

ART. XX. – *Profit, Principle and Perspective: The Case of George Carruthers and his “Pilot”*.

By PETER LUCAS.

REMEMBER the workers and you’ll get on well, George Carruthers was counselled when he switched editorial chairs in newly chartered, industrial Barrow in 1868.¹ Given that even three years later, the ‘professional’ and ‘commercial’ classes totalled merely 115 and around 800 respectively out of a population of 18,911 – a population that was to jump to over 30,000 within two years² – it was advice not to be ignored. Not that the ambitious 36-year-old Scotsman, who had begun his career as a printing apprentice in Carlisle, was likely to do so.³ Although as both penman and printer, he could be said to have straddled the professional and commercial classes, Carruthers liked to be known as a “unionist”,⁴ and this at a time when the “new model”, allegedly more peaceful, unions were, amidst widespread fears, pursuing successfully greater legal security.⁵

His *Pilot*’s six years and eleven months’ passage embraced Parliament’s decisions, by no means as smoothly taken as brevity here suggests, to decriminalize, in 1871, unions which were holding back business by strikes and, in 1875, peaceful pickets.⁶ This did not mean that men “in society” could do without support; far from it. Not only the course of legislation in the 1870s, but also events in Barrow itself, showed that in the second of the two cited years, already within that “Great Depression”, there was a “pervasive – and for the generations since 1850- . . . new . . . uneasiness and gloom about the prospects of the British economy . . .” Whatever temporal and geographical variations there were, “prices, profits and rates of interest fell or stayed puzzlingly low”.⁷ If we accept Birch’s point that “even the ironmasters . . . agreed that trade unions should be given legal recognition and a proper status, in order to bring them under the supervision and control of the Government”,⁸ it has to be admitted that Haematite’s hard-nosed helmsman, Josiah Timmis Smith, hated them.⁹ Naturally, those who actually took on and handled labour “knew better than the public the limits to ‘new model’ moderation”;¹⁰ just as unionists knew what lay behind the masters’ declamations of “harmonious relations”.¹¹ This paper examines the attitudes of George Carruthers towards working men and employers. A sketch of his journalistic career precedes, firstly, a comparison of the views of the local press, and secondly, an examination of responses to two particular events – the issue of wages by the week in 1871 and the strike of the engineers in 1875.

The Good Templar’s gamble

Carruthers’ most immediate claim for our attention is that, as eventual editor, his skilled touch secured the hold on life of the town’s first paper. The *Barrow Herald* had been founded on 10 January, 1863, by James Waddington, of Chorley, who had come to Barrow seven years previously, aged nineteen, and set up as printer, stationer, and newsagent in St. George’s Square.¹² His probable lack of newspaper experience plus

apparent and only-to-be-expected early difficulties¹³ would have made him welcome Carruthers,¹⁴ whose track record, like that of many other journalists, bears a similarity to the "tramping system"¹⁵ of working men. Carruthers had been a journalist with the *Preston Guardian*, a sub-editor with the *Bradford Observer*, and editor of the *Lincoln Standard*. For the *Herald* to fulfil its *raison d'être*, which was to speak for everyone whose lives were influenced by the powerful set of capitalists determining the town's future,¹⁶ it had first to survive. It was one of sixty-one newspapers, magazines and reviews founded in England in that year.¹⁷ Carruthers made sure that it did, and ultimately it contributed to Barrow's development for over fifty-one years, during which, briefly but fittingly, Carruthers owned it.

To James Waddington's not unnatural annoyance, Carruthers left the *Herald* in 1868 to join W. Nicholson. He became a partner in publishing the penny weekly, the *Barrow Advertiser and District Reporter*, begun the previous year in Sydney Street, but soon to move to the corner of Duke and Sydney Streets.¹⁸ Nicholson, Carruthers & Co. became the Barrow Printing Company, with Carruthers editing, and Nicholson managing, and then it was enlarged in 1870 to include J. Askew as secretary, almost immediately going to 14 The Strand. This was a sensible move because the main firms were there. Carruthers' financial stake is obscure. In March, 1870, the firm had become Askew, Nicholson & Co., and then Askew and Nicholson. It remained as such until the last issue of 9 June, 1870.¹⁹

