of the tenement system of housing is two-fold.

First, the scope for a skilled worker to transform his own status from being a tenant into being a home owner or even a landlord was extremely limited.

Second, as a corollary of this, the abuses of the tenement system gave rise to a collective agitation - whether in terms of conferences, deputations - long before the rent strike of 1915. In both Glasgow and Liverpool there was concern with the question of slum clearance, but only in Glasgow are there other housing issues that the skilled workers agitated around.

Also because the tenement system was one in which blocks of good quality tenements were built next to inferior ones, the sorts of ghettos that existed in Liverpool never developed in Glasgow (although the Gorbals area developed partly into a Russian and Polish area, and partly into an 'Irish' area). The Irish and the Highlanders were spread throughout all the municipal wards of the city although in some areas they might be more concentrated than in others. 2

This lack of ghettoisation was not merely a result of the tenement system however - it is a combination of that system and the fact that Glasgow was a skilled workers city. For a skilled worker his employment was protected against all unskilled men by his craft

1. Ibid. p42 para 1677 Evidence of Mr Ross, Glasgow Trades Council.

2. S. Checkland, "The Upas Tree" op cit p.21 "there were no true ghettos; Glasgow was one city."
skills and his craft trade unions, not by organised anti-Irish prejudice. For the skilled worker the Irish worker could be merely the lowest of the unskilled, rather than a threat to his employment.¹

As we shall see this meant that both the Protestant and Catholic communities of Glasgow developed differently from those of Liverpool.

The skilled workers of Glasgow were often extremely mobile workers. Glasgow was noted as a town in which workers travelled out in order to go to work, journeying from Bridgeton to Clydebank, and with a mobile labour force within the Glasgow extension. It was the unskilled workers who were immobile, living within three quarters of a mile of their place of employment in order to be able to walk to work, seeking employment from foremen that knew them, and placing their children in the unskilled boy and girl labour jobs that abounded in the city areas. It was the unskilled labourers who were more likely to form an 'occupational community' of some kind.²

1. Treble, "The market...", op cit, p.121-122 claims that Scottish and Highland Labour was spread throughout all unskilled occupations.

2. Ibid, p.130 "The considerable differences between skilled and unskilled labour were not, however, simply confined to the central issue of wages and earnings. In the Glasgow experience they also displayed fundamentally different patterns of mobility. It was quite common, for instance, for members of the labour aristocracy within the shipbuilding industry to travel several miles from their home to their place of employment ... On the other hand, workers in the unskilled market were much more tied to a particular locality".
There was no one occupation that was considered an 'Irish' occupation as dock work largely was in Liverpool. The occupations of males born in Ireland living in Glasgow in 1911 (when they comprised 11.44 per cent of Glasgow's occupied male labour force) shows a wide dispersal:

Table 7
Occupations of Males Born in Ireland Living in Glasgow 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. of occupied Irish born males</th>
<th>% of all Irish born males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Railways</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Roads</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On seas, rivers, canals</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In docks, harbours</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In storage, porterage</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines and quarry</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and Steel Manufacture</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Machines</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>14.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ships and Boats</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Building</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt, Drugs and other chemicals</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of which boot shoe etc.)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink, board, lodgings</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Water, Electricity</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of which gas)</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Labourers</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine drivers, stokers, firemen</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of these categories:</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Scotland 1911.

There is, of course, no way of distinguishing from this Table whether the Irish born were Protestant-born or Catholic-born, but it is known that there was a particularly high proportion of Protestant Irish born working in the shipyards.
An occupational and residential segregation of Irish Catholics, Irish Protestants, Highlanders, Scottish Protestants, never developed in Glasgow. Some municipal wards were artisan and some unskilled\(^1\), but none were Catholic or Protestant.

Even the 'artisan' wards had unskilled workers in them because of the building of single-end tenements and two-roomed, three-roomed tenements in the same area. Moreover, the system of municipal government in Glasgow by which municipal politics were not fought on party lines but 'arranged' through the ward system effectively shut out Irish Nationalists from the City Council\(^2\) and prevented municipal politics from developing along the lines of Liverpool.

\[1.\text{ I.C. Hutchinson } \textit{op cit} \text{ p. 140-150.}\]
\[2. \text{ Ibid}\]
No 'community' developed in Glasgow that was similar to the Scotland Road in Liverpool. Hutchinson has argued that in the 1880s, there was a concentration of Irish in the Bridgegate, Cowcaddens, Gorbals, Maryhill, Anderston and a section of the East End; he then assumes that an occupational/residential segregation may have allowed for an easily assembled community.¹ But to have settlements in the West, the East and the South of the city was very different from Liverpool and the organisation of the widely dispersed Catholic community was done through the Catholic Church and their organisation for the School Board elections ² and a large network of voluntary organisations.³

The dispersal of the Catholic Irish across Glasgow meant there was no equivalent of the Scotland division, but there were Catholic Irish voters in similar proportions in all seven of the divisions. In 1885 the Irish Tribune calculated 1700 votes to 2300 votes in each division, in 1906 the Scotsman calculated 1200-1500 in five with 2,000 in St. Rollox and 850 in Tradeston, in 1910 the Scotsman estimated 700-1400 in each.⁴

4. Quoted in E.P.M. Wollaston "The Irish Nationalist Movement in Great Britain 1886-1906" M. A. King's College, London 1958 p.19 (footnote) The Scotsman figures are also quoted in Pelling *op cit* p. 400-409. The Scotsman also estimated figures for the Govan and Partick divisions of Lanarkshire in 1906 and 1910; for Govan these were 1,500, then 800, for Partick these were 2,100 then 700. The decline in estimates of voting strength for the Irish Nationalists in the years 1906 and 1910 may be a re-evaluation or they may be associated with the decline in the electoral roll. The Glasgow Herald, September 23, 1909 claimed a large number of voters had been disqualified through non-payment of rates because of unemployment.
Because of the lack of mobility of the unskilled, the areas ringing the docks were the areas inhabited by more unskilled workers than other areas. The more artisan areas were those of the engineering works to the East (Shettleston and Parkhead), the railway engineering works to the North (Springburn and Cowlairs) the shipbuilding yards on the South side (Govan and Fairfield). It was the latter, more artisan wards, that were most likely to vote labour but it was the Parliamentary Division of Blackfriars and Hutchesontown that sent the first Labour MP to Parliament from Glasgow.

But Glasgow was not a city of distinct neighbourhoods. It was the most heavily populated central area in Europe.

"A large part of its labour force was packed into its heart with little or no working class suburbs".

1. S. Checkland "The Upas Tree" op cit p.18.
As has been discussed above, Classical Liberalism, unlike Modern Conservatism, was an active hegemony in which a large minority of working men participated through a network of voluntary organisations. Both 'Labour Aristocrats' and self-made men created a set of societies - friendly societies, co-operatives, trade unions - which they hoped would protect them within a laissez-faire society, which they had no aspirations to control. The societies they created became the societies of the 'respectable' working class.

There was also a set of societies which were created out of the beliefs of Liberal working men - temperance societies, education societies, radical and secular societies. Other sets of active organisations were created in relationship to the needs of the Liberal State - the Volunteers - or to the beliefs of Conservatism. Moreover, there were also the 'traditional' organisations of a previous epoch such as the Church and the Freemasonry.

The Classical Liberal hegemony was an active, voluntary, 'beehive' and the structure of the beehive could be different in each town, for each working class. In Glasgow the Friendly Societies, the Co-operative movement, and the Temperance Societies - all the societies of the radical self-help ideal - were particularly strong.

A strong trade union movement was a later development in Glasgow and therefore more closely bound to the late nineteenth century development towards labour representation and socialism.

Of all the societies of 'Liberal' working men it was the Friendly Societies that were most 'organic' both to the mode of
production and to the Liberal beliefs. The attempt of each labour aristocrat and 'respectable' working man to make himself 'independent' by providing for himself and his family in sickness and old age was critical to both Liberal ideology and Liberal 'laissez faire'.

In Glasgow the processions of the Friendly Societies were notable events dominated by Foresters, Shepherds and Rechabites (the Temperance Friendly Society). ¹

As late as 1903 when the Elder Park Library was opened by Andrew Carnegie the Govan demonstration was composed of:

Boys Brigades
United Boilermakers (7 branches)
Govan Weavers Society
Ancient Order of Foresters
Caledonian Order of United Oddfellows
Irish National Foresters
Independent Order of Oddfellows (Manchester Unity)
John Elder Lodge Oddfellows
Fairfields' Apprentice Shipwrights
Ancient Order of Free Gardeners
Loyal Order Ancient Shepherds
Independent Order of Rechabites
Associated Blacksmiths
Elder Model Yacht Club
Independent Order of Good Templers
Sailmakers
Grain Weighers
Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners
Shipwrights
Amalgamated Society of Engineers
Associated Carpenters and Joiners
Coppersmiths
Operative Masons. ²

The returns for the Friendly Society members in Lanarkshire in 1910 show that the Friendly Society movement in Glasgow and the surrounding district was still dominated by the great Friendly Societies, particularly the temperance societies.


Besides these established 'orders' with their branches, there were Collecting societies - of which the largest in Lanarkshire were the Scottish Legal Life Assurance (2,027,442 members) and the City of Glasgow (155,752) - and there were thirty seven branchless societies in the Glasgow area. Of these several were attached to particular occupations and were another form of insurance without the ritual of the great orders: the Commercial Travellers Friendly Society had over 70,000 members, the Caledonian Railway Servants had over 15,000, Glasgow Iron Manufacturers had 12,597 and there were several smaller societies (Goldsmiths, Foremen's Mutual with 2,133).

In the Lanarkshire area only a very few friendly societies displayed the very specific religious and occupational characteristics of the friendly societies movement in Liverpool. There was a small society for the Italian Operatives, there was one for the Jews (The Grand Order of Israel in the South-Side) with two branches, there was the Loyal Orange Institute with 532 members, and there was the Glasgow North British Friendly Society with 4,866 members and a Galloway Friendly Society with 6,778 members. (The Western Friendly Society of Glasgow with 51,089 members but no branches appears to have been much more of an Insurance Society.)

There was a divide in the Glasgow Friendly Societies on religious lines between the Friendly Societies of the skilled Protestant workers and the Irish National Foresters. But as the Govan demonstration shows they were seen as part of one movement - not belonging to one religious community only. This only began to change with the coming of the National Insurance Act and the creation of an 'Orange' Friendly Society in the West of Scotland.
Table 8

Friendly Society membership in Lanarkshire in 1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Nos. in area</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Note on the no. of lodges in the Glasgow conurbation and no. of members in Glasgow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Order of Ancient Shepherds, Ashton Unity</td>
<td>28,967</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>c.33 lodges in Glasgow area established predominantly in the 1870s. 32 outside of Glasgow established in the 1880s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Rechabites, Salford Unity</td>
<td>26,698</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Up to 1896 Lodges estab. in Glasgow and after that est. in the surrounding districts. Approx. no. in the Glasgow Lodge was 11,000 therefore greater than Ancient Shepherd (above) in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97 branches, unknown distribution bet. Glasgow and surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Juvenile District</td>
<td>19,058</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders of the Sons of Temperance</td>
<td>16,284</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>55 lodges, c.20 in Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews Order of Ancient Free Gardeners</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>10,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish National Foresters</td>
<td>11,792</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>72 lodges of which c.31 in Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Order of Ancient Free Gardeners</td>
<td>10,984</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>56 lodges, of which 11 are not in Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Order of Foresters</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>37 lodges, of which 4 are not in Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Order of Hibernians (Board of Erin)</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2 lodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Oddfellows, (Manchester Unity)</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>12 branches in Glasgow, 5 outside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 continued...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Nos. in area</th>
<th>Date est.</th>
<th>Note on the no. of lodges in the Glasgow conurbation and no. of members in Glasgow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Rechabites, Glasgow Unity Temperance Friendly Society</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>2,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Druids</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian order of United Oddfellows</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Benefit Society</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Majority of lodges were estab. in 1900s. 1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Order of United Oddfellows</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Order of United Oddfellows</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Independent Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>3 in Glasgow, 31 lodges outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Order of Israel</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1900-1903</td>
<td>2 branches in the South-Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent United Order of Scottish Mechanics</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the 1890s and the 1900s, the Friendly Society movement had been fearful of the development of National Insurance. The operation of the National Insurance Act did transform their work but by December 1912, the membership of branch Friendly Societies (the classic 'lodge' friendly society) exceeded three million, and had grown by half a million in two years, as had the membership of the branchless Friendly Societies (collecting societies) whose membership exceeded four million.

The Act did not destroy the old Friendly Societies in Glasgow. Branchless societies remained 'comparatively small, and their membership inconsiderable' in Wales, Scotland and Ireland. (In Glasgow their place was taken by the Savings Bank of Glasgow and the Royal Liver Insurance Company). But it did lead nationally to amalgamations, absorption of smaller societies, and to an increase in the number of branches of some societies. The National Catholic Benefit and Thrift Society (227 new branches), the Irish National Foresters (89), the Catholic Friendly Societies Association (104), and the Orange and Protestant Friendly Society (64), all expanded under the dual impact of both the National Insurance Act and the crisis in Ireland. The fact that it was largely due to the National Insurance Act can be seen in the fact that the great orders also expanded: Manchester Unity registered 224 new branches, the Rechabites

3. Ibid. p.15
4. Ibid. p.8
registered 103, the Grand United Order of Oddfellows, 72.¹

With the operation of the National Insurance Act it was necessary for the Orange Order to transform its organisation into large branched benefit societies in Glasgow and the West of Scotland. If they did not do this then their supporters would join alternative ones - like the Shepherds, or Druids - with a different way of looking at the world. In Liverpool it was possible for individual Protestant churches like George Wise's to organise their own dividing societies (Tontines),² but in a skilled workers city the benefits had to be higher than that. The Orange Protestant Friendly Society registered twenty six branches in and around Glasgow in 1913.

Although 'Orange' Friendly Society Lodges were being created before the First World War, parts of the Friendly Society movement could, and were, moving towards the Labour movement.

In Glasgow the labour movement had its own press, "The Civic Press: Printers and Stationers to the Trade Union and General Labour Movement", that had been established in May 1891. George Carson J.P., Secretary of the Glasgow Trades Council was the Chairman and Ben Shaw, the Labour Party Organiser, was Secretary, and the Committee comprised of delegates from different trades.

All the trade unions in the City used the Civic Press as did the ILP, the Labour Party in Scotland, the Clarion Scouts, the 'Forward' Newspaper Co. (which was owned by Tom Johnston the Editor),

1. Ibid.
2. See below p. 251-255.
Socialist Sunday School Union, and Workers' Education Association.
So did some of the Friendly Societies: Druids (Glasgow Equalized District), Foresters, Ancient Order of (Branches); Gardeners, B.O.A.F. (Branches), I.O.G.T. (Independent Order of Good Templars) Lodges; Oddfellows, Caledonian Order; Shepherds, Loyal Order of, Ancient; National Deposit Society; Rechabites; U.C.B.S. Friendly Society; Scottish Miners' Federation Friendly Society; City of Glasgow Defence League. ¹

Clearly it was possible for some labour men in some lodges, or branches, or small societies to move that they trade with the press or the Labour movement in Glasgow. There was no contradiction between the great Liberal societies and the Labour societies.

Before the First World War the Glasgow Co-operative movement did not move away from Liberalism - despite the efforts of John Maclean.²

The comment made on Glasgow co-operation in the local guide that:

"Trades Unionism and Co-operation were looked upon as joining hands to ruin the country. After more mature experience however the combination is showing itself to be destined to have a beneficial effect" ³

was justified by the argument that while Trade Unionism retards the accumulation of wealth the co-operative movement opens new vistas into the costs of production and costs in Britain relative to that in other countries and:

"...subdues irrational demands and imbues his (the co-operator) action with reason" ⁴

3. "Glasgow and Lanarkshire" Glasgow 1904. Mitchell Library. This comment was made on the description of the Co-operative Buildings and the career of William Maxwell, J.P. who stood as Liberal Parliamentary candidate for Tradeston in 1900.
4. Ibid
Certainly the Glasgow Co-operators were seen as the most reasonable of men and the most prominent working men in Glasgow.

Although co-operation was not as strong as in Glasgow, in Lancashire, the differences between Glasgow and Liverpool were enormous. In 1910 in Glasgow there were many small co-operative societies for each different area, particularly for each artisan area.

Table 9 The Glasgow Co-operative Movement in the localities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operative Society</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Rollox Co-op</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>3,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollcross Co-op</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder Co-op</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Eastern (Calton)</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>8,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniesland Co-op</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George's Co-op</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>14,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherglen</td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlairs Co-op</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>8,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shettleston</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The great 'voluntary' societies of the trade unions are most clearly related to the 'collective' purposes of working men although they also attempted to serve some of the same purposes as the Friendly Societies.

In Glasgow however, the nineteenth century trade union movement was not as strong as the Friendly Society movement or, according to the Webbs' secretary, Galton, as strong as the Co-operative movement.
In 1893 Galton reported back to the Webbs that:

"In Glasgow there are 100 trade unions but there is very little trade unionism. To take, for instance, the Engineering and Shipbuilding trades which form the staple industry of the Clyde, the Boilermakers alone have a really effective union. The ASE is regarded, both by employers and other unions as a benefit society.

The lack of energetic organisation on the part of the different trades is shown by the almost complete absence on the Clyde of those disputes about demarcation between trades which are such a feature of the 'North-East' Coast.

One's general impression is that the Scotch working men are still largely individualist in temperament, only thrashed temporarily into Trade Unionism by severe depressions, or tempted into it by big bribes. The best men, even if in the Unions, do not devote themselves to its affairs or otherwise to raising their Class but seek to become small masters, and very often succeed in rising to wealth. Hence the paucity of able men in the ranks of union officials. On the other hand Co-operation succeeds in all respects, though there has been a striking absence of attempts at the self-governing workshop. Cheap articles and high dividends are apparently much more potent in convincing the Scottish Workmen of the benefits of association than any of the promises of Trade Unions" (my emphasis JS)  

The involvement of "Liberal' working men in the Co-operative movement left the way clear for the involvement of socialists in the trade union movement. When George Carson, Secretary of the Glasgow

1. The Webbs Collection, British Library of Political and Economic Science Collection Section A Vol XXIII folios 209-222
W. Ferguson: Scotland: 1689 to the Present Day (Edinburgh 1968) p.345 argues that Scotland was in the van at the British TUC in arguing for better parliamentary representation because of the weakness of the Scottish trade union movement may also explain why women organisers helped inaugurate the STUC in 1897 and remained on the leading body while they only achieved that in the British TUC in 1918. See S. Lewenhak "Women in the Leadership of the STUC 1897-1970' Scottish Labour History Society Bulletin July 1973.
Trades Council was presented in 1908 with a gold watch for forty years service to the trade union movement he said:

"When he joined as a delegate from his own trade he did so with the deliberate intention, so far as he could, to promote what he believed to be the one and only question which would solve the labour problem. He frankly confessed he was a Socialist from his earliest days. He did not discover many socialists in Glasgow at that time. There were a few he believed, but they were difficult to get at. While he had always been an ardent trade unionist he had always looked beyond the trade unionism and felt that on every opportunity he had he should put this, the most important question to the front. He was proud to be secretary of the Trades Council, and he confessed he had done his best to raise its status and place it upon a higher plane than it had hitherto had been."

With the crises of the 1880s, the affiliations to the Glasgow Trades Council increased: 38 societies in 1880, 58 in 1888, 88 in 1890-91, 104 in 1893-4. Moreover whereas in the 1880s the 'father' of the Trades Council was John Battersby, a Radical and a printer, increasingly in the 1890s it became George Carson, an ILP member.

The annual May Day march, which increased its support in 1895, was always a demonstration for the eight hour day.

1. Forward, September 26, 1908
2. Glasgow Trades Council Annual Report 1890-91
3. Ibid. 1893-4.
4. Although the affiliations to the Trades Council continued to steadily increase, the ability of the Glasgow Trades Council to intervene politically depended on the degree of industrial unrest. During the 1887-9 unemployment and industrial agitations they ran 4 candidates in the municipal elections 'from a purely labour standpoint' (Glasgow Trades Council Annual Report 1888-9).

4. Ibid. 1894-5, 1895-6. The demand for the shorter working week was always central to socialists and was part of the background of the participation of ILP trade unionists in the leadership of the STUC, the ASE District Committee, and the Glasgow Trades Council in the 1919 Forty Hours Strike.
The questions that concerned Glasgow working men primarily were not trade union questions. They were temperance and ecclesiastical questions. Temperance societies, like the Friendly Society and Co-operative movements, developed alongside the shipbuilding industry from the 1870s.

In 1869 the International Order of Good Templars came to Scotland from the United States. It was the first national organisation in Scotland to operate with a local temperance branch structure. The Rechabites (see Table 8 above) were established in the last quarter of the 19th century as the Temperance Friendly Society. The Good Templars peaked in terms of the number of their lodges and members in Scotland in 1876, but the Rechabites continued to grow until 1910 in both their adult and juvenile divisions. These two groups had the strongest working class support. The Liberal Party, however, continued to organise on the temperance issue until the 1920s, and conducted municipal referendums. After 1900, however, the secular temperance organisations gave way to those organised by the churches, while the ILP strongly opposed the temperance philosophy (although most individual ILP members were teetotal).

4. Ibid, p. 388-428. On p. 428 Paton discusses the 'culture of respectability' which was part of being a member of a co-operative society, a friendly society or a temperance society, and which later entered the leisure programme of the ILP.
In Glasgow there were two very important 'traditional' societies: the Church and the Freemasonry. The deep importance of Scottish Presbyterianism and its relationship to liberal ideals among Glasgow artisans in the 19th century has been stressed many times.¹ Even the discovery of thirty thousand non-churchgoers in Glasgow and Govan in 1893, could not deny the thousands who did go. The 'Glasgow Echo' a rank and file paper produced by locked-out printers in May 1893 printed Church reports alongside of Trade and Trade Union reports, Friendly Society reports (especially the Free Gardeners and the Shepherds), 'Volunteer' reports and Sports reports. It was a mirror of the different involvements of working men and Church reports were central to it.² The deep commitment of the ILP in Glasgow to secularism was a reaction to the hold of Presbyterian Liberalism over the Glasgow working class.