Carruthers had been brought in for his proven and acknowledged editorial ability, but finance dictated affairs. This time a Carruthers' rescue bid failed. Sufficient money and an effective editor were very necessary, but insufficient in themselves; it was essential not to give up.²⁰ Carruthers clearly had a declining 'say'. Significantly, the last leading article said the paper was finishing "not because the *Advertiser* lacks nourishment and support, but from the wish to retire, so to speak, into private life, and devote our energies to other and more lucrative branches of our business". This sounds like the truth. The *Barrow Herald*, with satisfaction no doubt, had said six months earlier that the "fast-sinking" *Advertiser's* public was small.²¹

Carruthers, himself, did persevere. In the same year that Waddington last published the *Herald* as an individual, he brought out his own newspaper, the *Barrow Pilot*, aptly named in view of the fact that the local waters were choppy. "In the area of labour relations the mid-Victorian period was anything but an age of calm and stability".²² The *Pilot* is to be the principal focus of attention here. Carruthers gauged the weather better than did his erstwhile partners, for, in spite of difficulties, the *Pilot* seems to have benefited from the buoyant and expansive currents of the 1870s. At the end of 1872 he moved from Cornwallis Street to Duke Street, which must be seen as a move up in the world; and in autumn 1873, he told his readers that he intended to make his paper bigger.²³ But it was not easy. Several pages in each issue were externally supplied; there was serious competition from other papers; misprints spattered the *Pilot's* pages (surely irritating to a craftsman), suggesting great pressure of work and/or less experienced hands; house advertisements were many and others few; no lists of agents appeared, at least from 1872; stories were confined to Barrow; and save for the accidents of travel, circulation was limited to the workers' centres of Barrow, Dalton, and Askam. It was a more local paper than either the *Times* or the *Herald*.²⁴ These features betoken a leanness of organization which helps to explain Carruthers' anger when the big men, who included

the Steel Works manager, set up the Barrow Printing and Publishing Company in 1873. ". . . gilding the pills the trading community of Barrow will have to swallow", seen as one objective, disgusted the journalist. The fact that ". . . they will not refuse to compete with other tradesmen in carrying on the general letter-press printing of the town" hurt the businessman, especially the father of a large family.²⁵

And yet Carruthers was able, not simply to survive, but to buy from Waddington and Company in 1877 his old paper, the *Herald*.²⁶ By this time it was completely independent of James Waddington, who had announced on 1 January, 1876, that "I . . . trust it may have fallen into more independent hands than those I have had to deal with". This purchase, which Carruthers must have seen as a great coup, perhaps reflects, in part at least, the savings inherent in a Good Templar's life-style; in his increasingly more unusual combination of printer and journalist, and in a family-run concern – his sons James and Thomas Acton were soon to take over. Absence of financial documents, however, means that much of this is speculation. Carruthers' personal triumph, in fact, lasted less than two years. At forty-seven, apparently worn out, he died whilst pursuing some transaction in Preston, where he had previously worked and where, ". . . although not first in the field, . . . teetotalers were the first who vigorously propagated the new cause", over forty years before.²⁷ Comment in his obituary, borne out by the record, suggests an energetic, committed, competent and outspoken man, who was not to be intimidated; who exercised a preference for "the people's side", and who was prepared to participate as well as observe.²⁸ Contemporaries respected and liked him. His career appears to have been, if not remarkable, at least successful; even the hiccup of his *Advertiser* partnership was the prelude to his first full proprietorship in Barrow. His second claimed the town's first and chief journal.

In focussing upon one dimension of urban life, this paper does not forget, but does not elaborate upon, the publicity and support Carruthers – and others – gave to his adopted town's needs – for accommodation, sanitation, recreation, nursing care, the demand for "household" suffrage (1867) and the secret ballot (1872). In respect of the former, Carruthers was canvassing the opinion, shared of course by unionists, that the people, predominantly in Barrow the working men and their families, were entitled to satisfactory existence levels.²⁹ As might be expected in the circumstances of a new town, contemporaries were acutely aware of the importance of this, and of Carruthers' role. Claims by a supporter of Joseph Richardson, for example, that the publisher of the *Times* first mooted a better post (so important to migrants' happiness) and a hospital (so important where workers' injuries were commonplace) were answered by John Morris in the *Barrow Pilot*.³⁰ The household suffrage was not the universal suffrage unionists wanted,³¹ but Carruthers, pushing it in the *Herald* in the sixties, saw it as "the highway of democracy" and envisioned that "soon all must have the vote".³² This was an appropriate stance if we accept that "the model to which working-class circles aspired was a progressive democracy which gave scope to the individual".³³

The broad lines of debate

Carruthers was always happy to talk to, for, and with the working men. In 1864 he stood before the Operative Carpenters and Joiners at their General Union's celebratory gathering.³⁴ In 1871 he joined the men's confrontation with Smith; and in 1875 he took

soundings among the engineers. In confirming working men and capitalists as inveterate and continuing antagonists,³⁵ he displayed an "acceptance of the hierarchic principle and of social inequality", one of "the common values which held the members of the social body together . . ."³⁶ As a radical, Carruthers therefore accepted the propriety of men coalescing for the more favourable adjustment of pay and time, as well as anything else that properly came within their ambit.³⁷ As a liberal, typically, he disregarded imbalances of strength in the real-life situations when he welcomed as an equaliser the alliance of bosses; it would even the contest.³⁸ This was the National Federation of Associated Employers of Labour and its journal, for the next eight years, "kept up a relentless and frequently vitriolic assault on trade unionism".³⁹ Carruthers, in 1873, didn't like to think that it looked as though workmen were wearying of marketing themselves in the manner that the political economy's rigorous rubric required. He was repelled by unionism's compelling of parity between the diligent, excellent working man and his lazy, inadequate colleague. Such compulsion was inappropriate and not fair.⁴⁰ In spite of, or perhaps because of his own personal success, Carruthers presumably remained unconvinced by the argument expressed by Robert Applegarth of the Carpenters, that "we are not all Arkwrights, Brunels, or Stephensons. Men of such extraordinary talent soon become other than working men. We have to make rules which shall apply to workmen generally . . ."⁴¹ Knowing when to stop, rapprochement, working together for mutual gain: this was George Carruthers' philosophy. In tight times it spelled remuneration on a smaller scale for J. T. Smith as well as for the man he had taken on.⁴² Such pragmatism did not require close scrutiny of economists' ideas, and it lay at the heart of what has been called "viable class relations".⁴³

Essentially, the difference between the *Pilot* and the *Times* lay in Carruthers' appeal, vigorously shared by the *Herald* in 1871⁴⁴ when it supported wages by the week, for give and take to characterise the masters' actions as well as those of the men.⁴⁵ "Pause and ponder, ponder and pause", his former paper counselled the capitalists.⁴⁶ Carruthers' *Pilot*, if not his later *Herald*, when times were harder, was noticeably less forward in puffing Barrow, and far less sycophantic towards the key men.⁴⁷ When Ramsden's statue was unveiled, so too, was an article with the satirical refrain: "We can do anything in this wonderful borough of ours".⁴⁸ Nevertheless, even Carruthers confessed to having his eyes opened when the Duke of Devonshire was launched in 1873, hoping, in a rare leader on the lines of those in the *Times* and in the *Herald*, that there would be greater faith in the capitalists, and, in the light of a Liverpool object lesson, less discord among them.⁴⁹

Smith's sentiments were stated simply by his *Times*. "The capitalist", wrote Francis Leach, editor, "has been taught by unwelcome experience that he must anticipate constant demands for increase in the rate of wages whenever there is a brisk trade and a rising market: but that, on the occurrence of reverse conditions, he will find it difficult, if not impossible, to revert to a rate of wages equitably proportionate to the altered circumstances".⁵⁰ A workman's claim in the *Herald* that "the first object of the workman should be to secure as large a wage as possible for as short a week's work as possible",⁵¹ negated the *Times*' belief that "natural laws which cannot be subverted" regulated pay,⁵² and its frequent expostulations of "hearty cordiality",⁵³ explicable only in terms of capitalist fears that would-be investors would change their minds. The brittleness of the axiom that both sides had common goals, pushed by the Liberal *Times* in Barrow and

the Conservative *Exchange* in Middlesbrough,⁵⁴ was revealed by the former's statement later in the decade: "A man must make up his mind that he must work, and the best thing he can do is to cultivate a love of work for its own sake".⁵⁵ This was a clear reflection of the fact that "the entrepreneurial class society . . . was based on the moral conception of work".⁵⁶