2. Glasgow Echo, 1893-5. It was set up from shares taken by the separate Glasgow trade unions. Apart from the Glasgow Typographical Society (who took 500 5s. shares) the major shareholders were Associated Iron Moulders of Scotland (300), Associated Iron Dressers of Scotland (100). Smaller shareholders came from trade unions in the printing trades, the building trades, the textile trades.
The Freemasonry, on the other hand, has been ignored despite the fact that in 1883, 5,000 freemasons marched in the Municipal Demonstration.\(^1\) Harry McShane remembers freemasonry as being particularly important among the engineers\(^2\) and an employer of labour thought it particularly important among his foremen:

"I am for my sins, and by good luck, an employer of labour. I am a socialist. My 'hands' are not. They are indeed at this moment busily engaged in a voluble discussion on the respective football merits of Billy Quinn and Jimmy Hogg. It is the same every Monday - every kick, every scrummage every dash up the touchline is remembered and discussed. The foremen are either interested in Rechabite Lodges or Freemasonry. They are all really horrified at the thought of socialism - all, except one man, who poses to me as a Tory though I see him grinning and applauding in the Pavilion Theatre on Sunday Nights."

McShane thought that the Freemasons were Conservatives, although it is probable that they could also be Liberal Unionists and they themselves declared that they never discussed religious and political questions. But the very structure of Freemasonry was different from that of the "Liberal" societies, and it did not share any of the Liberal world vision. The major difference was that the Church, the Freemasonry and, also, the Volunteers were 'societies' where relationships between employers and employees, municipal leaders and working men could take place. Hon. John Ure, Lord Provost of Glasgow in 1883, was a Freemason and the Masonic Procession was separate from both the Civil Procession and from the Trades Procession.

2. H. McShane and J. Smith op cit p. 19
3. Forward, January 11 1913
Whereas the First World War was a major crisis for the 'Liberal' societies, the Freemasonry grew.  

In 1911 there were 40 lodges; in 1921, 56; in 1931 there were 62. Similar increases took place in the Royal Arch Chapters (18, 20, 24) and the Order of the Eastern Star (women) (11, 29, 35).  

The workers involved in Freemasonry had to be artisans at the least because of the size of the affiliation fees. But when the 'Volunteer' movement was first formed in Glasgow it too was assumed to be made up of artisans: the 10th was named after the Carlton artisans, the 11th the Maryhill artisans. Only in 1900 were the volunteers reorganised into 5 Brigades which included the 1st Lanark Engineer Volunteers. From 1868 however there was also another Volunteer Battalion, not of artisans and from a different tradition, when the Highland Volunteer Battalion was formed. But the volunteer brigades never became central to the 'societies' of Liberal Glasgow the way they became central to Tory Birmingham. For example, before the First World War, it was necessary to organise a march of the Territorials in order to get recruits to fill the Territorial units:  

1. Partick and Maryhill Press, September 17, 1915. Partick Chapter became the leading one in Glasgow.  
"The imposing and inspiring spectacle witnessed in Glasgow on Saturday afternoon should go far towards wiping out the reproach implied in the necessity for having a march of the Territorial units in order to awaken the young men of the city to a sense of their duty to the new scheme for home defence. ... If the interest awakened is translated by all classes into hearty co-operation for the end in view the Glasgow Territorial-units should be filled to their establishment requirements in a very short time." ¹

The Glasgow Herald also reported that a counter-demonstration by socialists was rumoured but did not take place.² The tactic was successful in filling the Highland Light Infantry and the Scottish Rifles but although the Engineers were up to strength, they were appealing for more tradesmen.³

I. C. Hutchinson has argued that the Conservative vote among the Glasgow working class (approximately one third voted Conservative in the late nineteenth century) was due to an Orange presence.⁴ But it is possible that the Conservative vote among working men in Glasgow could be traced to the Freemason and Volunteer movement and not Orangeism. The Orange Order was largely confined to the shipyards in Glasgow and the coal mining and iron working towns ringing Glasgow.⁵ In Glasgow a militant anti-Catholic Protestant Orange movement never developed the hold that it did in Liverpool. This was not because there were no men like George Wise in Glasgow but because it was an artisan city whose predominant commonsense was Liberal.

1. Glasgow Herald March 15 1909
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid March 19 1909
Protestantism and Irish Nationalism in Glasgow

Churches like the Protestant Reformers Memorial Church (Wise's Church in Liverpool), did exist in Glasgow, but their influence was restricted. P. T. McRostie attempted to set up a similar church in the East End of Glasgow at Bethany Hall, Bridgeton, and then at Tent Hall in the Saltmarket. At Bethany Hall he held Gospel Temperance meetings, started 'Men's Own', leafleted Singer's workers at Bridgeton Cross Station at 5.30a.m, and enrolled 1435 members by the end of the First Year with an attendance of 1000. By 1907, there was a 'Men's Own' of 1700 members, a 'Girls' Own' of 600 and a Sunshine band. In 1908, he moved to the Tent Hall, Saltmarket, preaching during the depression years that "booze" was the cause of distress to an audience of 1800 men and women upwards on Sundays. In Bridgeton he organised marches through the streets on a Saturday night to pick up inebriates.¹

In Maryhill there was the Tabernacle in Maryhill Road, St George's Cross, Glasgow run by Pastor D. J. Findlay. In 1905 the Welsh revivalists came and booked Hengler's Circus as well as the Tabernacle for eight days in April 1905, and carters, miners, insurance'agents' stood up and gave testimony. In 1906, the Tabernacle had to be extended to seat 1500.²

In the 'Reminiscences' of a Partick Free Church Minister, the Reverend Henry Anderson (1844-94) blamed the Irish problems on both the bad farming techniques of the Irish and that they built

Cathedrals that cost thousands of pounds. He was decidedly anti-Irish Home Rule on the grounds that God had joined England, Scotland and Ireland and "let no man set asunder". On the Govan School Board it was Anderson to whom "we are very much indebted that the Bible and the Shorter Catechism (are) so firmly embedded in religious instruction of the youth of the parish". But in his Jubilee commemoration it was said:

"He has taken no part in politics and in thus acting I think he has set ministers a good example "

There were men in Glasgow who would have led an anti-Catholic, anti-ritual Protestant movement. But in Glasgow it was also possible after the wave of Protestantism of the 1870s (that ended in a complete 'cul de sac') for Dr. J. Macleod of Govan to reintroduce ritual into the Church of Scotland without a great hue and cry over Romanish practices:

"The whole structure of Dr. Macleod's religious teaching rested upon the great verities of the Catholic Faith."

This was despite the fact that the Orange marches had grown quite large by the end of the 1870s.

2. Ibid. p.142
3. See Glasgow Collection, Mitchell Library for 1870s Protestant Pamphlets Collection. op cit p.395 describes the attempt in the 1870s to create a Protestant agitation as a 'cul de sac'. In 1873 the elections to the newly created School Board were fought out by the Conservative-Orange candidates on a "Use and Want" platform and they got all but one of their candidates elected. Volunteers only got 3 out of 15 (ibid) p.377.
5. I. C. Hutchinson op cit, p.381,600 marched on 12th July 1868, 10,000 in 1873, 14-15,000 in 1878.
Conservatism did not develop on an Orange base in Glasgow.

In 1885 Glasgow returned seven Liberal M.P.s and even the Home Rule Crisis did not result in the growth of Conservatism but of Liberal Unionism which was not associated with Orangeism. Even the growth of Liberal Unionism has to be related to the shift of other social classes in Glasgow out of Liberalism; the Glasgow Herald became a Unionist paper and with an electorate that was always less than 100,000 for the seven Glasgow divisions (with an occupied male labour force of over 250,000 in the City of Glasgow) shifts in opinion in other social classes were critical.

The reasons why a Conservative-Orange caucus did not develop in Glasgow are probably fourfold. First; Glasgow was an expanding economy from the 1880s onwards. Second; it was an economy based upon a skilled workforce whose 'ticket' to employment was their individually earned apprenticeship lines. Skilled workers could see themselves as tradesmen first, and protestants second because they did not have to rely on their religious affiliations to get employment - they could look down on all unskilled men, Protestants Highlanders, Catholics, without organising against any. Third; the predominant societies of working men were the friendly societies, co-operatives and trade societies dominated by the skilled. Fourth; the overwhelming commonsense in Glasgow was a Liberal commonsense for whom the enemy was the landlord, or the despot - not the Irish.

1. Glasgow Herald September 23, 1909 surveyed the political history of each of the seven divisions. The division which had a strong Conservative tradition - Bridgeton - was won by the Liberals until a Liberal Unionist candidate stood. See also J. D Young op cit p.158 for Scotland. Pelling, op cit, p. 405-406.

2. Ibid
IV Commonsense thought in Glasgow

Glasgow was a city of workers who were divided according to skill and ethnic origins but not by ghettos. Many different sets of 'private associations' were available for the men of Glasgow to join, yet alongside these the cultural forms of 'mass society' were developing.

Two opposing views have been expressed in describing the kind of commonsense which predominated in pre-First World War Glasgow: that Glasgow was an overwhelmingly Liberal city; and that it was deeply divided between "Catholics and Protestants, Irish and Scottish, Lowland and Highland". Both may be true. Certainly neither explanation on its own can deal with all the evidence. But, I suspect, both arise from a fairly simplistic approach to Glasgow's history in which the transformation from the strongly Liberal city of the mid 19th century to the deeply divided city of the 1920s and 1930s is laid at the door of the Irish Home Rule issue, and the transformation is therefore located at beginning in 1885.

I believe there is a different explanation: Glasgow Liberalism, I would argue, contained the divisions between Protestant and Catholic, Scottish and Irish, Lowland and Highland, up and into the First World War. Unlike Liverpool, the Protestant/Catholic


split could not be organised into a foundation for the Conservative Party until the remnants of Liberal 'commonsense' were destroyed in the 1920s. Glasgow was a society of transition before the First World War, and this was reflected in its classical Liberal commonsense which showed marked differences from the New Liberalism that Clarke has argued characterised Lancashire.\(^1\)

**Liberalism**

It is, of course, very difficult to come to terms with a 'commonsense' understanding of the world at a distance of one hundred years. People's 'commonsense' understanding is by definition not critical and not literary, and one must therefore study what masses of men chose to do rather than what a few men wrote. Fortunately, in Glasgow, it is possible to observe the creation of a Liberal commonsense view of the world through the progress of the great Reform demonstrations that punctuate its history in 1832, 1866 and in 1884.

The 1884 demonstration was the last typical produce of the 'old' Glasgow Liberalism, founded and built around the twin issues of Free Trade and Reform. On the march were local Liberal Associations, the Scottish Land Restoration League and the Workmen's Electoral Union. There were some workers marching behind their firms' banners, but above all it was a demonstration of the trade societies, and, as Appendix 1 to this chapter shows, it was a living affirmation of the Liberal tradition: a view of history in which the 19th century was a Liberal struggle for reform against the landed aristocracy. On the demonstration were

veterans of 1832 and banners from 1832 and 1866 carried by both the Liberal Associations and trade societies.

The Glasgow Herald reported 35,000 on the procession, but counting up its figures for the different contingents gives a total of 64,000. With the thousands who thronged the streets and those who went to Glasgow Green, the grand total participating was probably around the 1866 figure of 200,000. In the procession there were countless portraits of Gladstone and several of John Bright. Gladstone's portrait also dominated the streets through which the procession passed.

Although only three contingents carried union jacks (including the Partick Engineers, the only engineers to march as a trade society), the banners reading "We don't want to fight but by jingo if we do" (the slogan of the Crimea) and "No Surrender" (the slogan of the Orange Order), show how far Liberalism in Glasgow contained the Conservative tradition. The presence of Chartist flags alongside the 1832 and 1866 banners, and of others from early Catholic Emancipation demonstrations, show how far Glasgow Liberalism also encompassed the entire Glasgow radical tradition. The demonstration further shows how strongly the Glasgow skilled men were committed to this tradition: on Platform No. 1 it was John Battersby of the Glasgow Trades Council who moved the resolution, and throughout the demonstration the trade societies carried working models of their crafts made by their members together with pithy little mottoes like "The crooked Lords - we'll cut them straight" (attached to two circular saws). For these workingmen

1. Glasgow Herald September 8 1884.
2. Glasgow Herald September 8 1884.
the struggle for reform was a way of understanding the whole history of the 19th century: the Lords and the aristocracy were the enemy, reform would ensure economic, social and political progress.

Hutchinson\(^1\), argues that the Glasgow working class were Liberal not just on 'economic' or 'social' grounds, but because they were committed to the principles of Liberalism. He also suggests that Liberal anti-landlord agitation grew stronger after the enfranchisement of the rural worker in the third Reform Act since it gave the "Highland Host" political weight. Thus in Scotland the belief that the enemy was the landlord grew stronger towards the end of the 19th century.\(^2\)

Hanham argues it was the struggle for Reform that in Scotland turned Liberalism into the party of national patriotism:

"The reforms of the 1830s... had the effect in Scotland of restoring representation to the nation at large. The Scots reacted to the change by giving their whole hearted support to the Whigs and radicals who had come to be regarded as the champions of the national interest."\(^3\)

In the first crisis over Irish Home Rule, Gladstone appealed to this long tradition of Liberalism when he visited Glasgow in June 1886. Having dismissed the argument that Protestants in Northern Ireland would be persecuted (they were too numerous and it hadn't happened in Belgium, France or Italy), Gladstone invoked the old Liberal tradition of freedom in relation to Scotland and the Union:

2. Hutchinson, _op cit_, p. 377
"The real point to observe is this - that the Union, after the lapse of time, commended itself in Scotland to the mind and heart of the people at large; and the people at large were content with the Union ... "I do not doubt that your judgement has been right, and that upon the whole you have greatly prospered under and prospered a great deal from, the Union. But I wish to put this to you, that if you should change your minds, if in the course of time you should arrive at the conclusion that there might be a better system, that you might with advantage manage your own local affairs (loud cheers) within your own borders - well, gentlemen, do you think - (A voice - Home Rule for Scotland) do you think if you had arrived at a clear conclusion so that out of your 72 members ... 62 were united as one man to demand that change in your name, do you think that England would ever dare or wish to refuse you?"

Gladstone then argued it was wrong to deal with Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England altogether because it was the Irish question that was "over-ripe". But his recognition of Scottish nationalism tied the Irish question to the issue of a federal structure for Britain and Home Rule for Scotland. This stand meant that radical liberalism in Glasgow embraced Irish Home Rule, and this tradition later entered the socialist movement.

Indeed, the strength of the Liberal tradition in Scotland as a whole meant it held the line on Home Rule. In 1886, Glasgow unlike other great cities, retained a majority of Liberal seats despite the Liberal Unionist split. The Liberals did, however, still lose some 11,500 votes, about one third of the Liberal electorate.  

1. Address by Rt. Hon W.E. Gladstone delivered in Hengler's Circus, Glasgow, on Tuesday June 22 1886. Glasgow Parliamentary Election 1886, College Division, Mitchell Library.

2. Hutchinson op cit p.572-579. Eventually all three of the first Liberal Unionist M.P.s returned to the Liberal Party in Glasgow, as other issues became more important. ibid p.561-570.
The Glasgow working class Liberal tradition was wider than reform alone. When Bright accepted the Freedom of the City in 1883, he did not present his own world vision\(^1\) - which ranged from the English Civil War to the unending struggle for freedom; instead he presented a history of the 19th century Liberal struggles for Reform and the repeal of the Corn Laws and against the old enemy, the landed aristocracy\(^2\). These three themes dominated all the speeches and propaganda of Glasgow Liberalism. The Liberal attack on foreign despots and their support of peace was included, but interwoven with the cornerstone of Glasgow Liberal commonsense - deep anti-landlordism.

Another linked, but distinct, tradition was also present in the commonsense of Glasgow - although it was not as strongly held by the working class as was Liberalism - the belief in municipalism.

---

1. Vincent, op cit, p.29.
Municipalism

The City of Glasgow was run in the interest of the 'community' of Glasgow by its leading citizens, who often did not attend political meetings during their terms of office. This non-political stance developed in the 1840s, and was only challenged in the 1890s when Irish and ILP candidates sought election.¹

Municipal "good government" was part of a Liberal ideology but Glasgow's leading citizens were a much wider group than the members of the Liberal Associations. The two institutions Glasgow's elite belonged to (and which served to allow informal meetings to draw up agreed lists of nominations) were the Trades Houses, which dealt in charities for the public and their own members, and the Merchants' House, which dealt only in charity to fellow merchants. The Lord Provosts were often ex-Deacon Convenors of the various Trades Houses (such as the Hammermen or the Maltmen) or of the Merchants' House.²

Municipalism was not just an ideology held by the leaders of Glasgow civic government. It was also an ideology they helped to construct among the Glasgow working class. On October 6 1883 there was a general holiday for one day with the closure of public works for the day, and many other establishments shut down to mark the laying of the foundation stone of the new Municipal Buildings. The procession of 25,000 (on this

1. Hutchinson, *op cit*, pp. 140-150 describes the role of ward committees in the selection process.

occasion the Glasgow Herald aggregate figure tallies with the numbers they give for each section of the march) was organised not by area but by trades. First came the Carters (including the Carters of the Railway Companies who did not send their men on the 1884 demonstration), then the building trades, the textile group, a miscellaneous group, then metal workers, the Corporation and Clyde Trustees workers, and the Shipbuilding Group.

Separate from this procession were two others - the Civic procession and the Masonic procession. The second of these was comprised of 5,000 Freemasons from all over Scotland of whom approximately one quarter (by number of lodges) may have come from Glasgow and the surrounding area. The Freemason turnout was not merely because of their involvement of their 'craft' with building but also because the Lord Provost, Sir John Ure Primrose was a Freemason, as was W. Pearce, owner of Fairfield's shipyard, the Grand Master for the Province of Glasgow that year.

That the ideology of municipalism was still under construction in the organisations of the labour movement was clear from the turnout on the procession. It was less than half the turnout of the 1884 demonstration for Reform (although the Glasgow Herald claimed otherwise) and while the trades carried working models, the witty and ingenious banners of 1884 are absent. Some trade unions did not march; the Associated Carpenters and Joiners, the leather trade, the potters, upholsterers,

1. *Glasgow Herald* October 8 1883
work cutters and fleshers were all absent. But nevertheless, the ideology of municipalism was to enter and to become a real part of all strands of Labour and socialist thought in Glasgow, apart from the Socialist Labour Party (SLP).

It has been argued that the social conditions of Glasgow were responsible for the rapid growth of municipalism in the 1860s and 1870s, and that the impact of Irish immigration was also significant. But contemporaries had another explanation – the necessity for the local ruling class of the city to collectively develop the Clyde. The Clyde was not a natural harbour and required dredging: from such an enormous undertaking to accept collective responsibility for water and for gas was but a short step. Thus Glasgow’s middle and ruling classes were concerned at the insanitary and criminal dangers of the slums and were under industrial pressure to accept municipalisation. The result was that Glasgow Liberals and Conservatives came together in a single party of municipal ‘good government’ and ignored the ratepayers’ opposition of the 1860s and 1870s. Indeed, it was only with the decline of big business involvement in the City Council that the ratepayers’ opposition actually became important in the argument over municipalisation of housing between 1898 and 1907.


2. G. Best, op cit p. 399.

3. Glasgow Herald, December 19 1912. This was the opinion of John Lindsay, the Town Clerk. The dredging of the Clyde began in 1760, ibid, November 2 1912.

4. W. Hamish Fraser, op cit, p.3.

5. Ibid, pp. 15-17.
From the 1860s social legislation had enabled local authorities to adopt municipalisation if they wished. In Glasgow, as elsewhere, the water supply had been one of the first concerns taken over by the municipality, soon followed by measures to deal with overcrowded houses, the collection of ashes and night soil and the control of factories. The City had power to purchase property for the sake of sanitary improvement by means of the City Improvement Trust, which also built common lodging houses - seven by the 1880s. In 1867 the City took over the gas companies; two years later it opened the first municipal fever hospital and in 1878 it opened the first baths and wash houses.

In 1890 the City took over the running of the tramways (in addition to the tracks) after a municipalisation campaign supported by Glasgow Trades Council and the Town Council, which was concerned with the standards maintained.

The guiding policy of Glasgow's municipal 'good government' was that the municipal enterprises endeavour to reduce the prices of the goods and services provided, not that they produce a profit to reduce the rates. Thus it was only when private developers refused to take over the City Improvement Trust's housing property that the Trust itself began to build 'model' homes. And when this occurred, "the principle concern was to promote a market for the nearby property... Glasgow's involvement in housing was an attempt to solve a business problem

1. W. Hamish Fraser, *op cit.*, pp 2-3.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9. Although they objected to the Town Council providing work for the unemployed during the 1885 Depression on the grounds that this would aid non-unionists.
not a social one.""

From 1890, therefore, when the Housing of the Working Classes Act provided for both slum clearance and building working class housing, Glasgow’s Town Council never used the powers to undertake municipal housing. And in 1897 the City was allowed to evade the portion of the Act which required it to make provision for those displaced by slum clearance on the grounds that there was already adequate private housing available. This private housing was the tenement system where a large number of small property owners invested money in tenements which were then managed on their behalf by the property factors.

The small property owners carried considerable political weight in shaping the direction of Glasgow’s ‘good government’. Thus when in 1897 the Provost, Samuel Chisholm, supported a limited Corporation scheme to borrow £750,000 to build workmen’s houses, a ‘Citizens’ Union’ developed opposing the proposal and in 1902 succeeded in unseating him.

Corporation housing was thus an unfinished aspect of Glasgow municipalism, and it became the central component of the Labour programme.