Carruthers shared with both the *Times* and the *Herald* a nation-wide penchant for adversely contrasting the English workman with his counterpart abroad. And just as *Engineer* and *Engineering* disseminated United States' models of enterprise,⁵⁷ so the *Pilot's* Good Templar noted that the worker there "is a more intelligent man, and works less like a machine, and above all else, he is not a suction pipe for endless draughts of muddy beer".⁵⁸ It seems strange that a man so restrained in his views on labour relations should belong to what Brian Harrison calls "a pseudo-masonic organization of the most extreme temperance zealots".⁵⁹ Temperance itself fits into the image of the "new model" union member, who "had a horror of anything that reeked of the tavern".⁶⁰ The opinion of Thomas Whittaker that "Good Templarism has always seemed to me a society set on foot to put little men into big places . . ." ⁶¹ need not detain us, even if we acknowledge that Carruthers was not quite one of the labour aristocracy in one of the "many nineteenth-century British communities (that) consisted almost completely of manual workers, so that the aristocracy of labour would be virtually unalloyed",⁶² and obviously was not (as was Francis Leach) associated with the key personnel. A psychological explanation is not necessary; the drunk was everywhere to see and the severity of his attitude could simply have reflected his sensitivity towards the working populace. Nevertheless, it is an indication of the "abstractness" of the liberal, of the "compartmentalization" of his attitudes,⁶³ (so ironic in an editor and a factor to consider in a realistic assessment of Fourth Estate influence) that "the two great provocations to drunkenness – excessive work-strain and involuntary idleness", recognised as such by others, if not by him, did not intensify his written support for the working men.⁶⁴

Carruthers' adopted town, ". . . one of the most strike-bound . . . in Britain" in the decade of his personal triumph, fluctuated.⁶⁵ Discussion of wages by the week and a nine-hour day dominated late 1871; acute unrest soured the early part of 1872; and although between summer 1873 and autumn 1874, high levels of employment and pay, sucking in hands without due regard for housing and amenities, sweetened the situation, 1875 saw a Steel Works' dispute between 8 January and 12 September.⁶⁶

Action and not just words

Correspondence columns offer a rough and ready gauge of pressures within a local community. Letters positively attributable to working men appeared only infrequently in the Furness press, a characteristic apparently shared by that of Cleveland.⁶⁷ This partly reflects the accuracy of Carruthers' complaint in his *Pilot* in 1871, that coffee was more popular than literature in workingmen's institutes. Instruction was needed, he suggested, not just in the three Rs but in mechanical drawing, too.⁶⁸ His observation was well-meant, but dealt harshly with the working men. Weariness, lack of privacy, peer-group scorn, a restricted range of 'respectable' alternatives, but a ready access to the tap-rooms were potent physical and psychological inhibitors of practice in the basic skills, especially in a Victorian industrial new town.⁶⁹ The following year, Barrow's

"accommodation crisis" peaked,⁷⁰ and "in 1873 it was estimated that a Barrow population of 32,000 had no fewer than 30 public houses and 50 beershops at its disposal – that is, one place of refreshment to about 160 adults".⁷¹ Carruthers himself, backing a demand for higher wages, drew attention to the fact that railmen toiled for too long.⁷² They were not alone,⁷³ and in such circumstances a book did not come to mind as a way of relaxing. "Engineer", "Carpenter", and "Trade Unionist", their *nom-de-plume* asserting their artisan status, did make use of the facility; and the not-so-literate, presumably semi and unskilled, sent off contributions too, even if editors might have rejected them. John Taylor was told by the *Times* that his contribution couldn't be put in because the numerous syntactical mistakes meant it was too hard to understand.⁷⁴ But he was told that he had not been discarded willy-nilly. Furness labour was more than "the demoralised, ignorant instrument" which masters could manipulate, as J. D. Marshall emphasizes.⁷⁵ Our clearly identifiable working-class contributors represent the minimal number; the actual figure would have been much higher. If a situation out of the ordinary occurred, then more such contributions might appear, as in the *Barrow Herald* in 1865 after the death of William Blackburn, bricklayer, who had toiled alongside others who were not members of a union.⁷⁶

In the autumn of 1871 an Amalgamated Society of Engineers' initiative highlighted the issues of wages by the week and a limit of nine hours.⁷⁷ During September, October and November, George Carruthers published ten letters in the *Pilot* on "weekly pays", at least eight of which were from working men. He wrote several lengthy supporting editorials, and also gave extensive coverage to the course of events.⁷⁸ He was not alone. The *Barrow Herald*, which Carruthers had stabilized, published nine letters in November, five of which were from working men on weekly pays and nine hours.⁷⁹ The paper provided lengthy editorial support. On 4 November, out of seventeen and a half columns of editorial matter, just under three were devoted to the workmen's agitation. Indeed, that same day, a workman thanked the *Herald*, whose support for weekly payment was not new:

I assure you, sir, the workmen are exceedingly pleased with the way in which you have placed their views before the public on all occasions . . .

As a former editor of the *Herald*, Carruthers could legitimately have a share in such praise. Letters in the *Times* were fewer, yet it was a daily at this time.⁸⁰ This is not surprising. A Dalton miner told Carruthers that the *Times* was "a paper I very seldom read, because I have no faith in it".⁸¹ Workmen were hardly likely to spend hard-earned cash on journals that annoyed them. In 1874, *Vulcan* acknowledged having been sent letters, apparently mostly penned by joiners, informing it of their decision to stop buying it after its criticism of their strike decision.⁸² A working man did write on the nine hours issue in November in the *Times*, and in September, another's suggestion of manipulation was denied by Carruthers: the workmen had used their own initiative and were trusting to their own judgment. He regarded the letter as a plant.⁸³

Carruthers did not confine himself to writing and publishing. Representatives of both camps met in November. Smith led for the masters, and James Ramsden, the Furness Railway chief and mayor, chaired the discussion on the basis of objectivity deriving from the public office. His objectivity can be doubted.⁸⁴ Accompanying fourteen other nominees, including four A.S.E. men, voted for during an Assembly Rooms gathering,

George Carruthers was in effect presenting a united "class front" to help spearhead their arguments.⁸⁵ This act showed the workmen's realization of the value to them of "a man of wide information and a fluent speaker", as *Vulcan* described him later.⁸⁶ After all, such men would have been conscious of facing others who had been better schooled than they, in a formal sense, that is. It demonstrated, too, that Carruthers was alive to the need for "firm solidarity and loyalty – the very stuff of collective action . . ." ⁸⁷ It meant, moreover, that they acknowledged him, and he the men, "as belonging to the same world and the same *milieu*".⁸⁸ And it was not just the shared environment of capitalists' decisions, of prices and wages and overcrowding and insecurity. "Behind every strike, demonstration, protest march and petition there would be committees, minutes, letters, broadsides and newspapers, and therefore, self-educated working men".⁸⁹ This was Carruthers' real brotherhood. And yet, lest *too* much be made of it, we should remember that this project was one that had captured widespread support; no less than 3,367 names were on the request.⁹⁰

The enterprise was substantially a failure.⁹¹ True, chairman Ramsden agreed with wages paid each week; however, he acceded independence of action to Haematite, and Smith's sole concession was disbursement at times different to businesses elsewhere in the town, to avoid traders facing a flood of purchasers. In Newcastle, where the working men had been successful, Joseph Cowen, of the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, had played a role similar to that of Carruthers.⁹² The Barrow experience showed starkly the imbalance in power between the two camps. Discussion of nine hours got nowhere. Ironmoulders withdrew labour at several firms, resulting in repetition of the chairman's proposal: time and an eighth after 54 hours. There was "no fruitful result; 'labour troubles' were once more upon the scene on a grand scale".⁹³

Smith stands firm

A very small percentage of Barrow workers, mostly belonging to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, effectively had a nine-hour day, working ten, on overtime for the rest. Unskilled men employed by Smith worked ten hours, in contrast to some of their peers elsewhere. Smith, responding to a more difficult market, sought a general 5% pay cut plus 57½ hours instead of 54. His engineers felt most threatened by the latter. Following protests, Smith issued "notices". This policy did not spread beyond his firm; shipyard notices aborted, not surprisingly for "it was hardly feasible to lock out the majority of the skilled men in the town". Two to three hundred men suffered. Nationwide financial support helped. Each got 25s. weekly, and an extra shilling per child. Westray and Copeland workmen, opposing 2½% cuts, received assistance. Benevolent capitalist intercession by Liverpool's William Simpson was unsuccessful. Time was on Smith's side. He waited; his engineers eventually went back – if they hadn't left the borough – "at reduced pay if not extended hours". Dispossession of tenants from company cottages reinforced the rancour.⁹⁴

During this period there was a sharp contrast with what had occurred four years previously in the columns of both *Pilot* and *Herald*. Enflamed relations did not automatically cause an efflorescence of impassioned penmanship. This time there was a noticeable lack of letters from workmen on the dispute.