1. Ibid, p. 8.
3. Ibid, p.16
5. Ibid p.16, They also ousted most of the Labour stalwarts in 1901, ibid, p.15.
Glasgow Labourism

In the 1880s a Scottish Labour tradition developed out of Liberalism and municipalism. This took place because Liberalism could no longer satisfy the questions of radical working men. Liberalism in Glasgow underwent a crisis in the mid-1880s. Firstly, the reform movement had finally led to the enfranchisement of agricultural workers leaving full adult suffrage (rather than an extension of the property qualification) and women's suffrage as unresolved questions. Secondly, the Irish Home Rule issue marked a watershed between the old John Bright tradition and Gladstonian Liberalism. Thirdly, the economic crisis of 1879-1884 led to doubts as to how such a crisis could occur in a self-expanding Free Trade economy.

The delegates to Glasgow Trades Council could not escape the question of why there was a depression. They circularised all the other known Trades Councils in 1884 asking them for their opinion of its causes. All replied arguing that the Land Laws were to blame, although some added other arguments. But John Battersby on Glasgow Trades Council pointed out that this explanation was no longer adequate because there were no land laws in America and trade was as bad there. He argued that the world crisis was caused

1. In this period the Trades Council did not discuss politics. Many delegates were involved in the Liberal Workingmen's Associations where politics were discussed. Yet issues such as the crofters' agitation were discussed and supported on the Trades Council, see Glasgow Trades Council, Minutes, November-December 1884, March 1886; an anti-landlord agitation wasn't seen as 'politics' since it was so fundamental to the Liberal commonsense.
by over production and that the solution was emigration. Eventually, the Trades Council decided that a series of factors including the Land Laws and over production were to blame, but the debate lasted for weeks and reappeared months later.

At this point it was impossible for a Liberal 'good sense' thinker like Battersby to break from Liberalism - although during the 1908 unemployed agitation he was repudiated by the Liberal Party as a 'socialist'. But it was possible for men like John Ferguson to begin to develop a Glasgow Labour tradition as a mixture of two ideologies: Glasgow municipal Liberalism and Henry George's Single Tax philosophy.

Ferguson was a Protestant supporter of Irish Home Rule and he formed the first branch of the Irish National League and later, of the United Irish League. He worked with the Scottish Land Movement and opposed Parnell's directive in November 1885 that the Irish vote should go Tory. In 1888 Ferguson supported Keir Hardie against the Liberal candidate in Mid-Lanark and was a co-founder of the Scottish Labour Party.

1. Glasgow Trades Council, Minutes, July 8 1885.
2. Ibid, August 19 1885; February 4 1886.
3. Hutchinson, op cit, pp 140-150.
Ferguson was known as the most prominent single-taxer in Glasgow, and the demand for a tax on land values was included in his election platform. When he died Forward admitted:

"The present popularity of the proposal to tax land values is principally due to the efforts and political influence of the late John Ferguson. Inside Glasgow Council Chambers, and outside of them, he advocated the taxation of land values with a persistency and enthusiasm worthy of a better cause."

Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* circulated in Britain from 1881, precisely at the point when a world-wide trade depression raised the question whether progress was inevitable, and it entered a Liberal tradition which already saw the landlord as the enemy. In Glasgow, in particular, the anti-landlord agitation had been fired by the struggles of the crofters on Skye and by the evidence before the Crofters' Commission which sat in Glasgow. The Irish tradition also supported a land agitation and Michael Davitt's Irish Movement. Glasgow thus naturally became the centre of Henry Georgism in Britain, and both the Scottish Labour Party and, later, the ILP, had to develop clearly defined differences with the 'single taxers'. And in his turn, George made very clear his differences

1. *Forward*, October 13, 1906

2. Young, *op cit*, p. 144

with the socialists:

"I do not propose to fight competition, but to fight all special privileges, monopolies and imposts, that prevent or hamper competition. If Mr. Graham and the socialists are engaged in fighting competition, they have company - for, from Russian Absolutists to American Protectionists and Land Grabbers that is what the classes as distinguished from the masses are everywhere doing... The evils to which Mr. Graham is keenly alive - unemployed labour and low wages, the unnatural toil of women and children, the existence of widespread and bitter want in the midst of what seems like a very excess of productive power - do not come from too much freedom but too much restrictions. They are not to be cured by imposing more restrictions, but by abolishing all restrictions. And the most fundamental and important of all these restrictions is that which restricts to some of its tenants the right to use the planet." ¹

In Glasgow Ferguson and the UIL supported the Single Tax², whereas the ILP stood for land nationalisation. But Henry Georgism was also important in Glasgow because it was the most extreme Liberal position. ³

When the Scottish Labour Party was set up in 1888 it was an amalgamation of land reformers and trade unionists. ³ Its programme was clearly derived from Radical Liberalism - Reform, land, drink, peace, disestablishment... were the central issues. The first seven points dealt with adult suffrage, the reform of parliament and Home Rule "for each separate nationality and country in the British Empire, with an Imperial Parliament for Imperial affairs"; the eighth was for the nationalisation of the land and the mines;

1. Quoted in D. Lowe, Souvenirs of Scottish Labour, (1919) p.32.
2. Forward, Sept. 21 1908 refers to members of the UIL in 1918 saying that this was the major difference standing in the way of their joining the ILP.
the ninth called for the legalised eight hour day and state insurance; the tenth demanded the prohibition of liquor traffic; the eleventh called for the House of Commons to give written consent to the declaration of war; the twelfth point was free education; the thirteenth, disestablishment; the sixteenth was for the "state acquisition of railways, tramways and waterways"; and the eighteenth was for a "cumulative Income Tax". An amendment to include "the full socialist programme" was defeated, and even the Labour demands showed the influence of Liberalism: "nationalisation" of the land and mines, but only "acquisition" of the railways.

In 1893 Ferguson was elected for the Calton ward with the support of the Glasgow Trades Council and was made a magistrate. The United Irish League affiliated to the Workers' Municipal Election Committee (along with the ILP, the GTC, and the SOF) and UIL and ILP candidates fought municipal elections alongside each other. However, Wood argues, "Fear of an Orange backlash was certainly a factor in complicating reciprocal action by ILP and Trades Councils in repaying Irish electoral help by endorsing UIL candidates who were also Catholics."

By 1898 there was a group of ten 'Labour Stalwarts' on

1. Ibid, p.2. The Conference was held in Glasgow on May 19, 1888 and was attended by Cunninghame-Graham MP, Dr. Clarke MP, John Ferguson, J. Shaw Maxwell, Duncan McPherson, Keir Hardie, George Mitchell, John Murdoch, A.C. Morton, Richard McGhee, Donald Stewart, Reverend W.L. Walker.

2. Glasgow Observer, April 28 1906
3. S. Wood, op cit, p.32
4. Ibid, p. 33
the City Council. But they had no common policy, and
did not vote together necessarily and in 1901 most of them
were defeated. One of the problems of the group was that
even the leader of them shared the basic assumptions
of Glasgow municipalism, of government by the 'best'
citizens and the common good of municipal progress. In
his 1902 election address Ferguson discussed the composition of
the Town Council agreeing that the sixty representatives
of the "capitalistic classes... are capable administrators
and given proper social principles to administer, could
administer well". Of these he believed eleven were in favour
of "social evolution" and six were "advanced" but "have not,
on labour questions, yet gone beyond charity and justice". The opposition to him was also still couched in the language
of good government:

"Those who have requested Mr. McFarlane to oppose me say
they have nothing against me, but that I only represent
a section of the ward - they want a representative of
all sections."  

1. W. Hamish Fraser, op cit p.11 suggests it was the momentum of
the tramways campaign that won the 10 seats (out of 75) for
the ILP-Trades Council alliance. Its platform was further
municipalisation and the improvement of working conditions
for the existing municipal workers. This was achieved in
October 1898 with a minimum wage of 21/- a week. For the
next ten years, "the demand for a maximum working week of 48
hours, with trade union wages remained at the forefront of the
programme of the Glasgow Workers' Municipal Election Committee."

2. John Ferguson, Election Address, (1902) Muirhead Collection,
Baillie Library.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.
The municipal alliance of 'good citizens' made success for the Labour candidates in the 1890s and early 1900s very difficult to achieve. The 'Labour stalwarts' had been brought together by 1898 under the leadership of John Ferguson and under the programme on which Ferguson and another 'Labour' man had first been elected in 1893:

"A Living Wage, A Six Days Week, Holidays with Pay, Pensions for Old Corporation Workers, More Baths and Wash-houses, Better Lighted Streets, Night Play Grounds for Children, Covered and Lighted Free Ferries, Improved Conditions for the Police Force and for Postmen, Houses of Comfort, Decency and Cheerfulness, Municipal Hospitals, Reduction of Drunkenness by the establishment of better relations between the Police and the Publicans, increased Tramway extension and facilities."

The lynchpin of the programme was Ferguson's "one great question" - the taxation of land values - which explained how the programme could be put into effect: a two shillings in the pound tax on land.

Ferguson then formed the Workers Municipal Election Committee as an alliance between the 'stalwarts', the Irish Nationalists, the ILP and the Trades Council and other socialist groups. In 1903 the UIL withdrew from the Committee after a major dispute when it refused to renew support for Hugh Murphy after he had been defeated in Mile End. The group was reconstituted in 1904, but a dispute with the SOF left it basically as an alliance between the ILP and the Trades Council.

1. John Ferguson, Glasgow Municipal Politics: The duty of the electors in 1902. An address to the Citizens of the 25 wards, Muirhead Collection, Baillie Library.

2. Ibid, this would bring the price of land for sale down and so make housing cheaper. W. Hamish Fraser, op cit, p.11 claims the demand for a 48 hour week with trade union wages was very important.

3. Forward, December 15 1906. After Murphy's defeat John Ferguson and Baillie O'Hare were expelled from the Workers' Election Committee.
The poor showing in the municipal elections meant the election committee came under fire again from the SDF in 1906. From 1906 the ILP increasingly began to develop its own electoral machine and the Labour councillors were almost entirely members of the ILP. With the development of the 'Forward' they began to challenge some of the ideas of Liberal commonsense, while taking other liberal ideas into their version of radical ILPism.

The subsequent careers of John Wheatley and Willie Reagan inside the ILP suggest that the "Orange backlash" was only a real possibility during the ten years of Conservative government, 1895-1905, and especially in the Boer war hysteria. When Liberalism was in the ascendancy in Glasgow, as it was after 1906, then the backlash evaporated, suggesting that it was the Glasgow Liberal 'commonsense' which held the Protestant/Catholic divisions in check.

1. After a poor showing in the 1906 municipal elections, the SDF delegates moved the expulsion of five ILP councillors - P.G. Stewart, Alston (municipal councillors), James Stuart, Dr. Erskine, John Stewart (parish councillors) - for supporting an ILP member, Baillie Forsyth from Townhead, as a candidate when he hadn't been supported by the Workers' Election Committee because of his views on the Tramway Surplus. Forward, December 8 1906.

2. In Glasgow the Boer War was important in demonstrating how far the Labour movement had taken over the role of the Liberal organisations in the demand for peace. The ILP opposed the Boer War and the Scottish branch of the 'Stop the War' movement was headed by John Ferguson and David Lowe (see W.H. Marwick, A short history of Labour in Scotland 1967 p.74) while the Peace Society did nothing. Out of the Boer War agitation a new radical Liberal society had to be set up - the Young Scots Society - to defend the principles of Gladstonian Liberalism, after attacks on pro-Boer meetings in Edinburgh.
After 1906 many engineers joined the ILP, and the upsurge of the Glasgow socialist movement can be seen in part as attributable to the development of these individuals towards a commitment to a Labour world vision. The Labour world vision they became committed to, however, was not one that radically broke from Liberal commonsense but developed out of it - the Scottish ILP. It was a vision which still contained many elements of that Liberal commonsense, above all anti-landlordism, temperance and an evolutionary road to socialism.
### Selected Summary of the Procession at the Great Franchise Demonstration in Glasgow, 1884

**Appendix 1**

#### Composition of the Procession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Examples of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamated Carters</td>
<td>600 men, 70 horses (Railway Company carters were absent)</td>
<td>&quot;Our crops are ripe, So are the Lords, We'll thrash them soon&quot; (grain merchants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Associations and Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832 veterans in Carriages</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1832 Banner, 1832 Flag; &quot;Tremble oh cowards&quot; &quot;When the wicked cease from troubling&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Liberal Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddingston Liberal Association</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1832 Banner; &quot;King William&quot; and &quot;Let Liberty Flourish&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Iron Company, Ravenscraig</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;While we live, let us live as preservers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beith Liberal Association</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Land Restoration League</td>
<td>(Exec. only, members with trades)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherglen Liberal Association</td>
<td>deputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Liberal Club</td>
<td>deputation</td>
<td>&quot;Knowledge is power&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochwinnoch Liberal Association</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1832 Banner; an earlier banner used in the 1871 and 1821 demos; &quot;The Constitution of 1688&quot; (Bill of Rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlands, Laidlaw &amp; Co.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&quot;The rank is but the guinea stamp, the man's the gowd for a' that&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative Tailors</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>&quot;We've taken their measure and we'll cut them out&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Examples of Banners and Models carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Trade</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>&quot;Tobacco and the Lords are equal - they are all weeds&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many on the theme of &quot;smoking&quot; the Lords out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Makers and French Polishers</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>&quot;Support a well constructed Cabinet&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>&quot;Wanted two million cabinet makers. Apply to W. E. Gladstone, the greatest cabinet maker of the day&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French polishers carried a miniature wardrobe that was carried in 1832; &quot;The French Polishers will polish off the Lords and make the cabinet shine&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood Liberal Association</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>&quot;Now's the day and now's the hour&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partick Liberal Association</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(3-4 thou. marched with other bodies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Carpenters and Joiners (Central Branch)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1832 Flag &quot;Joiners: they are unworthy of Freedom who hope for it from other hands than their own&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1866; &quot;Joiners secure your rights&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1884; &quot;Before our will the Lords must fall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Banners and a large number of models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The most amusing, from a Liberal point of view was the House of Lords, with Lord Salisbury disguised as an acrobat trying to walk on a broken plank stretched between the Franchise Bill and re-distribution. A ploughman was represented standing at his cottage door declaring with emphatic resolution - &quot;A vote I'll have, and that's quite clear, In spite of puny Lord or Tory Peer&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherwell Contingent</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. of the Liberal Association and small industries</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalzell Steel &amp; Iron Works</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners North Motherwell Colliery</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherwell colliers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Goodwin &amp; Co. employees</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Iron Company</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Liberal Association</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included: Weavers, Foundry workers, Masons, Joiners, Tailors, Chemical workers, Millworkers, Slaters, shop keepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Motherwell's will is the Franchise Bill&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner 110 years old 1774; 1832 Banner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Surrender&quot;; &quot;Mend or End&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Banners altogether; &quot;We demand our rights and we shall have them&quot;, &quot;We claim citizenship&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division III**

| Glasgow Locomotive Works                                  | 800  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| "Cast 51 new Peers, selected patterns Rosebery & Wemyss"  |
| "We saw through them"                                     |

| Employees of Messrs Cockburn & Co. (foundry workers)       |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Glasgow and West of Scotland Sawmillers                   | 550  |
| "The whole Bill and nothing but the Bill"                 |
| Messrs Bradbury & Co Ltd                                   | 40   |
| "Progress, not privilege"                                 |
| Govan Liberal Association                                 | 500  |
| 1832 Flag                                                  |
| Glasgow Junior Liberal Association                         | 200  |
| 4 Banners                                                  |
### Composition of the Procession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade/Association</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leather Trades</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Iron Moulders</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet Weavers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Bank carpenters</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laird &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>94 (14 veterans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeton &amp; Co.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomvale Carpenters</td>
<td>big contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Alley &amp; McLellan (Sentinel Iron Works)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Cooks &amp; Pastry Bakers</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example of Banners and Models carried

- **1832 Flag**: "We'll Leather them till they pass the Franchise Bill" and other anti-Lords slogans
- **Models of furnaces**
  - John Bright - veteran of Reform "Down with class legislation"
  - Model crane and ladle inscribed: "wanted MPs to put all classes on a footing of equality"
  - "We will mould the Peers to the people's will"
  - Union Jack

- "Weave with trust"
- **1832 Flag**
  - Banner showing House of Lords on fire
  - "The carpet weavers won't take any yarns the peers may spin"
  - "Give us the wool, the peers the sack"

- "Ever watchful and so on the alert"
- **Sugarwork Banners, Flag of 1832, 1846**