*Letters to the Barrow press during nine months of 1875*⁹⁵

	<i>Pilot</i>	<i>Herald</i>	<i>Times</i>
Number of issues	36	38	36
Number of letters	52	61	107
Number of contributors	43	49	78
Letters clearly identifiable			
as from workmen	6	7	2
Letters on ASE dispute	0	1	0

Those identifiable workmen wrote on a range of topics. In the *Pilot* one wrote twice about temperance; a foreman thanked his workmates for a testimonial; and another complained about how much bread cost.⁹⁶ It is perhaps significant of the abiding popularity of the *Herald* – during this trouble, less sustentative than either *Pilot* or *Vulcan* – that an acrimonious (and very readable) dispute over a rowing club race, which would have been interesting to Barrow's workmen, was confined almost entirely to that paper.⁹⁷ Temperance prompted a letter to the *Times*,⁹⁸ but not from the *Pilot*'s contributor. *Vulcan* published a letter from "Engineer" on the ASE quarrel,⁹⁹ but unfortunately that journal's files are incomplete, so it does not appear in the table above. The one letter on the lock-out published in the *Herald* came from members of the Lock-Out Committee.¹⁰⁰ This was a reply to an article hostile to the strikers from the business print *Capital and Labour*, one of a number, which, like alliances and choosing individuals for presenting their facts in official investigations "created new opportunities for organising beliefs and values and putting them into practice".¹⁰¹ The *Herald*, as well as the *Times*, carried such extracts;¹⁰² Carruthers' *Pilot* did not. If the Lock-Out Committee wrote to the *Times*, their letter was ignored. This neglect of the press is surprising. Many of the strikers (among them those most likely to write?) had left; those who had remained might have felt that they were unlikely to have any effect on Smith. Alternatively, they might have felt that there was no need because they had a committee to express their views. Moreover, they did have journalistic backing.

Detailed comparison of the attitudes of the local press further clarifies Carruthers' position. Seemingly in contradiction to its traditional sympathy for workmen, the *Herald*'s response, some two years before it would be in Carruthers' hands, was similar to that of Smith's *Times*. Possession by more than one person is the likely explanation; Waddington hinted at hands being tied. *Capital and Labour* had condemned monies, contributed elsewhere, helping men on strike at Westray against a mere 2½% wage cut. They were rejecting 33s. This was fraudulent. Such an attack could not be allowed to go unchallenged. Unlike the *Times* (and surely the masters would not have gone unanswered), the *Herald* carried the Lock-Out Committee's counterblast, significantly addressed: "To the artisans of Great Britain". The committee declared that Westray men had struck against a 5% cut; Westray inferring the blame lay with Smith. Forces had been joined because this was what owners did. There was no secret about this; it had appeared in report number four. Westray had wanted to select six from the 70 strikers as the price for the 33s. Again, there was no secret about this; this was the first time the committee had got together since Westray's proposal. The *Times* (i.e. the masters) had had the opportunity to attend the committee meetings. The committee suggested that the owners had not been so forthright. This was on target and, significantly,

the *Herald* subsequently published *Capital and Labour's* riposte, which criticised the committee's "language unhappily too common with persons of their class". No such inference about Smith had been made; considerable effort had gone into attributing the blame to prevailing economic conditions. It concerned only thirty-five men; a mere six deserved what was proposed.¹⁰³ Given the *Herald's* editorial line at this time, the engineers would not have seen this as Fourth Estate objectivity; the local paper was enabling a national employers' organ to speak to the men; it had been "taken over".

"Admirable tact" on the big employers' part, "reasoning reflection" on the workmen's were given by the *Times* (keeping its eye on would-be investors, and indeed, those who had invested) at the beginning of 1875 as an explanation for the absence of trouble, as if to deny a worsening in the employment situation.¹⁰⁴ Seven days later, working men's "unfortunate misunderstanding" was said to have resulted in 200-300 Steel Works engineering department workers losing their jobs.¹⁰⁵ To be taken on again, their choice had lain between a 5% cut or ending Saturday afternoon's overtime status, representing a 4% cut. Smith chose the Saturday solution. His workmen would not accept this. The *Times* went on to caution about more job losses when lack of fitters meant equipment was not repaired; argued that the men could hardly get their jobs back with conditions superior to conditions accepted by their peers beyond Barrow; and, given existing economic circumstances, denied the fairness of opposition to lowering wages.