### Division IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Lipton</td>
<td>4/5 lorries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barhead District</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehouse Junior Liberal Association</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteshire Liberal Association</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Matchworks, Govan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two 1832 Flags, numerous others representing industries in the district
- carried 1832 Flag
- 1866 Reform Flag and 3 Banners
- "We are a match for the Lords"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of the Procession</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Chemical Co. (Maryhill)</td>
<td>3 lorries</td>
<td>Working Models and products match factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Bell &amp; Black</td>
<td>3 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milngavie Liberal Association</td>
<td>not represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs T &amp; R Napier Henry (soapmakers)</td>
<td>a lorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Clow &amp; Son (oatcakes)</td>
<td>a lorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potters (nine branches)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9 Branch Trades Flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We'll pack off the Lords&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pottery Kiln with inscription &quot;We'll Fire them up&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnieston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrowfield</td>
<td>4 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilnmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall &amp; Gunn (oil grease refiners)</td>
<td>2 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Glasgow Upholsterers                                   | 190 (or over) | New banner being carried "Shelter to the needy: unite and be steady."
<p>|                                                        |       | Sofa first carried in 1832                                                  |
| Alex Wood &amp; Sons (weighing machines)                  | 30    | Painting on tin representing justice with real beams and scales            |
| Possilpark District                                   | 1,000 | No fewer than 9 Flags carried                                              |
| The Saracen Foundry                                   | 6 lorries | large variety working models                                              |
| Clydesdale Iron Works                                 |       | &quot;We will not bow to Tory will, We will make the tyrants eat the Bill&quot;     |
| Lochburn Iron Works                                   |       |                                                                            |
| Saracen Colliery                                       |       |                                                                            |
| Strone Colliery                                        |       |                                                                            |
| Possil Iron Works                                     |       |                                                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of the Procession</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Chemical Co. (Maryhill)</td>
<td>3 lorries</td>
<td>Working Models and products match factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Bell &amp; Black</td>
<td>3 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milngavie Liberal Association</td>
<td>not represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs T &amp; R Napier Henry (soapmakers)</td>
<td>a lorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Clow &amp; Son (oatcakes)</td>
<td>a lorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potters (nine branches)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9 Branch Trades Flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We'll pack off the Lords&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pottery Kiln with inscription &quot;We'll Fire them up&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnieston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrowfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springburn</td>
<td>4 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilnmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall &amp; Gunn (oil grease refiners)</td>
<td>2 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Upholsterers.</td>
<td>190 (or over)</td>
<td>New banner being carried &quot;Shelter to the needy: unite and be steady.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Wood &amp; Sons (weighing machines)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sofa first carried in 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possilpark District</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Painting on tin representing justice with real beams and scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Saracen Foundry</td>
<td>6 lorries</td>
<td>No fewer than 9 Flags carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clydesdale Iron Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>large variety working models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochburn Iron Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We will not bow to Tory will, We will make the tyrants eat the Bill&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saracen Colliery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strone Colliery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possil Iron Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Example of Banners and Models Carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>They carried a machine which bore the inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;This machine will mend a rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lords will surely now repent&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wallace &amp; Son</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>&quot;As you sow, so shall you reap&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(agricultural implement makers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Several Banners &quot;Near the End of the Peerage&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullock &amp; Co (aerated waters)</td>
<td>a lorry</td>
<td>1868 Hyde Park demo Flag on one side: &quot;You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have chiselled us long enough&quot; on the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Those who assert that politics will ruin trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unions have yet something to learn&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan Liberal Association</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Old Chartist Flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>&quot;The People's Rights in their own possession&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Annual Parliaments&quot;, &quot;Vote by Ballot&quot;, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Payment of Members&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boot and Shoemakers Society</td>
<td>250 (wagon with them from 1832)</td>
<td>Trade Emblem and Banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We'll peg in, till we get our rights&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Union of Boot, Riveters &amp; Finishers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Lorry printing cartoons from presses on the back, one depicting House of Lords as a fly-wheel. The words, 'Rights', 'Obstruction', 'Privileges', 'Robbery', 'Sinecures', and 'Bigotry' were round the rim. Someone speaking to Gladstone who is depicted standing over the wheel says: &quot;William you must get this wheel removed, it is too old, rotten and shaky; and very dangerous besides, we can't improve it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithographic Printing Trades</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fine show of models and flags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We'll forward the Franchise, and finish the Peers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinders</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Example of Banners and Models carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Letterpress Printers                                             | 300 (lorries) | Printing Presses on back of lorries scattered broadsheets to the crowd  
Mottoes: "A free press makes a free people"  
"The Lords must not be stationery, but move on"                                                                                     |
| Messrs Collins Sons & Co                                         |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Division V                                                       |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| The Fish Curers                                                  | 15 (2 lorries) | Model of a smoking kiln, full working process of curing and smoking                                                                                                                                                                   |
| The Cambuslang District                                          | 2,500      | 5 Banners, 12 bannerettes "Freedom's battle once begun, though baffled oft is ever won"                                                                                                                                                |
| comprising local liberal associations                           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| and neighbouring villages                                        |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Miners Associations                                              |            | "Peace, retrenchment and Reform"  
"We Live to Dye, and Dye to Live"                                                                                           |
| Dye Workers                                                      |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| The Cork Cutters                                                | 150        | 1832 Banner                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| The Busby Liberal Association                                   | 260 (+1832 veterans) 4 Banners | 3 Banners "As dying is our trade, and making colours Bright; We must re-dye the House of Lords, before we get our rights"                                                                                                          |
| Co-operative Journeyman Dyers                                   | 200 (a lorry) | 3 Banners "As dying is our trade, and making colours Bright; We must re-dye the House of Lords, before we get our rights"                                                                                                          |
| Coachmakers                                                      | 400        | half a dozen trades banners and several large models of vehicles  
"The Franchise and No Surrender  
The ship is the state, the people the crew; Gladstone the Pilot, will carry through."                                                                 |
| The Glasgow and Clyde Shipwrights                                | 2,000      | Numerous Flags and Banners "The House of Lords, Hew them down"  
Splendid Models and Craft Descriptions                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of the Procession</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Brassfounders</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>&quot;The death knell of hereditary legislation&quot;, Trades Banners, old broken gas seller bore inscription: &quot;Salisbury Lamp&quot; Large Vase from 1866 Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushmakers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1832 Edinburgh demonstration Banner bore brass-makers coat of arms and motto &quot;Liberty &amp; Commerce&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers</td>
<td>300 (-400)</td>
<td>Trade Banner, 2 Union Jacks and old flag on last reform demonstration + 40 working models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha Ironworkers</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>14 models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division VI</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Three large Flags; &quot;United Operative Masons Society&quot;, &quot;Equal Justice to all strengthens the Nation&quot;, &quot;Loyalty to our Queen, our rights as men, and our privileges as citizens&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Large number of flags and banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Blacksmiths</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cotton Yarn Tape Dressers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Trades Banners; &quot;Keep up the steam Willie, and we'll dress the Lords&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs A. Beveridge &amp; Co (pickle and sauce makers)</td>
<td>lorry</td>
<td>Lorry laden with a show of produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Scotland Power Loom Tenters</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Trades banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston Bros. City Engine Works</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lorry with a steam pump saying &quot;The Lords throw water on the Bill; We'll pump it dry and save it still&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Composition of the Procession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Painters</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Finest Flags and Banners in the Procession. 1832 Reform Demonstration Banner; Tapestry Banner of Harvest scene: &quot;The harvest of reform is ripening&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fleshers</td>
<td>400 (4 bullocks)</td>
<td>Seven Flags and Banners, one representing a bullock as &quot;the House of Lords&quot; with a man &quot;Reform&quot; and an axe as &quot;Public Opinion&quot;. There were also 30-40 vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-Loom Beamers</td>
<td>150 (+carriage with veterans of 1832)</td>
<td>Large Trade Flag, 2 small Banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Operative Warpors of Glasgow</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Trade Banner and 2 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Calenderers</td>
<td>well represented</td>
<td>&quot;We'll finish the privileged lot&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Twisters and Drawers Society of Glasgow and Vicinity</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>&quot;The Lords may try to twist the Bill, but 'Bill' will 'draw' it through&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint-Glass Workers, Glass Cutters &amp; Bottlemakers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2 Trade Banners; 1 plate mirror written in gold: &quot;It seems to us as clear as glass, that the Franchise Bill the Lords must pass&quot; Lorry with large number of specimens of handiwork 1832 veteran carried Banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Horseshoers</td>
<td>300 (6 lorries)</td>
<td>&quot;United to Support but not to injure&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs John Clarke Junior &amp; Co.</td>
<td>100 (6 1832 veterans in lorry)</td>
<td>Company Banner, Trade Flag, 2 Banners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"My Lords beware! The Franchise Bill must thread it's way, oppose who will" A huge model of a bobbin carried the slogan: "A Gladstone Spool - A Liberal Measure" Carriage transporting the veterans carried the message: "There's life in the old boys yet!"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of the Procession</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenboig Union Fire Clay Co.</td>
<td>lorry</td>
<td>lorry carrying fire brick makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partick District Engineers (walked with Liberal Association)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2 Union Jacks, a Banner; Model of a propeller, various models including locomotive boiler saying &quot;We'll ram them&quot;, &quot;It will require a stopper&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Grant &amp; Son (Cotton, Spinning, weaving)</td>
<td>31(lorry)</td>
<td>Company Banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey-Red Dyers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Company banner and motto of dyers; 2 small banners; &quot;Bundling Out the Lords&quot;, &quot;Before our Will the Lords must fall&quot; Union Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. D. Waddell (pudding makers)</td>
<td>lorry carrying workers</td>
<td>Life size model of pig labelled &quot;Reform Pig&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of Messrs, Masser Pickle Manufacturer</td>
<td>large numbers on vehicles</td>
<td>Sides of which said &quot;We'll press the peers with right good will&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers &amp; Valve Makers Turnbull &amp; Co</td>
<td>1lorry</td>
<td>the lorry carried a huge oil painting of Gladstone &quot;Preserve the Peoples Rights&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs John Gray &amp; Son (confectioners)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6 Flags and Banners Portrait of Gladstone &quot;We come from the bowels of the earth to demand our rights&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilsyth &amp; Banton Liberal Association *trades of village Miners</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Model of loom and weaver which had been in 1832 Glasgow demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kilbarchan contingent</td>
<td>400 (23 in 1832 demonstration)</td>
<td>Trade and Society Flags &quot;The true right to a Peerage - Merit&quot;. Liberal Association Flag had been in Chartist agitation of 1848: &quot;We have set our lives upon the cast, and will stand the hazard of the die&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall - Operative Miners, Weavers Free Miners &amp; Liberal Association of Larkhall &amp; District</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Example of Banners and Models carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnock Colliery</td>
<td>50 (lorry)</td>
<td>Pit Banner - Painting of Colliery on one side and demand for franchise on back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springburn District</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlairs &amp; St Rolloxs</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>13 Flags and Banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Franchise Bill is a bitter pill to all who who oppose the people's will&quot;; Life-size portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Engine Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Gladstone with motto on reverse: &quot;our case is just&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East End Contingent</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representatives of various factories and works in</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Numerous Models including a Samson Steam Hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhead, Shettleston</td>
<td>18 1832 reformers</td>
<td>named the &quot;People's Will&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollcross</td>
<td></td>
<td>1832 Flag represented Earl Grey presenting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe Machine Co</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Reform Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; several wire works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banner with cartoon in black and white representing a rotten tree and branches, the hollow stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhead Forge and Rolling Mill</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>showed a nest of vipers with heads of Salisbury,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Shetlenton veterans</td>
<td>Churchill, and others. The fruit of the tree were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;war&quot;, &quot;taxes&quot;, &quot;debts&quot;, &quot;city slums&quot;; the roots were claws clutching houses, factories, human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>beings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Workers,Weaving &amp; Drawing Trades</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Banner made of Wire and scroll work - &quot;For Crown and Commons&quot; with name of Springfield Wire Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe Machine Co.</td>
<td>600 (2 lorry)</td>
<td>Banner with likeness of Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Charles Tennant &amp; Co.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>A dozen Flags and Banners. Model of a Cooper at work made in 1754 carried in 1832, 1866, 1883 demos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the Procession</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Example of Banners and Models carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division VIII</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Makers and Iron Shipbuilders</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Society Banner and Banner with representation of exploded boiler with Salisbury in mid-air with slogan &quot;Past Mending&quot; 50-60 models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs J. Copeland &amp; Co Engineers and Boilermakers, Dobbies Loan</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>&quot;We will roll the Franchise Bill through&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs Mattieson's Saracen Toolworks</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Company Banner and 1832 Banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barbers</td>
<td>10 (lorry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Monkland Liberal Association including associated trades and public works</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4 Trade Banners; 6 Liberal Association Flags with machinery &quot;We do not beg a privilege, We demand a right&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatbridge Operative Masons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Works Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Blacksmiths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors of District</td>
<td>3 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Iron Workers</td>
<td>with machinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Works</td>
<td>300 (3 lorries)</td>
<td>Lots of Flags and Banners &quot;We don't want to fight (the Lords) but by jingo, if we do;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths, Silversmiths &amp; Watchmakers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Handsome displays of crafts on lorries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs D. Y. Stewart</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>&quot;Franchise for the People&quot;, &quot;Down with the House of Lords&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Composition of the Procession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Example of Banners and Models carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Operative Slaters</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2 Trade Banners; 1 in use in 1832 Reform Demo; Union Jack + Bannerettes - &quot;The peers are ripe and will fall in the Autumn&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glasgow Sailmakers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Old silk Union Jack in use in 1832 demonstration; 2 1832 bannerettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow and West of Scotland Tin Plate Workers</td>
<td>600 (lorries)</td>
<td>Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Tube Works</td>
<td>400 (2 lorries)</td>
<td>&quot;The Lords must bend or break&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative Bricklayers Friendly and Protective Assoc.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Flag carried in 1832 &quot;Let Glasgow Flourish&quot; &quot;We join to protect&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Simpson &amp; Co (Rutherglen)</td>
<td>2 lorries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrew Liberal Association blacksmiths</td>
<td>500 (-600)</td>
<td>1832 Reform Flag carried by same man Mr John Lang as carried it in 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Few but Firm from a Rotten Burgh&quot; + trade flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathsplitters</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Trades Flags and emblems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Glasgow Herald, September 8 1884.
Chapter 5  The Liverpool Conurbation

I  Industrial Structure

The economy of the Liverpool conurbation was unique in a quite different way to that of Glasgow:

"No urban area of comparable size had as small a proportion of its labour force employed in manufacturing industry. Watchmaking, pottery and shipbuilding, the major industries of Liverpool in the eighteenth century were declining in the early decades of industrialisation partly no doubt, because of the shift of capital and enterprise into overseas trade and the shipping services of the docks and industries based upon them. Manufacturing concerns that did exist were on a small scale involving the employment of a considerable number of unskilled workers. Thus the artisan class in Liverpool was small compared with most urban areas. Job opportunities were especially concentrated within two major occupations; work on the waterfront and clerical work. The multifarious jobs on the waterfront will be examined later. The common feature running through them all was their unskilled and casual nature." 4

The prosperity of Liverpool depended entirely on its work as a port which in turn depended on three factors: the volume of trade in and out of Britain, its share of that trade, and the prosperity of its Lancashire hinterland. The changing balance of British trade during the quarter of a century up to 1914 has been charted by Saul 2 but for Liverpool the most significant factor was that within a growing volume its share dropped.

Although the registered tonnage of shipping using the port rose from 4.4 million in 1858 (establishment of Mersey Docks and Harbour Board) to 9.6 million in 1890, and to 12.3 in 1900, 16.6 in 1910 and to 19 million in 1914, 3 Liverpool's share of the export trade


was just over one third before the First World War (down from nearly a half in 1857) and her share of the import trade down to under a quarter (from one third)\(^1\). This pattern was reversed during the First World War - a period when the dockers especially were able to better both their working conditions and their wages - but only temporarily.\(^2\) In the thirty years before the First World War the 'vested interests' in the port were concerned with the threat to Liverpool's prosperity from the building of the Manchester Ship Canal which could turn Manchester into a rival port, and the establishment of competitive docks by the railway companies of which Garston was one.\(^3\) Liverpool was, in fact, an expensive dock not only because the main railway stations were built in a ring two miles from the docks but also because of the very high railway charges.\(^4\)

The relationship with Manchester was vital, in terms of the cargo trade. Nine commodities accounted for nearly half of the imports into Liverpool docks by value before the First World War:

2. G. C. Allen, F. E. Hyde, D. J. Morgan, W. J. Corbett, *Import Trade of the Port of Liverpool. Future Prospects*, New Merseyside Series, University of Liverpool Social Science Department, University Press of Liverpool, 1946, p.20-21. Share of imports by volume rose from 23.5.1% in 1911 to 36.81% in 1918 returning to 22% in 1921 and 1922.
cotton (of which 80-90 per cent of the imports went through Liverpool), wool (20%), rubber (50%), oil seeds, tobacco (25%), wheat (chief port of entry), sugar (20%), tin (90%), Fruit. Of these cotton alone accounted for 30 per cent of Liverpool's total imports by value. Cotton was of overwhelming importance for the export trade. Cotton yarn, piece goods and other cotton textiles amounted to approximately half of total exports (by value) by 1901 and forty per cent in 1913. Thus the prosperity of the Port of Liverpool depended on the health of the cotton trade, or of finding an alternative trade. Apart from cotton and grain the major transatlantic trade was the passenger and emigrant traffic.

The enormous growth of the docks in Liverpool had pushed shipbuilding (apart from ship-repairing) out of Liverpool itself to Birkenhead leaving Liverpool predominantly a transport and commercial city. The occupational structure was the reverse of Glasgow.

2. F. E. Hyde *op cit* p98
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Liverpool conurbation of which:</th>
<th>Liverpool City,</th>
<th>Bootle,</th>
<th>Birkenhead,</th>
<th>Wallasey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conveyance ...</td>
<td>99,208 32.03</td>
<td>20,823 33.4</td>
<td>9,649 44.0</td>
<td>10,415 25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Metals, Machines, Implements ...</td>
<td>35,462 11.44</td>
<td>21,426 9.5</td>
<td>2,714 12.4</td>
<td>9,760 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Commercial ...</td>
<td>31,205 10.08</td>
<td>20,823 9.3</td>
<td>1,783 8.1</td>
<td>3,648 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Food, Tobacco, Drink, Lodgings</td>
<td>30,699 9.91</td>
<td>23,580 10.5</td>
<td>1,460 6.2</td>
<td>3,216 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Building ...</td>
<td>24,761 7.99</td>
<td>18,291 8.1</td>
<td>1,378 6.3</td>
<td>3,177 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Wood, furniture, fittings ...</td>
<td>9,717 3.14</td>
<td>7,559 3.4</td>
<td>831 3.8</td>
<td>899 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Professional ...</td>
<td>9,388 3.03</td>
<td>6,616 2.9</td>
<td>408 1.9</td>
<td>1,206 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Government ...</td>
<td>8,617 2.78</td>
<td>6,248 2.8</td>
<td>393 1.8</td>
<td>1,043 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dress ...</td>
<td>8,530 2.75</td>
<td>6,732 3.0</td>
<td>340 1.5</td>
<td>808 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Chemicals, oil, grease, soap ...</td>
<td>7,180 2.32</td>
<td>5,437 2.4</td>
<td>370 1.7</td>
<td>932 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Paper, prints, books, stationary</td>
<td>5,375 1.74</td>
<td>4,259 1.9</td>
<td>130 0.6</td>
<td>481 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Textiles ...</td>
<td>3,584 1.16</td>
<td>2,547 1.1</td>
<td>197 0.9</td>
<td>360 0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued ....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Liverpool conurbation of which: Liverpool City, Bootle, Birkenhead, Wallasey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, water, electricity ...</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining ...</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, general &amp; undefined ...</td>
<td>17,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All occupied</td>
<td>309,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 orders listed as % of total occupied</td>
<td>95.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1911, males in Liverpool of over ten years of age were predominantly employed in conveyance (33.4%, 44%, 25.8%, and 18.6% in Liverpool City, Bootle, Birkenhead and Wallasey) and commercial employment was nearly as important as employment in metals, machines and implements. Only in Birkenhead did metals, machines and implements nearly equal the proportion employed on conveyance work (25.6% in conveyance, 24% in metals, machines and implements) while in Wallasey 22% of all occupied men were engaged in commercial occupations and only 18.6% in conveyance.

It is important to note that once again there are quite different 'economies' within the Liverpool conurbation. Wallasey was an area in which those occupied in commerce, professions and government resided (nearly one third of Wallasey's population) with similar proportions of those engaged in categories 20 (food, drink, tobacco, lodgings) and category 12 (buildings) as Liverpool. Birkenhead, on the other hand, had proportionally more skilled workers residing in it with one eighth of its adult male population employed in ships and boats (5,052, of which a quarter were labourers, 1,213) and with just over 2,000 dockers (1 in 20 of its labour force), and 2,000 railwaymen out of its 10,000 conveyance workers!

It was a much more mixed economy than Liverpool. Birkenhead and Wallasey were often identified together as the 'Wirral', and were quite distinct from Liverpool.

Bootle on the other hand had an even higher proportion of dock labourers in its adult male work force than Liverpool - 14.9% (3,278) as compared with 8.7% (19,446), and a higher proportion of merchant seamen 10.9% (2,383) compared with 5.5% (12,305) and the same proportion of commercial and business clerks, 6.1%.
In Liverpool the overwhelmingly important occupations were connected with the waterfront and with commerce. Within the category of conveyance nearly 20,000 adult males (over 10 years of age) identified their occupation as being dock labourer, or wharf labourer in Liverpool City i.e. 8.7% of the total workforce. Within the commercial category thirteen and a half thousand males identified themselves as commercial and business clerks in Liverpool City i.e. 6.1%.

Table 11
Conveyance and Commercial Occupations in the Liverpool Conurbation, 1911
(Males, 10 and over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI CONVEYANCE</th>
<th>Bootle</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
<th>Birk'head</th>
<th>Wallasey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Railways</td>
<td>3.8 (21945)</td>
<td>4.3 (224584)</td>
<td>5.2 (40697)</td>
<td>1.7 (22489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roads -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmen, cabmen</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(679)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsekeeper</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(779)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor van, car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driver</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(357)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car men, Carriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carters, Wagoners</td>
<td>3.5 (778)</td>
<td>4.6 (10283)</td>
<td>3.1 (1242)</td>
<td>1.8 (405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van - guards, boys</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(654)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>1.1 (2566)</td>
<td>(305)</td>
<td>(272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Merchants services,</td>
<td>10.9(2383)</td>
<td>5.5 (12305)</td>
<td>4.5 (1829)</td>
<td>5.0 (1122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots, Boatmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf labourers</td>
<td>14.9(3278)</td>
<td>8.7 (19446)</td>
<td>5.2 (2130)</td>
<td>1.6 (365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Messengers, Porter</td>
<td>3.8 (823)</td>
<td>5.2 (11735)</td>
<td>2.9 (1190)</td>
<td>2.9 (645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchmen</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td>0.6 (1363)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalheavers, coal-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porters, labourers</td>
<td>1.1 (220)</td>
<td>1.4 (3140)</td>
<td>1.8 (742)</td>
<td>4.0 (896)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V COMMERCIAL

| 1. Merchant, Agent | 1.1 (234) | 1.8 (4015) | 2.0 (804) | 5.4 (1213) |
| Accountant         |            |           |           |            |
| 2. Commercial and  | 6.1(1329)  | 6.1(13688) | 5.2 (2102) | 12.6 (2842) |
| Business clerks    |            |           |           |            |
| 3. Dealers in      | 1.0 (220)  | 1.4 (3140) | 1.8 (742) | 4.0 (896)  |
| Housing, &         |            |           |           |            |
| Insurance          |            |           |           |            |

SOURCE: Census of England and Wales, Vol 10 Part II
The Liverpool Docks

It is important therefore to look at the conditions of work of both the dock labourers and the clerks. The Dock Estate (seven miles of 60 docks, quay space of 27 miles on the Lancashire side, see map) of both Liverpool and Birkenhead was managed by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board from 1858 and leased out to the shipping companies.

For cargo trade there were three main trade routes: the North American entered the North-End docks (chiefly cotton and grain), the coastal trade the Central docks, and the South-American trade via the South-End docks. Although the North American trade was by far the most important for the prosperity of the docks as a whole.¹

The other trade was the large passenger liners, again from the North-End Docks.² Both trades - cargo and passenger - had their peaks: cotton in the autumn and passenger in the spring and summer, leaving a large body of men unemployed for large parts of the winter.³

There were four classes of employers of labour at the Liverpool docks: the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board itself (a minor employer); master stevedores and master porters who were either directly contracted to load and unload (stevedores), or to deal with cargo on the quay (porters), or were employed by a firm of shipowners; shipowners who did their own loading or unloading or porterage work; merchants who did their own porterage work.⁴ The independent master stevedores and master porters were more common at the South-End of the docks than at the North-End where the masters were nominees of

1. F. E. Hyde op cit p123-128
2. Ibid, p111-114.
the large steamship companies. There was a division between stevedore work, packing and unpacking the ship, and porterage. Within porterage work there was also specialisation in cotton, provision, fruit and coal. Rates of wages varied according to employer, type of work and whether the firm recognised the union (NUDL whose sole base was in the South-End docks prior to 1911). The following rates of pay were presented in a report on Poor Law Relief in 1908:

Table 12

1. Employees of Shipping Cos, Merchants, Master Stevedores, Master Porters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day work</th>
<th>Night work (union)</th>
<th>(non-union)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevedores proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stow the cargo</td>
<td>7s. 0d</td>
<td>13s. 0d</td>
<td>1s. 0d an hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipmen or stevedore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labourers</td>
<td>5s. 0d</td>
<td>8s. 0d</td>
<td>8d &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Porters</td>
<td>4s. 6d</td>
<td>8s. 0d</td>
<td>7d &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Employees of Mersey Docks and Harbour Board

|                  |          |                   |             |
| Shipmen          | 4s. 6d   |                   |             |
| Porters          | 4s. 3d   |                   |             |

3. Cross Channel and Coasting Trade Men

A weekly wage of 30s is paid for 54 or 60 hours worked at anytime. Overtime is 8d. an hour. These workers form more or less a separate class and 'follow' certain firms in the trade only.

Source: P.P. 1908 Cd 4391 op cit p15.

These rates of pay were essentially the same as Eleanor Rathbone had found in 1904 (her report was quoted extensively) and also essentially the same as had been won by the 1890 strike.

1. E. L. Taplin, op cit
2. E. Rathbone, op cit see also PP 1908 Dock Labour in Relation to Poor Law Relief Cd 4391 p15
They therefore represented a decline in real wages, a decline which underlay the secret union organisation of the North-End Docks from 1908, and the 1911 Transport Strike. The rates of pay were such that no decline in real wages could be absorbed, as it still could be by the Glasgow skilled workers before the First World War.

James Sexton, in his evidence, suggested that the weekly earnings of the 26,000 workforce might be as follows: 30 per cent might average 30s. a week, 25 per cent average 15s. a week, 25 per cent 7s. 6d. a week, 20 per cent 5s. a week.

Sexton's figures, of course, referred to years of reasonable trade when work would be available for 14-16,000 of the 26,000 casual workers. But during the 1908 crisis which severely affected the American trade, or during disputes in the cotton industry, the figures would have been much lower. Liverpool experienced two such depressions - 1903-5, and 1907-8 - in the period of declining real wages up to the 1911 Transport strike.

The wage rates of the port of Liverpool were actually higher than that of London. The low weekly earnings were a result of the casual system of employment at the Liverpool docks. The men were called at 'stands' at fixed hours and the first call was made at 6.50a.m. There

1. See below p.376.
2. F. E. Hyde, op cit, p.130 argues that in real terms the wages of both seamen and dockers had fallen from the Boer War.
3. PP 1908, Cd 4391, op cit. The 26,000 workforce figure was derived from the 1901 Census and comprised 19,594 dock and wharf labourers in Liverpool, 9,773 in Bootle, 2,058 in Birkenhead and Wallasey.
4. Ibid. p32 Letter from Mr James Sexton against the extension of the ticket system.
5. Ibid Sexton uses the argument that work is only available for 16,000 out of 26,000 to argue against an extension of the ticket system i.e. against decasualisation.
7. E. L. Töplin, op cit, p.11, who also claims that the Liverpool docker had a higher status than in London.
was no general ticket system and no preference lists but men 'followed' a particular firm of employers, a particular line of ships or regularly attended the same stand and 'in practice' were given preference. All firms gave 'brass tallies' or a note with a number to the men they employed for them to claim payment at the end of the week and some large firms adopted a policy of giving low numbers to the best men and they retained those numbers from week to week. Thus some men were 'preference men'.

The system of 'preference' was less widespread in 1908 than in 1904. Although 'preference' had gradually come in, in the Liverpool and Birkenhead docks the disruption of trade during the depression appears to have caused a reversal. In 1908, the 'preference' workers were confined to the grain warehouses owned by and worked by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board and to about 100 workers who were 'preference' men for each of the major North-End lines, the Cunard, White Star and Johnston Shipping Cos. The NUOL claimed in their evidence that they were the man 'who mugs the boss the most', The fact that no union man was ever a preference man may explain James Sexton's total opposition to decasualisation although the reasons he gave were many and varied including the statement:

"Preference would and does lead to bribery and corruption, this we know to be a fact."  

1. PP 1908, Cd 4391, Summary of Rathbone's 1904 report. Also see E. Rathbone op cit.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid, p.32. The reasons included 1. It would reduce the standard rate of wages; 2. It would introduce excessive driving under the bonus system; 3. The preference class would be favoured against the other dockers, and if entire decasualisation was achieved then 10,000 would have no work; 4. Worker would be demoralised; at present he is a skilled worker of a particular trade; 5. Again returns to the position of the 'man crushed out'. Sexton's total opposition to decasualisation was one shared by the employers and the rank and file dockers' opposition to the 1912 Clearing House Scheme, which had been agreed without consultation with the NUOL membership, was probably founded in the demand for decasualisation. see below p. 398-399.
The casual nature of dock work had a wide impact on dockland employment. First, the workers who worked in the same areas as the dockers were principally the Carters. The carters were also divided into separate categories. The largest section were the traffic section, consisting of men employed by firms of master carters forwarding goods to and from docks, warehouses, railways and canals. There was also a Timber Carter section and a Coal Carter section and a Short Carter section. The 'Traffic' and 'Timber' Carters were paid 30s. a week (if they were teamsmen) or 27s. a week (if they were one horsemen) in both the Liverpool side of the docks and the Wirral, prior to the 1911 strike. The Coal Carters and the Short Carters (carrying materials for buildings, roadmaking and excavations) had the hardest work for the worst rates of pay. Before the 1911 strike they were paid 28s. a week (teamsmen) or 26s. a week (one horsemen) and these rates of wages had only just been obtained in 1909. Moreover, the Carters, although comparatively highly unionised prior to 1911, were faced with a separate problem of masters employing 'youths' for men's work at 17s a week.

Second, the existence of a widespread number of casual dock workers and also of 10,000 general labourers and 11,000 carters had the result that permanent unskilled work was prized, no matter how badly paid. In Liverpool over 6,000 were employed by the Corporation and one of the demands of extreme Protestant organisations was that this employment should be for Protestants. The railway companies too provided permanent employment. Despite low wages the nearly 9,000 railway workers employed by the Liverpool and Bootle Railway Companies

1. The Transport Worker August 1911 article by W. H. Billal Quillam Vice-President Mersey Quay and Railway Carters' Union.

2. See below p.346. The Catholics also complained that this was the case.
the London and North-Western Railway, the Lancashire and Yorkshire railway, the Mersey and Cheshire committee lines) did not face the humiliation and uncertainty of the stand system. It was in the railwaymen's wards of the city that it was possible to establish organisations like the Co-op and which later went Labour.

In Liverpool the different history of the dock workers wards and the railwaymen's and postmen's wards suggest that Hobsbawm's 'market' criteria for the skilled are ones which also differentiate between different types of unskilled workers.

Apart from the several small industries associated with the docks, largely connected with food or leather processing, there was one other major source of manual employment. In Liverpool and Bootle, approximately 20,000 workers were employed in the building industry, largely in house building which tended to have its own employment cycle and its own traditions quite separate from those of the rest of Liverpool.

It was the building industry in Liverpool, along with the printing industry (employed nearly 3000) which was the major employer of skilled men. Although marine engineering had existed in Liverpool and engineering and machine making employed over 13,000 this was largely concentrated in the uncertain shiprepair industry - shipbuilding having been pushed out by the gradual extension of the docks and transferred to Birkenhead. A skilled man in Liverpool could earn 39s. 2d. in the building industry, up to 36s. in printing, and between that in engineering. There was obviously a huge gap between earnings such as these and the earnings of casual dockers and permanent railwaymen.

1. See below, p. 257-258.
The industry of 'clerking', also had a quite distinctive impact on the city of Liverpool. As early as 1871 there were over 15,000 clerks, apprentice clerks, office lads etc. By 1911 there were over 31,000 men aged 10+ engaged in commercial activities (including merchants agents and accountants; commercial and business clerks; dealers in money and insurance, insurance clerks) in the Liverpool conurbation compared with 26,000+ in the Glasgow conurbation.

A major difference between the Glasgow clerks and the Liverpool clerks were much larger numbers employed as insurance clerks and insurance agents in Liverpool (5,000 in Liverpool compared to 2,500 approximately in Glasgow). A

A further difference was that in Glasgow over 10,000 women found employment in commercial occupations in the Glasgow conurbation, whilst in Liverpool only 5,000 women did. It would thus appear that in Liverpool men were prepared to take jobs that were taken by women in Glasgow.

For the low-paid clerk in Liverpool 'clerking' was as near a 'factory' occupation as it could be before the First World War, and the lowest paid were paid worse than skilled workers. There was an enormous gulf between the £80 a year clerk who could not afford a servant, and those clerks who earned £300 - £400 a year and were men of consequence. Domestic labour was a major source of employment for working class women.

2. 1911 Census of England and Wales, Vol. 10 Part II; 1911 Census for Scotland Vol I.
3. Ibid. See below p. 242.
4. G. L. P. Anderson, op. cit, Introduction, p.4. argues that domestic service "expanded enormously as the middle class utilised domestic labour as one of the key props in their definition of middle classness" and p.144. where he argues that the real defining line in the struggle for respectability was whether a clerk kept a servant or not.
As with dock labour, patronage played an important part in getting a job for a clerk. The North and South Wales banks entirely employed clerks on a personal basis and their clerks had to be bilingual in Welsh and English.¹ Bank clerks were the 'aristocracy' of the clerks, working shorter hours and with good salaries and promotion prospects.

In the Insurance Companies, there was job security and steadily increasing salaries. But clerks in Liverpool were also employed by the Steamship Companies (54 companies employed 1,000 as early as 1871), the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board (300 by 1875), and by the Railway Companies as well as the small concerns in the city.² Clerks were paid lowest in the brokerege trade because it was argued that they would eventually set up in business for themselves.³

But the belief of the mid-Victorian years - that with hard work a clerk could become a wealthy ship broker⁴, had even less semblance of truth with the advent of steamships and the highly capitalised concerns of the post 1860s. Also, from 1870 onwards, the effect of the Education Act was to create a large supply of potential clerks. Increasingly before the First World War the Liverpool clerk was worried by the advent of both boy labour,

1. G. L. P. Anderson op cit, p.27.
2. Ibid, p.25-26
3. Ibid, Chapter 3 "The Counting House World: Clerks and Employers" p.83-111. Anderson states that the National Union of Clerks thought that the myth of a clerk becoming an employer was very potent in hampering unionisation.
4. Ibid. Anderson quotes B. G. Orchard, The Clerks of Liverpool (1871) and B. G. Orchard, Liverpool's Legion of Honour, (1893) as texts that encouraged clerks to believe in the possibility of social mobility. Orchard had been Secretary of the Liverpool Clerks Association.
and female labour.¹ By the Edwardian period the Liverpool clerk was no
longer middle class², except in the context of the entire Liverpool
labour market.

1. G. L. P. Anderson op cit, Chapter 4: "The Clerk under Pressure"
p.112-144.

2. Ibid, Anderson, Introduction, argues that both C. Wright Mills and
David Lockwood date the coming of the 'new little man'
of clerical labour too late. The late Victorian clerks of Liverpool
and Manchester were already in this position.
II  The 'natural' societies

For the Liverpool casual worker (docker, carter, labourer), his work-group was one not merely founded on competition between himself and his fellow workers, but one that was riddled with patronage, corruption and brutality. The most vivid description of the system is given by James Sexton in his autobiography, but even in 1929 the evils of the 'stand' system were as obvious. The system of casual labour on the docks meant that:

"... preference men paid for being preference men, and other men watched the preference men to report on them in the hope of getting their job."3

It also meant that the work groups were composed of men of varying ability and experience, particularly in times of good trade, and 'forcing' by foremen was common. Employment through patronage permeated all types of employment in Liverpool. Men got employment through contacts. This practice spread over into the permanent trades as well as casual.

2. F. G. Hanham, Report of an Enquiry into Casual Labour in the Merseyside Area (1930)
4. PP 1908 Cd 4391, op cit p.25; E. L. Taplin op cit, p.4.
5. PP 1920, House of Commons Commissioners Reports, 16 Session Vol. 24. 'Forcing' was common up until the 1911 dock strike i.e. foremen handiest with fists got the most work done.
6. How the Casual Labourer Lives, Report of the Liverpool Joint Research Committee on the Domestic Conditions and Expenditure of the Families of Certain Liverpool Labourers, Liverpool Economic and Statistical Society (1909), p.xx-xvi discusses "vague charges of favouritism and corruption among foremen were common but not substantiated". One foreman ran a boarding house, and another a football team, more common among some firms than others, and one man alleged "half a crown in your hand" helpful in getting work from this firm.
Additionally, such patronage was often based on prejudice. Locally, Catholics employed Catholics, Welsh employed Welsh, and Protestants employed Protestants.\(^1\)

On the docks the Catholic dockers were employed by the great liner companies at the North-End and Protestant dockers were employed at the South-End.\(^2\)

'Casual' labour in the dockland area certainly undermined the entire strength of the Liverpool labour movement in normal times, but it was also the basis of the vast upsurges in trade union militancy that did take place.

In Liverpool capitalism didn't present the 'natural', 'inevitable' appearance that it did in Glasgow. In Glasgow there were engineering shops where men had worked all their lives ('it was said that they were "in with the bricks" ').\(^3\) It was also seen as desirable however, that men should move from shop to shop to gain experience, and go to sea - never doubting that work would be there.

In Liverpool good trade could disappear as quickly as it had come. For men who had to go to the stand at 6.50a.m. in all weather, not knowing whether they were employed or not, the conception of the world that was 'mechanically imposed' was very different.

In Glasgow the very workshops and shipyard attested to the permanence of capitalism, even in periods of lay-off and short-time working. The engineering labour aristocrats in Glasgow organised

2. Ibid; E. L. Taplin op cit, p.10-11.
in their District Committee or later in their rank and file committees in order to strike work. In Liverpool, the rank and file struck spontaneously and even Tom Mann found it difficult to control the riot.¹

The families of unskilled casual workers always balanced on a knife edge between utter poverty and starvation. Marx's argument that the worker received a wage not merely to reproduce his own labour-power (through food, shelter etc), but also to reproduce the next generation of wage-labourers², highlights the problem at the centre of the family in Liverpool - the wages of the casual unskilled workers were only high enough to do that if they were in full-time employment. But if they were not, then their wages were simply not high enough. This was the problem at the heart of the 1911 strike wave.

After her investigation of unskilled casual labour in the docks (published in 1904), Eleanor Rathbone also organised the investigation into the circumstances of such workers' families. They investigated household budgets of 40 families known to 'various social workers' (i.e. missionaries, district visitors, schools' managers, provident collectors and children's invalid visitors). They found three dock labourers earning 25s. a week, 2 earning 20s., 12 earning 15s. - 20s. and 10 earning 15s.³

Not surprisingly in 16 out of the 40 families, wives added to

¹ See below p. 374 passim.
³ Liverpool "How the Casual Labourer Lives", op cit, p. vi - vii. Dona Torr was also one of the 12 women who helped in the investigation.
the income by charring, washing, sewing or hawking and also by
taking in lodgers, although only in six cases were the sums more
than 'trifling' amounts.1

Marx argued that in the case of the factory worker it was the
wages of the entire family that made up the family wage to reproduce
themselves, not just the wage of the male worker, but also that of his
wife and children.2 It was a mark of the labour aristocrat that he
alone could provide for his family, and in Glasgow, despite female
employment being available in the textile factories, married
women were much less likely to work. Whereas 35 per cent of women over
10 years were occupied in Glasgow City compared with 31.69 per cent
in Liverpool City, in Glasgow only 6.31 per cent of these women
were married whereas, in Liverpool 12.04 per cent were.3 This was
despite the fact that in Liverpool employment for women was
overwhelmingly in the sphere of domestic service.

1. Ibid.
"The value of labour-power was determined, not only by the
labour-time necessary to maintain the individual adult labourer,
but also by that necessary to maintain his family. Machinery,
by throwing every member of that family on to the labour-market,
spreads the value of the man's labour-power over his whole
family. It thus depreciates his labour-power. To purchase the
labour-power of a family of four workers may, perhaps, cost more
than it formerly did to purchase the labour power of the head
of the family, but, in return, four days' labour takes the place
of one. In order that the family may live, four people must now,
not only labour, but expend surplus labour for the capitalist"
3. Census of England and Wales, op cit, Census of Scotland op cit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Liverpool conurbation which: Liverpool City</th>
<th>Bootle</th>
<th>Birkenhead</th>
<th>Wallasey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>iv. Domestic ...</td>
<td>46,368</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>32,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>xix. Dress ...</td>
<td>18,489</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>xx. Food, Tobacco, drink, lodgings ...</td>
<td>14,811</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>10,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>iii. Professional ...</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>7,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>xviii. Textiles ...</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>v. Commercial ...</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>xvii. Paper, prints, books stationary ...</td>
<td>4,737</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>xv. Chemicals ...</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>xiii. Wood, furniture, fittings ...</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>i. Government ...</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>vi. Conveyance ...</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: All occupied women 128,053
The 11 orders listed above as % of total occupied women, 10+ 89.14

All occupied women as % of all women aged 10+ 30.74
No. of women in no occupation or unspecified 288,558

Source: Census, England and Wales 1911
The financial insecurity of their lives put dock-workers' families, at least, in the hands of the pawnbroker and the money lender. The pawnbrokers charged a rate of interest of 1d. on 2s. on pledging and a 1d. on 2s. on redeeming and the goods were put in on Monday and taken out on Saturday. But the money-lenders - often women - charged exorbitant interest and terrorised those who did not pay. They charged 4d. per shilling for the first week of lending, and 3d. per shilling thereafter - a rate of interest which was often 100 per cent per annum. One budget the 1909 report collected showed 4s. 3d. 'dead interest' owed (as it was known), out of an income of 10s.

Out of the forty budgets, 19 households were both pledging and borrowing, 6 borrowing only, 6 pledging only, and 9 doing neither. But of these nine, seven were unreliable budgets. As the report says:

"It is the generality rather than the extent of the transactions, especially with professional money-lenders, that seems to us so remarkable and depressing a feature of these statistics." 1

In the worst week every family's expenditure on food was below the Rowntree Minimum, but despite this, families still managed to insure against sickness and to pay into their burial club. This was clearly an extremely important item in their budget. 2 Clothing was often brought from the pawnbrokers, but other expenditure could be met through the 'money club'. In the club 16 women would pay

1. Liverpool "How the Casual Labourer Lives" op cit
2. Ibid
is. each week, and each week one of the women would take 16s.1

Despite the poverty the report found real generosity among the families - one family took in an old woman for her meals and another took in the six children of a dead sister to add to the five they already had.2

The report blamed the casual system of work for the conditions of the families of the casual labourer. It argued that the alternation of hard work and idleness meant that the surplus of good weeks was spent on self-indulgence; because the family's living standard had to be adjusted for the bad weeks, the fluctuations of income made housekeeping difficult; and that there was no social control over the labourer because periodic drinking bouts didn't impair a man's chance of work. They also argued that the petty corruption and tyranny of the foreman was a bad influence and that the system of casual labour blighted all other employment.3

What the investigation failed to deal with however, was how far the appalling poverty of the families concerned was not merely the result of the casual system of employment but also the result of the way the Poor Law was administered in Liverpool.

1. Liverpool "How the Casual Labourer Lives" op cit. In Glasgow there was also a similar system occasionally called a 'menage'

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. The conclusions were the same that Booth had come to, that work must be decasualised but again the problem was the employers and the unions. "Experience unfortunately has proved, not only that the employers as a body are very Conservative, but also that they are far from being all convinced that the existence of a large mass of semi-employed labour is a bad thing ... The men on their side are collectively concerned also to the gate of the squeezed out surplus and individually fearful of finding themselves numbered among the rejected."
From 1842, Liverpool had been exempted from the new Poor Law, having proved that the way they administered their "Select Vestry" was sound and the rate of outdoor relief was low. During the Irish famine years, the Liverpool Select Vestry actually reduced the numbers of cases they were relieving from 25,000 to 4-10,000. And they switched from a central relief system to a district relief in 1847. They did this despite having 80,000 Irish in Liverpool and an enormous leap in deaths among Irish paupers. Irish paupers remained a major problem throughout the 1850s but the administration of the 'Poor Law Vestry' became even more stringent. Until 1871, the numbers receiving outdoor relief varied up to 13,000. By 1875 the number was reduced to 2,600.

"The veteran Vestry clerk gives it as his opinion that the great decrease which took place between 1871 and 1875 in the number of persons receiving outdoor relief was largely brought about by improved administration. More rigid inquiries as to the circumstances of those applying for relief, and the exercise of greater care in the distribution of it, had a marked diminishing effect."  

Henry Joseph Haggar was assistant vestry clerk from 1859-1911, and then became Vestry Clerk, and was described as a man of:

"... fairness, justice and impartiality... appointed and paid a Catholic priest to give religious instruction facilities for inmates"  

It was argued that by his day the different religious representatives had come to an agreement about how the Poor Law should be administered.

2. Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury September 17, 1908. From September 15th - September 21st 1908, there was a series of articles on Poor Law Reform and Liverpool by Edward Horrigan. Liverpool NewsCutting Book Collection. Picton Library.  
3. Liverpool Courier March 27, 1922 ibid.
By 1894, in fact, the Liverpool anomaly had disappeared and Liverpool had become a Board of Guardians although it was still called the Select Vestry. The stringent approach to the poor remained, especially to the Irish. One of the Guardians, Henry Peet, systematically visited cases in his district:

"... and this vigilance on his part had not only an excellent effect upon the officers of the department, but enabled him to withdraw from relief many worthless and undeserving cases ... Whatever differences of opinion existed between himself and his colleagues on questions of policy, they always entertained the highest respect for him personally ... His courage in expressing the most unpopular opinion was unfailing ... in his absence we are threatened with a chronic condition of affairs, which I cannot better describe as nemine contradicente - a condition not appreciated by Irishmen at any rate."¹

Alongside the stringent application of the Poor Law there was the centralised organisation of all charities. In 1863 the Central Relief Society (CRS) had been founded by William Rathbone in order to discourage 'indiscriminate charity'.² Therefore the Irish in Liverpool were dependent on charity from their own Catholic community. The Poor Law and the charity organisations of Liverpool also reinforced the sectarian divide.

1. Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury, September 17 1908.
2. E. Rathbone op cit
In Liverpool the 'neighbourhood' and the 'private association' attached to the Churches of the neighborhood became the most meaningful relationships. The most 'natural' society of the Liverpool working man was his neighbourhood. Whereas in Glasgow the highlanders met at Argyll Street under the bridge (the 'highlanders' umbrella'), in Liverpool whole areas belonged to the Catholics, the Ulster Protestants, and the Welsh:

"After 1861, the pattern of migrational settlement becomes plainly discernible with movements outwards from the overcrowded core. The Irish immigrants moved into the Scotland Road area which was primarily Catholic, while Ulster Protestants lived on the fringes in Kirkdale: Welsh immigrants settled in Everton, Toxteth and Wavertree. In the general employment of these immigrants, the Irishmen worked mainly in the docks, while the Welshmen established themselves in the retail trades of dairying and drapery and in the building and constructional work. Thus, in outline, the main characteristics of Liverpool's physical development had taken place and by 1911 most of the townships, in an arc from Waterloo to Garston, had come within a high density category."

The development of the 'communities' of the City of Liverpool along occupational and religious lines was facilitated by the existence of four distinct types of housing. In the central area of Liverpool which - unlike Glasgow - had not been demolished for railway stations, there were the 'courts' of Liverpool. These were built during the famine to house the Irish and did 'contain as a rule, four rooms, viz. cellar, ground floor, first floor and attic.'

1. F. E. Hyde, op cit, p.69
2. Ibid
By 1903 these houses were often three-roomed (because their cellars had been condemned), and their conveniences were still shared between all the houses in the court. It was these houses that Liverpool Corporation was attempting to clear.¹

Outside of these central areas:

"In the period 1850 to 1900, terraced houses, hideous in the yellow brick of the Welsh building contractor, had topped the sandstone ridge and were engulfing Everton and Wavertree." ²

These terraced houses could either be of three rooms (a living room with a cooking range and a scullery behind and two bedrooms); four rooms (a living room, a back kitchen with a cooking range, and two bedrooms); five rooms (parlour, kitchen, scullery and three bedrooms. Six-roomed houses were more likely to be occupied by 'clerks, shop assistants, and the like, rather than people of the kind usually included in the "working classes"'. ³

In each case rents in Bootle were cheaper per type of house than in Liverpool and:

"In Bootle five-roomed houses of a very superior type, with bathroom and hot-water arrangements, have been and still are being extensively built for and rented by workpeople at 7s.9d. per week, which includes a supply of electric light in three rooms from 6p.m. to midnight." ⁴

1. PP 1908 Cost of Living of the Working Classes, Town Report on Liverpool, (Cd 3684)
2. F. E. Hyde, op cit, p. 70.
4. Ibid.
The following Table shows the rents most usually paid for the different types of houses in Liverpool and Bootle:

Table 14 Weekly Rents in Liverpool and Bootle, 1905

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rooms per Tenement</th>
<th>Predominant Weekly Rents, including all rates, at October, 1905.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three rooms</td>
<td>5s. to 6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four rooms</td>
<td>5s. to 6s.6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five rooms</td>
<td>6s. to 8s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six rooms</td>
<td>7s. to 8s.6d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rent index number which has been constructed from these figures is 65 compared with 100 in London, a number which denotes a level of rent generally higher than that found in the other large Lancashire towns, though rather lower than that in Birkenhead.

SOURCE: PP 1908 Cost of Living of the Working Classes (Cd 3684)

Unlike Glasgow, it was possible for skilled workers to live in quite different conditions from the unskilled workers, and in quite different areas. It was also possible for a few to own their own homes, and in the early years, to even build for renting.

"Many a semi-skilled joiner, slater, plasterer, stonemason and bricklayer from the rural parts of North Wales prospered during the Merseyside Building Boom ... through their diligence and frugality were able to save money when tradesmen's wages were only 4½d. an hour. With their savings they bought plots of land for building purposes or started business in the allied trades.

Artisans who worked on building sites in Parliament Fields, Liverpool - their wages being 11s. per week for ten hours a day - were seen collecting rents from the tenants of their property in their top hats and tail coats a few years later. No wonder Owen Elias ... earned the title of King of Everton" 1

1. Cwilym R. Jones, Liverpool and the influence of North Wales, P.110
These general statements about the neighbourhood divisions within Liverpool have recently been borne out by a research project undertaken by historians at Liverpool Polytechnic and Liverpool University. One member of this project, Sam Davies, has analysed the municipal election results for 1900-1939. Reworking his analysis it is possible to distinguish the following divisions within the wards for the period 1900-1920:

1. Protestant-Conservative wards of Kirkdale, St. Domingo, Netherfield, Breckfield and Dingle. None of these were won for Labour before 1926-1927.
2. Protestant-Conservative wards of Everton, Edge Hill and Garston. These wards were usually won by the Conservatives, but Labour won them all in 1911 and they also went Labour in the inter-war years.
3. Catholic-Nationalist wards of Sandhills, Scotland North and South, Vauxhall, St. George and Brunswick. These only went Labour with the collapse of the Irish Nationalist raison d'etre in the 1920s.
4. Catholic-Labour ward of St. Anne's. This seat was held by James Sexton, a Catholic, with the support of the Liberals and the Irish Nationalists.

These findings were related by Davies and other members of the team to the occupational structure of four of these wards in 1911. The four wards selected were Brunswick, St. Domingo and St. Anne's - all with more than half their male workers in the transport and associated industries - and Garston - with only 35 per cent in transport and 14 per cent working on the railways (compared with only 1 or 2 per cent in the three other wards). The high proportion of railwaymen in Garston was because it was built as a railway dock and was isolated from the other wards, but the work done so far completely bears out the argument of contemporary observers that it was the railwaymen who were the backbone of the Liverpool Labour movement.

2. Ibid.
III The 'private associations' of Liverpool

In Liverpool the predominant 'private associations' of working men were quite different from those of Glasgow. Neither co-operation nor trade unionism were strong in Liverpool and the Friendly Society movement took on a quite different form - one that was more consistent with communities divided upon religious and ethnic, and occupational lines. The 'traditional' societies of the different Churches were very important in Liverpool; as well as the major division between Protestantism and Catholicism. Different forms of Protestantism were associated with different ethnic groups. The freemasonry and the Volunteer movement were also strong.

The Friendly Society movement in Liverpool developed under the hegemony of a militant Protestantism and Irish nationalism. The list of Orders given in Table 15 show that the 'classical' friendly society - with lodges and branches - were established in Liverpool either before the Irish Famine and the rise of militant Protestantism or later, in the 1880s and 1890s. In either event they were extremely weak, with a much lower level of affiliation than one would expect given the absolute number of skilled workers in Liverpool and the strength of the Friendly Society movement in Lancashire. They were also surprisingly weak in the Wirral (Birkenhead, Wallasey, Seacombe, etc.) area.

Friendly Society insurance, however, was an essential part of the life of the 'respectable' working class because without it they could not protect themselves from sickness, nor could their funeral be paid for. Such insurance was especially essential in Liverpool given the exceptionally punitive attitude of the Board of Guardians. Therefore in Liverpool different forms of insurance
Table 15

Friendly Societies in Lancashire and Liverpool

1. Friendly Societies with no district in Liverpool but established elsewhere in Lancashire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>No. of other districts in Lancashire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Noble Order of United Oddfellows, Bolton Unity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Order of Foresters</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Order of Shepherds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand United Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Order of Ancient Shepherds</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Unity</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Independent Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National United Order of Free Gardeners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Druids</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Friendly Societies in Liverpool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Date est.</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Order of Ancient Free Shepherds</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Rechabites,</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Mechanics</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish National Foresters</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of the Sons of Temperance</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Grand Order of the Sons of the Phoenix</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly Societies in Cheshire</th>
<th>No. of Lodges</th>
<th>Date est.</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand United Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1836/1867</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Oddfellows</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1836-1850</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Rechabites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford Unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish National Foresters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1888-1890s</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Order of Ancient Shepherds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Ancient Imperial United Order of Oddfellows, Wirral District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Report of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies for the year ending 31st December 1910, PP 1912-1913, Accounts and Papers, Vol 33, Part A, Appendix N.
developed: the 'tontines' and dividing societies, the small branchless friendly society, and the great collecting societies.

The 'tontine' or dividing system was described in the *Liverpool Review* in 1886:

"Probably the society which most nearly fulfils every reasonable requirement of a perfect scheme of industrial insurance is the Manchester Unity Independent Order of Oddfellows, which now possesses a membership roll of 600,000 and a capital of £6,000,000, and which provides travelling relief to its members when in search of employment. Several other flourishing societies work upon very similar lines to the Oddfellows, some offering increased advantages in particular branches, but being much the same on a general and all-round comparison of their 'benefits'.

But though tontine societies as a rule, are comparatively small, and are confined to particular localities, the advantages they offer, and their commercial soundness under careful management, fully justify the estimation in which they are held and the wide-spread confidence placed in them. Their payments during sickness are usually as high as in the Oddfellows and other large societies but are not continued for as long. In some cases the weekly subscriptions of tontines are higher; in most they are about the same. Their principal feature is the 'divide' which usually takes place before Christmas, by which the members on an average will receive back not less than 75 per cent of their subscriptions. It is no uncommon thing, however, for a good tontine to repay its members the full amount of their subscriptions for the year; thus, they will have been sure of an allowance of ten or twelve shillings per week in time of sickness, practically free of cost to themselves. A circular which has just been issued by a very successful local tontine, sets forth the benefits secured to its members, as follows: 'Relief in sickness, 'twelve shillings per week for 16 weeks; six shillings per week for the next 16 weeks, and four shillings per week for the following 16 weeks; ... and the last dividend is stated to have been £2.14s.0d.

For returning good value for the money paid in, few societies whatever their plan of operation offer fairer inducements to the working classes than successful tontines. ...To those who cannot see their way to take out a full middle-class policy from a good office, and who cannot afford to permanently pay away a moderate sum into one of the larger friendly societies, the tontines offer inducements rarely equalled as safe and remunerative investments."

Members of tontines joined by the year, with the funds being divided at Christmas, and this was an advantage for unskilled labourers families.¹ But that does not explain why the skilled workers in Liverpool must have joined such tontines, and the collecting societies.

In Liverpool there were 265 of these small branchless societies and in Cheshire there were 46, whereas in the whole of the Glasgow conurbation there were only 37.² The reason they developed in Liverpool and the Wirral is that they could be locally constructed along religious, ethnic and occupational divides.

The names of some of the earliest - created at the same time as the national friendly society movement - explain this:
The Welsh Christian Friendly Society (1801, 48 members in 1910), Liverpool St. George's Operative Tontine Society (1852, 37), King Protestant Burial Society (1848), 1st Lancashire Artillery Volunteers (1875, 40), Liverpool Hebrew Tontine Society, Linacre Gas Station Workers Volunteer Society, Liverpool South End Dock Labourers (1866, 341). Such tontines could also be attached to an individual Church or individual Conservative Working Men's Association.³ George Wise's Church 'The Protestant Reformers Memorial Church' had its own tontine⁴ and so did some of the Conservative Working Men's Associations.⁵

¹ Liverpool, "How the Casual Labourer Lives ...", op cit, stresses that the dock labourers' families all took insurance although it does not deal with whether it was through a tontine club or through the collecting societies.


³ Ibid.

⁴ See below, p. 272.

⁵ The Toxteth Conservative Club ran the "East Toxteth Primrose Friendly Society."
Similar tontines and dividing societies also developed in the Wirral - St. Paul's Protestant Benefit Society (1878, 175), St Peter's Congregationalist (1889, 210).¹

In Liverpool, another form of insurance also developed - that of the great collecting societies, the Royal Liver developed from 1850 into the largest in Britain by 1883.²

The Royal Liver had its headquarters in Liverpool, and like the Glasgow collecting societies one can only assume that its members were concentrated in and around these conurbations.³ In 1883, when it was clearly more than a Liverpool society, it had a membership of 1 million.⁴ By 1910 the Royal Liver had a membership of two and a half million.⁵

In comparing the structure of the Liverpool Friendly Society movement with that of Glasgow one can see how societies develop 'organically' not merely to social class or fractions of social class but also in relation to the entire 'commonsense' and to the other societies that exist. Such a development then reinforces of course, the previous pattern of social relationships. The tontines of Liverpool were the reverse of the great friendly societies - not drawing a Manchester oddfellow closer to a Portsmouth oddfellow - but reinforcing and thus recreating ethnic and religious divisions, and could therefore be allied with quite different Tory Democratic traditions. This was not merely true of the unskilled workers

2. The Liverpool Review July 7 1883
3. All the articles written about them assume this.
4. The Liverpool Review July 7 1883
of Liverpool but given that there were only c.8,000 members of
the great orders in Liverpool and Wirral, the skilled workers were
also under the influence of these traditions.

Like the Friendly Society movement, the Co-operative
movement had an early presence in Liverpool. Wholesale co-operation
began in the 1830s, co-operation prospered until the 1860s. From
the 1870s on, co-operation collapsed however, only to re-establish
itself at the end of the 1880s. First co-operation took root in
Garston (1864), the railway docking area outside the City, then in
the City of Liverpool Equitable Co-operative Society (registered in
1886) and in 1890 the Edge Hill and Wavertree Co-operative Society
was registered which joined the Toxteth (registered in 1891) in
1899. Bootle and Seaforth registered their own Co-operative society
in 1890. In the history of all these co-operative societies it was
the regularly employed unskilled workers - railwaymen and postmen -
who were important. Moreover, they were constructed in an upsurge
of Labour identification that took place at the end of the 1890s.¹

Co-operation only became 'a living reality' in Liverpool in
1891, after the 1889-91 strike wave, when the Chairman of Liverpool
No. 1 branch of the ASRS organised a meeting of railwaymen to hear
the co-operative case,² and the railwaymen also collected £100 among
80 of them to open a shop in Walton:

"Three railway depots, Aintree, Walton and Sandhills
were prominent in the movement towards co-operation
...The addition of a hundred earnest members gave
a much needed fillip to the society. It went to Walton
and never looked back."³

1. W. Henry Brown, "The Story of the Liverpool Co-operative
   Society Limited", 1929.
2. Ibid, Chapter 9.
3. Ibid.
J. R. T. Mawson a member of the ILP became the manager:

"In those early nineties a wave of ILP branches rose in the city. Some of the enthusiasts thought of raising funds by trading ventures, selling packed teas, and other groceries. Mr Mawson was a member of the Everton branch when a proposal to open a Labour store was seriously considered. He found himself in a dual role."

It was in fact the local ILP branch who invited the Co-operators to open a store in Breckfield Road North, Everton, but 'trade was a long time coming.' The relationship between the ILP and Co-operation always remained in Liverpool: W. R. Blair became the most prominent co-operator before the war in Liverpool, and he was also an ILP member. The City of Liverpool Co-operative had 3,000 members in 1903 when he became Education Secretary and organised propaganda meetings in the local trade union. Under his Secretaryship (from 1905) the membership rose to over 7,000 and was 10,000 in 1912.

The pattern of Co-operative development was thus very different in Liverpool from that of Glasgow. In Glasgow it was one of the most Liberal of institutions which the Forward and others were still trying to win to their support in 1920. In Liverpool the development of Co-operation in a sea of Protestant and Catholic organisations had to be the work of Labour men in occupations that were outside of the Protestant-Catholic 'patronage' system.

This was also true of other areas in the Liverpool conurbation.

2. Ibid.
In 1891 there were new Garston stores, and in 1900 it was

"some of the railwaymen and postal workers living in
the Edge Hill and Wavertree districts"\(^1\)

who formed a society which had 300 members in 1893, and over

a thousand in 1898. Three new societies opened in 1891: Birkenhead

Bootle ('the railwaymen of Bootle and Seaforth'), and Toxteth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th>Membership of Co-operative Societies in Liverpool, 1892-1928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garston</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and district)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxteth</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Liverpool</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Hill &amp; Wavertree</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without Wavertree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Co-operation remained weak because it could not establish itself among the majority of the Liverpool working class, and it also appears to have been subject to the sectarian divide in Liverpool:

"north is north, and south is south, and they met and merged when the City of Liverpool and the Toxteth societies, which had operated in the north and south mainly, amalgamated in 1915.

...it was an act of co-operative diplomacy."\(^2\)

This amalgamation took place in 1915, when sectarianism had been destroyed by the provision of a common enemy, Germany. It was only after the war that co-operation took off in Liverpool.


2. Ibid, Chapter 12 F. J. Norris became the President, W. R. Blair the Secretary and Joseph F. Kitchen and F. Houseman joint managers.
Trade unionism was also weak in Liverpool. Affiliations to the Trades Council of both skilled and unskilled trade unions depended on the level of militancy among unskilled workers. This was as clear in the 1890s as in 1911. The Liverpool Trades Council was in decline from 1875-1888; only some of the skilled societies were affiliated and of the unskilled the most notable affiliations were the Railway Servants (with three branches affiliated, Edge Hill, South-End, Sandhill), and the Plasterers/Labourers. Even then, in 1878, with only 29 societies affiliated there were also other industrial bodies to co-ordinate the specific interests of two major industries, a Shipping Trades Council and a Building Trades Council.¹ The Trades Council declined to an affiliation of 16 societies, in 1888 but increased to an affiliation of 26 societies, representing 10,000 workers before the 1889-90 strike wave.²

The strikes of 1889-90 involved seamen, dockers, tramwaymen.³ As in 1879, the Liverpool Trades Council did not play a co-ordinating role but neither was it hostile as in 1879. Moreover, unlike 1879, the strike wave established 'new unionism' even though on a flimsy basis,⁴ and this clearly transformed the Labour movement in Liverpool, albeit briefly.


2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

Not only did the newly formed unskilled societies join the Trades Council but the affiliations from the skilled societies nearly doubled.¹

In Liverpool the organisation of the unskilled shipping and docking community was necessary for the skilled workers to have confidence in the Labour vision. As in 1911, the skilled workers in 1890 greatly overestimated how long this situation would last and what its effects would be:

"It is gratifying to know that today the old and the new are being drawn together by an irresistible affinity, the old element with its careful, slow but profound forces; the new with its enthusiastic, sympathetic, sturdy energy; forming a compound, indissoluble and invulnerable, though all the forces of federated capital are arranged against it.

Trades councils have now become 'Trades and Labour Councils' in order to accomodate this new link in the grand chain of unionism; representatives of the skilled sitting side by side with the unskilled around the Council Board, forming an harmonious Republic of Labour, in which equal rights and equal votes are the ruling laws of the constitution."²

For a brief period, positions in the Liverpool Trades Council were filled by members of the large unskilled unions. In 1891 Nicholson of the Seamen was Vice-President, then James Sexton was Vice-President in 1893, and President in 1894.³ Sexton became General Secretary of the National Union of Dock Labour in 1893 and while he was involved

in leading the Trades Council it moved decisively to the right on a question that Sexton raised at the TUC many times: aliens.

"The Council has been very active regarding the importation of alien paupers into the United Kingdom. In November a public meeting was held in the Picton Lecture Hall. The platform was a very representative one. The meeting was addressed by Mr. W. F. Lawrence M.P. and Mr J. H. Stock M.P. and others. The whole of the absent members of Parliament expressed themselves in favour of some steps being taken to stop destitute aliens being landed on our shores. ... The Council have passed a vote of thanks to Mr. J. H. Stock and Mr. J. H. Wilson for their action on this question."

The Liverpool Trades Council was far removed from the Liberalism of Glasgow.

In 1894 the NUDL and Sexton withdrew from the Trades Council. During the dock dispute at Hull Liverpool dockers had scabbed on the strike despite the efforts of the Liverpool Trades Council to keep men away. From 1894 on the NUDL was very weak in Liverpool, their sole base being the South-End of the docks. They did not return to the Trades Council until 1906.

Weak trade union organisation among the manual workers of Liverpool and the control of the Corporation by the Conservative caucus had a disastrous effect upon attempts at early organisation among the Liverpool clerks. It was impossible for trade union organisation to spread beyond a very few, nor did a base for trade union organisation develop among the Corporation clerks as it had in Manchester. Instead, the Corporation clerks were organised into


2. G. L. P. Anderson, op cit, Chapt. 3. 'The Counting House World: Clerks and Employers', and Chapt. 7, 'Trade Unionism' also states that Manchester branch of the National Union of Clerks was seen as a 'socialist hotbed' whereas the Liverpool branch wouldn't affiliate to the LRC.
the Civil Service League in 1911 and then as part of the Liverpool Volunteer Guard during the war. In both 1911 and 1915 there were attempts to use them as a strike breaking force - a precursor of the O.M.S. (Organisation for the Maintenance of Supplies) used in the General Strike.

On August 29, after the Transport strike was over it was decided to establish the Civic Service Corps as a 'permanent organisation of Citizens willing to assist the authorities in preserving the health and safety and well being of the city in time of need'.¹ All members of the Civic Service Corps (established by the Lord Mayor during the strike) and all those who had worked as Special Constables or at the power station in Lister Drive became members. The Chairman was Frank J. Leslie, a Conservative Alderman associated with Salvidge, and Percy F. Corkhill was the Secretary. From 1912 on, Corkhill was also the Chairman of the Municipal Officers Guild. Over a thousand enrolled by December 1911 and then a letter was sent to suitable individuals requesting them to enrol.² The Managing Committee of the League consisted of the Lord Mayor of Liverpool, Councillors from both the Conservative and the Liberal Party and also all the Presidents of the major trading associations - the Cotton Association, Corn Trade, Provision Trade, Fruit Brokers, the Chairman of the Mersey Dock Board, the Chairman of the Municipal Officers Guild, the County Council and a representative of the Bank of England.³ This section of the

2. Ibid. p.216b.
3. Ibid. p.216b.
Management Committee were there because of their position, and not as individuals.

At the outbreak of the war the League had 2,500 registered card holders who immediately organised the recruitment drive in Liverpool:

"At the request of the Head Constable they enrolled all the Special Constables; they were agents for enrolling for the Public Schools Battalion; they provided homes for Belgian refugees; and they instituted ambulance classes." 1

The CSL was also the first body in the country to start Civilian Drill, 2,000 men were trained at North Haymarket. The women's branch of the Civic Service League organised war parcels. 2

In January 1915 Lord Derby brought together all the organisations which existed for Home Defence 3 in Liverpool, under the auspices of the Volunteer Training Corps which was now recognised by the War Office. In Liverpool the Volunteer Guard was only open to all those above military age or those with a very good reason for not joining up. At the meeting Leslie said that the Civic

1. Liverpool NewsCutting Collection, op cit, NewsCutting Liverpool Courier, August 6 1915, reporting an address by Alderman F. L. Leslie to the Rotary Club. Recruitment was encouraged through the CSL arranging for some employers to pay salaries and hold jobs open: Liverpool Courier, December 13 1917, report on the CSL;

"...One of its first acts being to involve some 500 of the chief employers of the city to agree to pay the wages or a substantial proportion of such, during the absence of men who had joined the Forces, or to keep their places open. The Committee felt that this greatly helped the cause of recruiting in the early days of the war."

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., Liverpool Courier, May 1 1915, lists the organisations in Liverpool that made up the Liverpool Volunteer Guard when it was formed and their membership: Civil Service League (700), Home Defence League (400), Athletes Volunteer Force (300), National Volunteer Reserve (300), companies at Dingle and Garston, National Defence League (100), Leyfield Grange Drill Club (100). In West Derby Division there was the Cotton Exchange Corps (60), Post Office Drill Club (300 – suspended
at present), Revenue Officials Corps (100), Tramways Corps (800), Corporation Officials Corps (800), Kirkdale Home Defence Corp (60), Special Constables intending to transfer to new Corps (150), Wavertree Patriotic Rifle Club (170). In Birkenhead and Wallasey two volunteer corps existed of 800 each of which it was said:

"In these towns the majority of the members are well able to pay for their own uniform and equipment. In Liverpool the membership is more particularly working class."

In May the question of the Corporation providing a grant towards the cost of uniforms and rifles for some of the Liverpool men came up. Sir Charles Petrie moved one thousand pounds, Salvidge and Leslie moved £2,500. In opposing the amendment Alderman Cohen (Liberal), said he didn't know where 'this scheme was being carried by a certain clique in the city. There were a great many of that class.' Taggart said it was simply letting people play at soldiers in the street - if the money was given then there should be control over the 'understrappers of the type of Alderman Leslie'. In the end £1,000 was passed. *Ibid. Liverpool Courier, May 6, 1915.* Leslie attempted to refute the charge that it was a clique in a letter to the *Liverpool Courier, May 8, 1915*, but Cohen also had retracted. As one of the correspondents in the debate said:

"To put the question bluntly will the Volunteer Guard be soldiers or policemen*. *Liverpool Daily Post June 4, 1915.*
Service League now had no man enrolled who was of military age.

One of the new battalions was the Corporation Employees Battalion.¹

In May 1915, Percy F. Corkhill, Chairman of the Municipal Officer Guild, also suggested that the members of the Guild use their annual holiday for war work and an 'invitation' was issued to all 1,000 members of the Guild to take part in war work.

"The idea is both novel and fascinating, and it is hoped that the action of the Liverpool Municipal Officers' Guild which has been responsible for the initiation of many other important movements, will be followed not only by services outside the Corporation but by many people in permanent situations."²

The clerks of Liverpool Corporation were a central integrated element in Liverpool's Tory Democracy and it is not surprising that trade unionism could not get a foothold. It is, in fact, a measure of the depth of the crisis of 1920, that one group of clerks refused to act as a 'volunteer guard'. The 1919 Police strike and riot had forced the government to consider its strategy in the face of industrial unrest. In 1920 it informed the local authorities that they should not form "Citizen Guards" but should reconstitute and strengthen the Special Constabulary.³ In Liverpool an attempt was made to set up the Special Constabulary along the lines that the Volunteer forces had always been made on:

"steps were taken to appeal to various sections of the commercial and industrial life of the city, such as banks, insurance companies, exchanges and large business concerns, for men to undertake the duties of special constables."⁴


2. Ibid Liverpool Courier May 5 1915.

3. Ibid Liverpool Echo, January 5 1920.

4. Ibid Liverpool Echo, April 17 1920.
and added:

"The movement originated through the looting and hooliganism which followed the Police Strike in August last, and which resulted in considerable financial burden. ... Previous experience has proved that valuable time is lost in making appeals and enlisting special constables after disorder has broken out and damage caused for which the whole community has to pay." ¹

But in March, some of the clerks decided not to co-operate.

The second Annual Meeting of the Shipping Clerks, with 4,000 members, was much more militant than any previous Liverpool clerks meeting. First it declared for collective bargaining with all the employers - though it recognised it would probably have to negotiate with individual employers at the time. Second, affiliation to the TUC was moved, and the argument made that the Railway Clerks Association, affiliated to the TUC now had 80,000 members. Third,

"A remarkable feature of the meeting was the moving of a resolution against the enrolling of members as special constables. Before the resolution could be put to the meeting, said Mr Brown, all present rose as one man and intimidated (sic) their support of the motion." ²

1. Liverpool Newscutting Collection, op cit. Liverpool Echo April 17 1920.

2. Ibid., Liverpool Echo March 5 1920.
Protestantism and Irish Nationalism in Liverpool

The most important 'private associations' in Liverpool were those associated with Protestant Conservatism and Irish Nationalism.

The churches were the centre of religious, ethnic and political affiliations in Liverpool: there was as much division between Protestants as there was between Protestants and Catholics on occasions.

In Liverpool the great Liberal families - the Holts, the Rathbones, the Jevons - found their home in the Unitarian Churches. The Ulster Protestants developed an extreme Non-conformity and this divided them from the Anglican and Catholic wing of the Conservative Party. The Welsh found their home in the Methodist Churches that covered Liverpool.

This division was clear when the School Board was established in the 1870s. Catholics united with Anglicans to defeat the version of the bible that the Non-Conformists wanted taught, and then Liberals and Protestants united to prevent fees being paid to Catholic schools. The Protestants tried to impose an "Orange" programme on Conservative candidates which was essentially concerned with opposition to Catholic education, opposition to the payment of Catholic chaplains in prison and workhouses (a Liberal

1. B. G. Orchard, Liverpool's Legion of Honour, op cit p.45
This strata was politically organised through the Reform Club founded in 1879 but their real centre was to be found in the Unitarian Chapel in Renshaw Street. In the Unitarian Chapel the Rathbones and the Holts became "de facto one family or clan" and in the same chapel were to be found the Jevonses, Boults, Bowings, Booths, Tates.

2. The attitude of the Non-conformist Protestants, whose Protestantism was rooted in the political attitudes of the Loyal Orange Order were reinforced by the appointment of Ryle as Bishop. Ryle was Puritan, anti-ritualist, anti-Catholic, friendly with the Non-conformists and a Temperance supporter, Orchard, op cit, p.614 who quotes Ryle's pamphlet 'The first ten years of a new diocese'. Under Ryle's direction branches of the Church of England Temperance Society doubled.

3. by c.1855 20,000 Welsh had settled in Liverpool. John Bright called it the Capital of Wales.
"For the next twenty years the Workingmen's Conservative Association simmered with suppressed antagonism to the Constitutional Association because, first, they represented the wealthy or currant-jelly class and second, they declined to become party to rabid religious persecution. Therefore, when in 1892, Salvidge first took command he did not find an impotent or docile Cinderella, but an already powerful determined body equipped with a burning grievance and a yearning for self-assertion."

The Non-conformist Protestantism of the Loyal Orange Lodges, became the basis of the construction of the Conservative Workingmen's Association through which A. Salvidge became the 'city boss of Liverpool'.

When Salvidge died, the Liverpool Weekly Post wrote that in

"... the nineties of the last century ... he was devoting practically all his leisure time to the building up of any organisation that would keep the Liberals and the Irish in check... Early atmosphere and business associations drew him into Conservative company, but, beside which, he was without doubt a convinced believer in monarchy and in the Empire. Orangism and Jingoism were then rampant in the city and it required little more than a drum, a Union Jack and a little cheap oratory to get the crowd...

Salvidge found the material at his hand, realised what the possibilities were, and moulded it into a well-disciplined organisation, unique and all powerful ...

(my emphasis JS)

Every candidate to either Parliament or the Council had to pass the test of Imperialism and Protestantism with a dash of democracy thrown in ... It was the triumph of what became widely known as the Tory Democracy of Liverpool and the source of inspiration of more than one unauthorised Conservative programme of social reform that went no further than the platform stage.

... More than once he scandalised the older Tories by trampling on their cherished principles - for instance - by joining with the Liberals and the Irish Nationalists to carry a standing order requiring all Corporation contractors to pay trade union rates of wages ...

2. Ibid. p.45.
3. Alderman Fred Smith (Liberal) described Liverpool's conservative Leadership as the 'rankest and closest 'party government' that any city had seen except New York. Liverpool Mercury, February 7, 1901 in Biographical Newscutting Collection Fred Smith, Picton Library.
The machine that Salvidge constructed was a highly centralised and disciplined one. Its operation was described in 1936 when Conservatives in Liverpool had been agitating for over thirteen years to abolish it.¹ In Liverpool the Constitutional Association had a four-tiered structure: central council, divisional councils, ward committees, polling district committees. There was one organisation for all the divisions, one fund and one central office:

"This unique centralisation is achieved by admitting the Polling District Committee Caucus to the Ward Committee and vice-versa, the Ward Committee Caucus to the Divisional Council and vice versa. By this arrangement it is possible and indeed the rule, for the dominant members of each council or Committee to attend, supervise and hold office in every other unit of the organisation, and by this ingenious cross-rough recalcitrant individuals are easily subdued or squeezed out."²

It was also extremely difficult to join the Conservative Party. Anyone could join the Constitutional Association on payment of 5s., but the 'lowest grade of the machine'³ Polling District Committees were only open to new members once a year and only notified existing members.

"Next come the Workingmen's Conservative Association and the Orange Institution - identical in political outlook and personnel. The conservative clubs are their progeny ... Both these organisations are heavily represented on every unit of the Constitutional Association - where they have cornered a controlling share."⁴

1. B. Whitingham-Jones op cit.
2. Ibid., p.4.-5.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
Catholic working men were excluded even as late as the 1930s. The organisation of the Conservative Working Men's Association (CWMA) was established by the end of the 19th century.

In 1901 there were seventeen branches (a drop of one from 1899), in 1911 there were twenty-four branches, in 1922 nineteen branches and 1931 15 branches.¹

Branches often opened Conservative Working Men's Clubs which were notable for being temperance bodies. In Liverpool, the temperance movement (associated with Liberalism in Scotland) was associated with the Protestant and with the Catholic Churches.²

With the successful establishment of the CWMA by the end of the 1890s the problem of Salvidge was no longer containing the Irish and the Liberals, but controlling the extreme Protestant organisations that had developed on the ritual question. Two evangelical preachers - George Wise and John Kensit - began to develop an electoral force outside of the Conservative machine. When Kensit died in 1902, Wise clearly became the leader of the extreme Protestant forces.³

By 1903 Wise was able to take over a Welsh Methodist Church in Netherfield Road and convert it into the Protestant Reformers' Memorial Church. Attached to this Church were all the 'private associations' that a family might need to join. There were Endeavour Societies, Temperance Societies, Open Air Gospel Work,

1. **Liverpool Gore's Directory, 1899, 1901, 1911, 1922, 1931.**

2. **Liverpool Daily Post, September 18, 1908** 'A new branch of the CWMA was opened in Abercromby Division and when new branches were opened no intoxicating liquor was served.

3. See below p. 343-345.

George Wise came to Liverpool from London in 1897 as a member of the Christian Evidence Society campaigning against the 'Romish' practices of the Anglican Church.

the George Wise Protestant Crusade, the Boys Guild, Bible Study Classes, Women's Bible Classes, Women's Pleasant Events, George Wise Tontine Society (an approved section of the National Insurance Act with 1,000 members), Sunday School (8-9000), Young Women's Bible Class, Men's Bible Class, Cycling Club. The apex of the whole pyramid was the Men's Bible Class and this class held weekly parades to the open air meetings that were held at St. Domingo's Pit.

"Mr Wise was in the habit of holding five parades on Sunday afternoon. One of them was a United Church Parade, when close on three thousand persons took part and the others were in connection with his bible classes."3

The Protestant campaigns did not go without retaliation by some Irish Catholics. But the Irish Catholic community was also divided politically. Prior to the 1870s the Irish nationalist movement had been divided between a 'constitutional' wing in alliance with, and politically subordinate to, the Liberal non-conformist 'oligarchy' of the Rathbones, Holts etc, and a secret 'Fenian' wing.4 With the failure of Fenianism a more aggressive 'constitutional' Irish Nationalism developed out of a split from the Catholic Club. In the 1870s the new Home Rule Association challenged Liberal candidates whose commitment to Home Rule they doubted and thus

1. R. F. Henderson, op cit, p.22. These were the organisations attached to his church at the time of his death in 1917.

2. Ibid. p.12-15


an alliance had to be constructed between the Liberals and the Irish Nationalists just as an alliance had been constructed between the Constituency Associations and the non-conformist Protestant Orangemen. Nationalists were included on the Liberal Executive.

For a period in the 1880s, Irish Nationalism in Liverpool moved to the left of the Liberal Party around the campaign of the Land and Labour League. But they lost the municipal elections in 1883 and the two wings of Irish nationalism (left 'land leaguers' and moderates) came together on the basis of a national campaign and T.P. O'Connor's candidature in the Scotland Division in 1885. When Parnell's leadership crisis in 1890 came, the left in Liverpool (unlike the left wing of the Glasgow Nationalists supported him, and again the left fought the municipal elections. This time however they fought not on a land league programme but on a programme much more akin to that being developed by the Tory Democrats - on the basis that they represented the working class and would make social reforms in the Irish community.

This 'Parnellite' group developed its own organisation, the Irish Nationalist Association based on the South Scotland Ward under the leadership of the Harford brothers and others. This

3. Ibid. p.59.
4. Ibid., p.63-65.
5. Ibid. p.68. The only organisation that declared for Parnell in Liverpool was the Irish National Foresters.
attacked the old party as corrupt and unrepresentative and demanded social reform. When the two wings of the Irish nationalists came together in 1902 it was the Parnellites who took the local leadership, led by Austin Harford, and centred their programme on social reform and, in particular, a slum clearance and rehousing policy while it was T. P. O'Connor who retained the leadership on the national question.¹

There was no simple identity between Catholicism and a political programme in Liverpool. Bishop Whiteside, Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool, was an English bishop and the machinery of the Catholic Church was often used in opposition to that of the Irish Nationalist organisation. Even in 1906, the Wallasey Catholic Association supported the Conservative candidate in the general election and thus, in the words of the Catholic Herald 'joined forces with the Orange Lodges'.² The Catholic Herald had to battle with the argument that it should be more a Catholic paper rather than an Irish nationalist paper.

In the Scotland division two 'sets' of societies developed, the Irish Nationalist organisations - the United Irish League after 1902 - and all the secular social organisations such as the Irish National Foresters, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Gaelic League. These were the organisations that the Catholic Herald

constantly reported. On the other hand there were the religious and charitable organisations connected with the Catholic Church which in Liverpool had largely been the work of one churchman - Monseigneur Nugent.

Nugent was the Roman Catholic Church leader who constructed the societies of the Roman Catholic Church in the 1880s.

"Two Schemes especially occupied his mind - first, that of raising the standard of education, and secondly, that of providing for the masses rational amusements calculated to safeguard them from temptations and in his efforts in these directions he enjoyed the fullest sympathy of his bishop and Liverpool's leading citizens."  

Not only had he organised all the usual charitable organisations - the Sisters of Notre Dame, the Association of Providence - he also established the Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross, worked with the Young Men's Catholic Association and organised the prison visiting. His views were no threat to Tory Democracy; he was one of the oldest Volunteer officers in Liverpool and one of the originators of the movement in 1863 in Liverpool.

Nugent's interest in the Catholic schools was carried on in the 1900s. It was on the question of Catholic education that the Church challenged the Liberal-Irish alliance, and also constructed the Catholic School Managers Association.

1. Liverpool Biographical Newscutting, op cit. Monseigneur Nugent
2. Ibid., In 1897 the Earl of Derby was among those who raised £2000 as a testament to his good work among the Catholic poor.
3. See below p. 358-359.
4. The Liverpool Catholic School Managers' Association was formed in 1904 because the Liverpool Corporation were not paying the cleaning, heating and lighting bills of the Catholic schools as they were supposed to. They paid 'by scale' which meant that 50 per cent of the Catholic schools were underpaid - the Government auditors had to declare their practice illegal. The Catholic Herald, January 19 1906.
IV The 'commonsense' of Tory Democracy

In July 1908 Watson Rutherford, Conservative M.P. for the West Derby Division of Liverpool lectured on 'Tory Democracy' to the Fabian Society. It is a clear statement of how far one Liverpool 'philosopher' could develop Tory Democracy in the direction of state socialism and Modern Conservatism, with remnants of Liberalism thrown in.

"He said he was not a Socialist because he was born and bred in Liverpool, where people have no time for idle dreams; and Socialism he regarded as a hindrance to social reform. 'He had been called a Socialist because he desired to make public-houses comfortable and pleasant places, with food, newspapers, games and music.' The reforms he advocated were democratic and would be achieved by Tory Democracy.'

... The lecturer then outlined a programme of no less than thirty items, of which the more important were: abolition of strikes by compulsory arbitration; town planning; compulsory closing of slums, with a time limit; formation of an independent board to regulate wages and conditions of employment in government service; national insurance against sickness and accidents; abolition of adulteration of food and drink; abolition of casual labour by the enactment of a week as a minimum term of employment, except in certain trades; army reform by promotion of officers from the ranks; a minister of commerce and reform of the consular service; nationalization of railways by State purchase and payment in national railway stock; taxation of motor cars; adult suffrage; suppression of betting; abolition of back street money lenders; feeding and clothing of school children, and medical examinations at frequent intervals, with complete disregard to 'parental responsibility' and theoretical points about 'pauperization'; education reform, so as to put education on to useful lines for those who will not become clerks, with free secondary schools and free universities; land reform, because land is a limited national asset, and the nation should insist that the best use be made of it, whether for building, or for agriculture, or for playgrounds; land to be taxed and rated on its site value only, and not on the capital expenditure on it in houses or in crops - to this end the State and local authority to have power to buy at the assessed value; every man to be made his own landlord; and, finally, the unemployed problem to be dealt with. Those who cannot work by reason of age, or infirmity should be honorably provided for; those who fail from want of knowledge should be taught; those who can and will not work should be locked up. Finally those who can and will work, but for whom there is no work, must be provided with it. There is no 'right to work', but that is a matter of no consequence, because it will pay the State to find work for those who want it; and

1. Fabian News, July 1908
that, whether their labor is worth wages or not, because otherwise the unemployed becomes a pauper, not only in name but in fact."

He added that although socialism could never be successful because it was built on class hatred (and in destroying competition socialism destroyed progress), Tory Democracy owed socialism a debt in pointing 'the way to corporate, municipal and state enterprise' and to 'the gross disparity in the distribution of wealth and in many cases undeserving hardships of the poor'.

P. F. Clarke has labelled Watson Rutherford's views 'eccentric', and certainly they were far removed from 'official' Conservatism. But it would be wrong to think that they were an insignificant strand in Liverpool's Tory Democracy. Watson Rutherford was Lord Mayor of Liverpool in 1903 and Provincial Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Lodge in 1911. Because Tory Democracy in Liverpool was an active alliance between the Conservative Working Men's Association, and the Constitutional Association, its programme had to be one of social reform. Because the Conservative Protestants of Liverpool were non-conformists they had to define themselves politically against both the Papacy and Liberal non-conformity. The lead article in their local Liverpool paper, 'The Loyal Orangeman' was always on the question of the Papacy and Rome Rule but other articles consistently attacked the central tenet of Liberalism - Free Trade.

1. Fabian News July 1908
2. Ibid.
4. 1911 Municipal Elections Newscutting Book, Liverpool Local History Library. George Wise was also a Provincial Official.
5. The Loyal Orangeman, December 21 1889
The Loyal Orangeman stressed that it was not Free Trade that had transformed Britain industrially and led to prosperity, but 'steam':

"The Law of Alien is done away, hence the disastrous effect on our national production, foreign labour undersells our home labour and foreign production undersells our home production; and we are madly told that all this is for the benefit of the consumer".

Any thorough-going nationalism could only find the Free Trade argument anathema and the Loyal Orangeman saw it as a conspiracy against the British nation:

"He (the British manufacturer. J.S.) builds a mill or buys one in the United States, to save the Yankee tariff. In Russia, Germany or France he does the same and thus the fiscal policy of the foreigner succeeds designedly in directing British capital abroad, and fostering foreign industry. In the name of common sense how much longer will John Bull submit to this gross injustice to British industries and British workers."

Years later, in the 1906 and 1910 elections, Liberals bemoaned the fact that workers in the Port of Liverpool could actually vote against their own interest and vote against Free Trade. But they were voting not by interest but by their 'common-sense' understanding of the world which had been years in construction.

1. The Loyal Orangeman January 11 1890
2. Ibid. Apart from articles on the Papacy, articles about the Lodges and different Churches, the most common articles were on Free Trade, and attacks on Gladstone personally. In this particular issue there was also an article explaining that there was nothing wrong with the tenants in Ireland.
3. Not only Liberals were astonished. Sir William B. Forwood "Recollections of a Busy Life" Liverpool (1911) p.153 "Of late years my Free Trade principles have been a barrier to my taking an active part on the Conservative side. I did my best to prevent my hands delivering themselves up to Tariff Reform ... This is not the place to discuss these matters but one cannot understand Liverpool becoming enamoured with Tariff Reform. Liverpool lives on her shipping and carrying trade."
They also had a commonsense reply to the question of Reform — it was, after all, Disraeli who had 'enfranchised the nation'\(^1\) (my emphasis).

The Loyal Orangeman also offered its readers a view of history which opposed the new in the struggles of the martyrs (Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer) for the true bible compared with the evil torturers of the Spanish Inquisition:

"Dissociate yourself from every attempt to enter you into the Ritualist Church and Ritualist Sunday School."\(^2\)

and stated that the differences between Conservatives and Orangemen were the differences over ritualism. This non-conformism did mean that some attitudes of Liberalism — the social attitudes of Liberalism — were strong inside the Loyal Orange Lodge, particularly the commitment to Temperance.

It was on the question of Temperance, rather than ritualism, that Salvidge first challenged the 'currant-jelly' section of the Conservative Party — despite the fact that he himself was the 'outside manager' of Bent's Brewery at the time.\(^3\) In 1890, the Liberals launched a campaign on the 'liquor question' when the Rev. Richard A. Armstrong of the Unitarian Church, Hope Street wrote "The Deadly Shame of Liverpool. An appeal to Municipal Voters" which gained them support in the municipal elections.\(^4\) The old Tory Party was closely connected with the brewing interest and these interests

1. The Loyal Orangeman January 11 1890
2. Ibid January 25, 1890
3. B. Orchard. op cit, see entry under Rev. Richard Ackland Armstrong, p. 43.
4. Ibid, see entry under Archibald Salvidge, p. 618.
had to be openly broken with in order to construct the alliance with the non-conformist Loyal Orange Lodge. Old Conservative Councillors like Joseph Gibbons Livingstone were removed:

"But with the approach of the Radical Regime 'old Joe' had to go. Some opponents were sorry to see him out of the Council, but there was no alternative. He was too deep dyed with the traditions of cast-iron Toryism and the newer policies with regard to licensing, economic, finance and social questions were entirely opposed to his old fashioned ideas."¹

Local brewing interests continued to be part of the Conservative alliance despite the Temperance stance taken by Conservative Working Men's clubs. Robert Cain, head of the brewery, Cain and Co., was described as "King of the Toxteths",

"He employs about 300 hands, works hard, and expects his servants to work hard in the Conservative interest, and has been so successful in obtaining licences and establishing new public houses that no member of his trade is more obnoxious to the temperance and party reformer."

²

Charles Wycherley, the Chairman of the Conservative Working Mens Association before Salvidge, was a team-owner and a butcher's agent and the association of the Conservative Working Men's Association with Carter's - whether of the brewing or other trades - was and remained strong.³

The brewing interest could be accommodated in Liverpool Conservatism despite the temperance stance of the non-conformist Protestantism because Conservatism operated at three levels.

1. Biographical Newscuttings Collection Joseph Gibbons Livingston. Unidentified newscuttings Vol 19. p.167-176. See also B. Orchard op cit, p.459 "He is supposed to have been the most resolute and systematic Conservative advocate of a class alliance with the public house interest, certainly no living magistrate has done more to maintain it."

2. B. Orchard, op cit, p.223

3. Ibid. p.727
There was not merely the difference between the Constituency Associations ("current jelly" section) and the Conservative Working Men's Association based on the Loyal Orange Lodges but also the leadership of the latter were integrated into a wider Conservatism through the Freemasonry.¹

The entire Conservative alliance between local shop-keepers, team-owners and the working men of the Loyal Orange Lodges was constructed and held together by Salvidge after 1892 on the question of ritualism in the Church of England.² It was only during and after the Boer War when Wise developed a Protestantism that was a challenge to Salvidge's leadership that Salvidge withdrew from playing the 'ritual' card. In that period he finally defeated the old Constituency Association section of the Conservative Party and took control, and then came to a working arrangement with George Wise.³

¹ Orchard, op cit. In all the biographies of the Conservative notables membership of the Freemasonry and Volunteers is common although charitable pursuits are not. With the Liberal notables charitable pursuits are common. Wycherley was a Freemason as was John Utting. Writing of Charles Fothergill, Orchard notes, 'As usually happens with Freemasonry in this district the Conservative section predominates" p.306-7.

² Whittingham-Jones, op cit, p. 46-50.

³ Ibid.
Orchard thought that the basis of Tory Democracy was also the assiduous winning over of the 'ground' i.e. the working men within their own organisations:

"Openhanded Churchmen, most of whom were also genial and popular employers of labour, have mixed with the ground without assumption of superiority; they have become Freemen, Oddfellows, Buffalos, Shepherds; they have attended Trade Union balls and danced cheerfully with the women; and their influence has been such, directed by very shrewd wire-pullers, that, despite all the work on the otherside Conservative sentiment predominates, and when Democratic Socialism became a necessity, Liverpool was first to organise it."¹

As Orchard goes on to point out, political clubs in Liverpool did not reach the development of those in Manchester. In two respects Orchard is incorrect. In all his 700 pages of Liverpool notables, only three men claim to be members of the Friendly Societies. On every page at least one or two claim to be Freemasons, and Volunteers. And many of them are not Church of England but Presbyterian.²

But what appears to be very true is that the organisers of the CWMA were also members of the Freemasonry as were clerks. In the local history of Freemasonry it was claimed that the West Lancashire Province had 10,000 members in 1905 and 134 Lodges.³ Many of the lodges in the centre of Liverpool were based on particular trades: tobacco or provision trade (City Lodge), Commercial Travellers' Lodge, Temple Lodge (Doctors); the Ancient Britain Lodge was for the Welsh. Moreover, in Liverpool, Temperance Lodges were very strong:

"The great success which has attended the Temperance Lodges of both West Lancashire and Cheshire have proved beyond doubt that the promoters were right in the idea that many worthy men would join Masonry if they could become attached to one working entirely on Temperance principles."⁴

1. B. Orchard, op cit, p.50
2. Ibid pasim.
4. Ibid., p.36.
The most famous parliamentary representative that Tory Democracy had was not Lord Derby - who had been born to the leadership of Liverpool Conservatism - but a man whose political career was initially created by Salvidge, F. E. Smith, later 'Galloper Smith', later Lord Birkenhead. One of Smith's earliest briefs was as a junior to Kyffin-Taylor in an action the licensing judges brought against Sir Edward Russell (later Lord Russell) editor of the Liverpool Daily Post, the liberal newspaper.\(^1\) He later defended George Wise, and then prosecuted him.\(^2\)

He was returned to Parliament in 1906 for the Walton division of Liverpool and in 1910 his election address covered the principle concerns of that time. First it argued that the House of Commons dissolved because Redmond \(^3\) ordered the Liberal Party to do so:

"Let us replace them by a government which will correct the existing anomalies of Irish representation in the House of Commons and thereby put and keep Mr Redmond in his proper place in political life."\(^3\)

Second, he did not oppose land taxes but wrote that agricultural land


2. See below p. 345.


should be excluded and that land taxes from town lands should
go to the municipalities. Third, he opposed "Parnellite Home Rule", and

"If the Veto Bill becomes law the betrayal of Ulster could, and would be consummated in the next House of Commons"\(^1\)

But, as a Tory Democrat, he was in favour of a reformed second
chamber of which half the chamber is directly elected and disputes
between the two houses would be settled in Joint Session and through
a referendum. Fourth he argued for a two to one standard in all
branches of the service (e.g. 2 navy cruisers to every one of
Germany's). Fifth,

"Tariff Reform remains the first constructive work
of the Conservative Party"\(^2\)

Sixth, he argued for the absolute right of the parent to determine
the form of religious education in schools.

Liverpool Tory Democracy was an ideology that developed in an
unskilled workers city.

1. Biographical Newspaper Cuttings, Lord Birkenhead, Election
   Address November 1910 Election "To the Electors of Walton
   Division".

2. Ibid.
Salvidge could hold control over the Conservative Workingmen's Association despite the challenge of the extreme anti-ritualism of George Wise, because of the social reform platform of Liverpool Tory Democracy. This was far wider than the Liberal attitudes of Temperance and Charity and it built on the Liverpool Liberal Municipal tradition.

Liverpool, like Glasgow, had one very good reason for early municipal intervention - the construction and expansion of the Mersey Docks and Harbours. In 1858, the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board was created: of the twenty eight original members of the Dock Board twenty four were elected by the Dock Ratepayers, and had complete control of the docks and bonded warehouses on both sides of the Mersey. Like Glasgow, Liverpool undertook to control all its own local services.

1. F. E. Hyde, op cit, p.88 -94
2. H. Pumphreyes, The History of Liverpool's Services, (Liverpool, 1940)
The major difference between Liverpool and Glasgow was in Liverpool's housing intervention. Liverpool was the first corporation to begin the construction of houses in the centre of the city. Large blocks of tenements were built:

"By 1914 ten insanitary areas had been demolished and new Corporation dwellings erected on their sites. A population of 6,748 was displaced from the 1,647 houses demolished. Three-quarters of these people were rehoused in the same part of the city." 2

By 1913 it was possible for the Liverpool Daily Post to write:

"Liverpool's reputation in the matter of the housing of the poor has achieved a continental if not a world wide reputation. Last month two deputations from Germany and one from America visited the various sites where slumdom has given place to modern dwellings. Yesterday a party of thirty was expected from Spain, under the auspices of the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association ... It is of course a far cry from San Sebastian to Scotland Road but to those interested in sociology such a visit is well worth while" 3

and to add that the recent Dublin tragedy, when buildings collapsed would be impossible in Liverpool because of the work of the building surveyor's team. 4

1. This may be due to the fact that housing interests in Liverpool did not have as much influence in the Corporation as brewing and carting interests. In Glasgow the factors were extremely well organised.

2. H. Pumphreyes. op cit, (1940) p.148-152

3. Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury September 4 1913.

4. Ibid.
In Glasgow municipal intervention was defended on the grounds that certain industries were prone to monopolisation (gas, water etc). In Liverpool they were also defended on the grounds of "Civic Patriotism". The ideology of 'civic patriotism' was also part of the commonsense of Tory Democracy. After the 1911 Transport Strike, Salvidge, during the municipal elections:

"... advocated a policy of encouragement of new industries in Liverpool and said that an earnest effort should be made by the City Council to find out how far its municipal policy had fallen short in fostering the establishment of factories and works." 

Advertisements in newspapers were headed 'Civic Patriotism' and asked why should Liverpool Gentlemen get their suits made in London when they could be made in Liverpool:

"London tailors pay no rates and support no charities in Liverpool. By persistent touting and appeals to prejudice they obtain a large amount of business that should be given in Liverpool".

The same argument was used as a solution to the unemployment problem in 1908:

"Liverpool must look after Liverpool's unemployed. There must be a vast amount of work in this city done by workmen brought in from other towns. One would like to know how far our Corporation contractors employ Liverpool workmen. In the present emergency a clause to that effect should be compulsory in all contracts let by the representatives of men many of whom are out of work.

One very effective weapon will very shortly be available. I refer to the November elections. Let all those who have our city's welfare at heart concentrate their energies in helping to return those men as members of the Council who will pledge themselves to give Liverpool work to Liverpool men."  

1. See above, p. 196.
2. Liverpool Daily Post, 25.10.11. This position was actually merely a propaganda appeal to the working classes. During the war shipowners and other municipal leaders went to the Minister of Munitions asking them not to build factories near to the dock estates because that would interfere with the supply of labour.
3. Ibid. October 2 1912.
Such attitudes of 'civic patriotism' would have been deeply offensive to the Liberal-labour ideas of the Glasgow Trades Council. In 1910 standing orders were suspended to hear the report from Councillor James Stewart that a contract worth £30,000 had been given by the Corporation Water Committee to a St. Rollox firm because it would enable that firm to employ an extra 200 hands. A Middlesborough firm had put in a cheaper estimate for pipes and the Trades Council unanimously supported the motion protesting that the Corporation should accept the recommendation of the Committee. Eventually the Corporation agreed to give the contract to the Middlesborough firm, a decision which gave the Glasgow Trades Council great satisfaction. Liberal attitudes to competition and to municipal 'guardianship' were prevalent throughout the Labour movement in Glasgow.

The assumptions that lay behind the 'commonsense' of Tory Democracy - principally nationalism, social reform and temperance - had a major impact on the other important Liverpool belief systems. Irish Nationalism developed quite differently in Liverpool compared with Glasgow. In Glasgow the United Irish League remained the home of the Single Tax philosophy until the end of the First World War, and on its left was outflanked by the Catholic Socialist Society. On its right the Catholic Church could not mount a successful anti-Liberal agitation. The ideology of the UIL in Glasgow was more radical than Liberal working class commonsense and not as radical as the socialist commonsense of the ILP but it was on the same continuum.


2. See above, p. 204.

3. See below, p. 313.
When Austin Harford died the relationship between Irish Nationalism and Tory Democracy in Liverpool was all too clear:

"As a member of the Housing committee for 22 years and its deputy Chairman for 17 Alderman Harford had a leading share second only to that of the former chairman (Brigadier-General Kyffin Taylor) in his opening phases of the attack on the city slums. He has always been a keen housing reformer and a strong advocate of rebuilding on existing lines."\(^1\)

O'Connell argues that over 90 per cent of the rehousing went to Irish people in Liverpool as the slums were cleared and that from 1907 on it was an issue removed from party politics.\(^2\)

Because the ideology of Irish Nationalism was not fundamentally Liberal but constructed out of Irish Nationalism, working class representation, patronage\(^3\), and social reform, Catholic ideology was always a possible alternative political focus. An English Catholic was imposed as Bishop and in both 1897\(^4\) and later in 1906\(^5\) Bishop Whiteside attempted to construct a Catholic politics in Liverpool rather than an Irish Nationalist politics, around the question of Catholic education.

Irish nationalism in Liverpool was thus drawn into two ideological 'cul-de-sacs' as well as being physically ghettoised: a social reform movement in which gains were negotiated for a particular community within a Tory council and a Catholic education agitation. Neither could go beyond the Catholic working class and

1. Biographical Newscuttings Collection, Austin Harford, Liverpool Local History Library.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. See below p. 358-359.
both cut the Catholic working class off from the Labour movement.

Liberalism in Liverpool was also pushed into a 'cul-de-sac'.

Unable to appeal to the 'free independent men' of the Friendly Societies, Co-operative Societies, national Temperance organisations, and craft trade unions, it had lost municipal control in 1841. Although William Rathbone was the minority M.P. for eleven years after the Second Reform Act, municipally Liberalism was a 'social' ideology, an ideology of charity, self help, and temperance, rather than a 'political' ideology whose 'raison d'être' was organisation of the masses against the classes. William Rathbone was a typical Liberal in his social attitudes:

"For permanent improvement in the condition of the poorer classes he looked more to the changes in their habits and aspirations which a better education and civil freedom were bringing about than to any system, good or bad, of philanthropy or Poor Law".

Those social attitudes could change. William Rathbone organised the Central Relief Society to prevent indiscriminate, overlapping, charity and to expose fraud but he also organised the first District Nursing Scheme and a Liverpool training school for nurses as well as a committee of 'Friendly Visitors'. Eleanor Rathbone, later, by-passed New Liberalism altogether leaping straight to the social attitudes of Modern Conservatism and became the great advocate of family allowance - a social policy seen to be necessary in an unskilled workers' town.

1. Contemporaries also understood this.

2. E. F. Rathbone. "William Rathbone", (1905) p.384 "In Liverpool Building Societies, Friendly Societies, Co-operative Stores, and all such agencies flourish less than they do in the other great Northern cities", and she goes on to argue that casual labour lies behind this.

3. Ibid.p.382. See also M. B. Simey "Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the Nineteenth Century" (Liverpool 1951) Chapter VI.

4. Ibid.
and one that was organic to both the Modern Conservative state and the homogeneous working class of the 1930s.

The political attitudes of Liverpool Liberalism showed a similar contradiction. On the one hand, Gladstonian Liberalism remained imprisoned in the Unitarian Church which during the Boer War led a South African Conciliation Committee Campaign which was in the old tradition of a Liberal rational opposition to war. Liverpool was the major city where opposition to the Boer War was led through this kind of campaign rather than the more militant 'Stop the War Campaign', and even then it led to a split in the Liberal ranks and the threatened, and retracted resignation of Edward Evans Jnr, President of the Liberal Federal Council.

In 1913 when the Conservative caucus offered the Lord Mayorality to the Liberals (which they did infrequently) the Liverpool Daily Post said of their candidate, Herbert Rathbone:

"Along with Lawrence D. Holt he is one of the hon. secretaries of the Liverpool Queen Victorian District Nursing Association, a movement which was established by his uncle Mr William Rathbone and which has now spread to all parts of the world .. It may be added that at the time of the South African war, Mr Rathbone volunteered for active service but could not be accepted owing to his having just exceeded the age limit".

The land question and the question of reforming the House of Lords helped support Liberal 'commonsense' in Glasgow throughout the 1900s. In Liverpool, neither of these questions were issues.

2. Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury, August 27 1901
3. Ibid. September 11 1913. In 1899 the Liverpool Daily Post and Liverpool Echo ran a subscription list for the widows and orphans of the soldiers killed in battle. Money poured in from workplaces as well as individual subscriptions.
F. E. Smith could also support the reform of the House of Lords and land taxation was not the central theory of the Liverpool Irish nationalists. The strength of Liberalism remained in the Wirral Division which was criss-crossed by chapels built by Welsh builders.

The ghettoisation of the Welsh tradition, unlike the Highland tradition, may have led to the enormous impact of Evan Roberts, 1904-5, when the great Welsh revival spread to Liverpool.

With no strong Liberal commonsense the Labour tradition in Liverpool developed in the shade of Tory Democracy - nationalistic arguing for minor reforms (that the Conservative caucus under Salvidge were prepared to concede) and for labour representation rather than socialism. Unlike Glasgow, the strongest Labour Society for many years was the Fabian Society, which actually managed to publish its own paper for a brief period, "The Labour Chronicle". The Liverpool Trades Council was the central co-ordinating body of the Liverpool labour movement because of the weakness of that movement politically, not because of the strength of the Trades Council.
With the founding of the ILP in 1893, those socialists in Liverpool who had previously been members of the SOF or the Fabian Society, or had been radicalised by the strike wave of 1889-1890, came together in the ILP. In 1894 there were eight branches of the ILP in the Liverpool conurbation (Central, Kirkdale, Everton, West Derby, Edge Hill, Toxteth, Birkenhead, Bootle). From the very beginning, Sam Reeves, an ex-SOFer, put forward the SDF line that the Liberals were the real enemy of the working class:

"Tacitly implied or openly expressed, the Radical Party has been the historical enemy of Labour and between it and a Socialist Labour Party there can be no compromise, no quarter given or taken... When Labour men feel any inclination to part with their principles let them remember the Liberal record, national and Municipal, of the last two or three years... The battle between Hereditary privilege and the democracy cannot be fought to a finish until Liberalism... shall have entirely been driven from the arena of public affairs."

This was an extremely convenient approach in Liverpool. In the municipal elections of 1894 a joint committee of the Trades Council, ILP, Fabians and Labour Electoral Association, decided to support their own candidates only and to ignore the overtures from the Progressive Party for an alliance. In November 1895 they put forward a pure Labour representation programme:

"We don't want either Tories or Liberals to adopt items of our programme, we want to go to the Town Hall to do our own business for ourselves in our own way, and be it now, or next year, or the year after, we shall ultimately succeed."

Reeves had the highest vote in Edge Hill (the railwaymen's ward) followed by Kensington.

In 1894 the Liverpool Labour movement was in retreat. When they called a demonstration to coincide with the TUC at Norwich they

1. Liverpool Labour Chronicle, August 1 1894.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid, November 1 1894.
4. Ibid, November 1 1895.
5. Ibid, December 2 1895.
had to cancel it\(^1\). In January 1895 they were running soup vans to prove that the unemployed existed\(^2\), and after the Merry England Fayre for May Day 1895 they decided to organise a Christmas sale for the goods left over.\(^3\)

Unlike the situation in Glasgow, the Fabian Society in Liverpool was always strong. John Edwards argued that all Fabians should be members of the ILP and for many years many of them were. In 1893, 1894 and 1895 Edwards wrote to the churches on behalf of the Liverpool Fabians asking them to preach a Labour sermon on or about the first Sunday in May\(^4\); during May their leading articles were on Christian socialism. The response was not great — 11 Churches and two promises of sermons.

The weakness of the socialist movement in Liverpool was also demonstrated during the Boer War. In Liverpool it was the Liberals of the Unitarian Church who led a conciliation movement, whereas elsewhere the opposition was a 'Stop the War' one led by the SOF.\(^5\) The Liberal Party was divided on the issue, but so was the Liverpool Labour movement.

The Annual Report of the Liverpool Trades Council attempted to avoid the questions by talking about the problems of war, which also brought trade to Liverpool. The division within the ILP and between the Trades Council and the socialist movement appeared in the Liverpool Labour Chronicle. In July 1900 one page was headed "This page is assigned to the Fabian Society and the ILP and the Trades Council are not responsible for the opinions expressed". The article explained that the ILP had not said

1. Liverpool Labour Chronicle, October 1 1894.
2. Ibid, March 1 1895.
3. Ibid, June 1 1895.
4. Liverpool Fabian Chronicle, April 1 1895.
5. Ibid, May 1 1895.
anything about the Boer War because of its dispute with the Trades Council, although 49 out of 50 ILP members were opposed to the war:

"Not only are we opposed to the present war, but we are opposed on principle to all war."

It argued that meetings should be held opposing the Government on the war.

The Liverpool Labour Chronicle then fell silent on the war, carrying articles on the opening of Bootle Technical School, Lord Derby on foreign competition, old age pensions, the Plumbers' ball, the Engineers' soiree, and for Christmas their readers were given a portrait of the Executive of the Liverpool and Vicinity United Trades and Labour Council and the notable trade union leaders of the day.

In March 1901 the dispute between the Trades Council and the socialist organisations flared up again. The ILP and the Fabian Society asked the Chronicle to reproduce Blatchford's pamphlet on 'Competition' on their page as a serial. The editor refused:

"We, ourselves, believe that Socialism is inevitable, and we are willing to do a good deal to bring it about, believing that every step in that direction makes for the universal good and happiness of the human race, and we are willing to talk socialism by the hour to anyone willing to listen.

"On the other hand we believe that the bulwarks of the workers' liberties today are the Trades Unions and while we believe Socialism will come some day, Trades Unionism is here now, threatened on all hands and at, perhaps, one of the most perilous periods of its existence, and every man who depends, as we do, on his daily toil for his daily bread, should forget his religion and his politics while

2. Ibid. October 15 1900.
3. Ibid. December 15 1900.
he fights in the ranks of Unions to maintain the position his fathers have won for him and if possible to improve it. This is the policy of this paper. It is the organ of organised labour, it bears alost the banner of Trade Unionism and Socialism, Liberalism, Conservatism or any other politicalism is tabooed and only taken account of in its bearing to organised labour."

The Editor then argued he wasn't sacrificing the principles of the paper for popularity; he merely was against thrusting "our principles" down workers' throats. He wouldn't publish 'Competition' because that could ultimately injure the Liverpool and Birkenhead Labour movement.

In the first years the Liverpool Trades Council ran the Liverpool Labour Chronicle it claimed the circulation rose ten times. Its support was based on the skilled unions' agents - five for the carpenters and joiners, two for the engineers, and one each for the print workers' unions, for other building unions, the tailors, coachmakers and upholsters

Yet the railwaymen were the critical sector of the Liverpool labour force. It was the District Committee of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants which called a meeting of the "well paid workmen" of Liverpool to assist in "organising the badly paid unorganised workers, seeing that all men are equal" in January 1900. Liverpool's skilled trade unionists could not lead the unskilled majority of Liverpool's workers. The section which could was the railwaymen, the only large group of non-casual unskilled workers. This pattern was to prevail throughout most of the pre-war years.

1. Ibid, March 15 1901. The Editor, Arthur W. Short, was a member of the ILP.
2. Ibid, December 15 1900.
3. Ibid, January 15 1900. The meeting was badly attended.