This Smith line was echoed by the *Herald* on the same day.¹⁰⁶ Engineers' failure to act prompted Smith to do so. Barrovians, above all, knew that up to now the lowest cuts that could be made in the face of competition motivated Smith. ". . . the one that has taken place was the smallest that could have been proposed by the company when the reductions which have been made by other firms are taken into consideration". With Smith's record common knowledge in the town, the *Herald* was optimistic that the engineers would swallow this! No attempt was made to consider alternative strategies. Again analogous to the *Times*, there was a monitory gesture: a lot of other workers could lose their jobs. It trusted in wisdom to accept the unavoidable. Barrow shipbuilders' reversal of the decision to make cuts was applauded as preventing real disaster. The *Herald* was the only Barrow paper to moot mediation.

Carruthers made it plain that he had conversed with the engineers.¹⁰⁷ After having said that striking, which meant hardship for all, was usually unsuccessful, the *Pilot* gave the men's view. The Steel Works' proposals removed what acknowledgement there had been that the limit was nine hours. An additional three and a half hours without payment was the demand. Carruthers argued that it was possible to avoid disaster for the borough if there was mutual flexibility.

Pyrotechnics from "this little print"

More violent support came from *Vulcan*, which bitterly attacked the Steel Works, claiming the latter received yearly almost 50% return from its investment and that its order-book was long. Company houses made the engineers vulnerable; their departure from the town, with their wives and children, was likely "as no other houses can be got" – a sympathetic reference to the formidable deficit in housing. *Vulcan* identified the "great curse": investment, the legal process, civic administration were possessed by a coterie whose "remarkable generosity . . . is . . . about as effervescent as the champagne

under whose influence it is produced". It contrasted their degree of concern for borough and for profit.' The ten-hours stipulation prevented agreement to the 5% cut; the engineers did sufficient with nine hours.¹⁰⁸

Bitter amusement and head nodding there may have been when the engineers read this; the capitalists' *Times* was stung. "A Ratepayer", possibly a Steel Works plant, though he disclaimed association, accused *Vulcan* of seeking more readers among the men.¹⁰⁹ The *Times*, itself, noted that *Vulcan's* statements were not backed up with proof. It would not examine the issue of time. Francis Leach would have penned a much longer article answering what he called "this little print". Investment in building up goods was unlikely to be great when concern was to meet demand. What had been initially proposed effectively meant 4% cuts. The engineers were again cautioned that worse conditions were now in prospect. The Steel Works' position was clear: "unless they are content to cease business operations entirely, or resolve, with a commercial immorality which no one will attempt to justify, that they will waste the substance of their shareholders in manufacturing at a loss". Wage cuts, lined up with economic conditions, which were little different to other places, were the men's total entitlement. The Shipyard decision showed the capitalists' concern for Barrow. Sheffield workmen, suffering 15% cuts, were now on ten hours. Adopting a challenging posture would help Barrow. Leach went on to paint a scenario where *Vulcan's* "great curse" was no more:

Our industrial establishments might be closed, our docks deserted, our shops and private dwellings tenantless, but should we not have driven out the 'clique' and secured 'freedom of opinion' with *Vulcan* as its organ?¹¹⁰

Smith was behind Leach with this, according to *Vulcan*, which questioned whether he could actually reject mean returns at more than 40% during the Steel Works' career. Common knowledge suggested the length of time: "two to three years" for finishing current tasks. It accepted the view of the men as being "locked out", and said they referred to Leach having stated more than once that current requests involved twelve months. An open-book policy, based on trust, had been required – a point that has a clear parallel with the Lock-Out Committee's letter. The employers' better schooling, with its associated perks, necessitated that they ought to lead in showing flexibility. The withdrawal of labour had awful results, but demonstrated vigour on behalf of justice. This stirring declaration was quickly tempered with the observation that often labour was withdrawn without reason, that it was done to frighten firms. *Vulcan* did not stop at this. It attributed to excessive labour, bodily impairment, particularly typical where the atmosphere was similar to that of the Steel Works, referring also to ". . . wives and families . . . huddled together in overcrowded purlieus, or in abominable and damnable dens like those on Old Barrow". It referred, too, to the possibility of appropriate rental cuts.¹¹¹ This fierce exchange, generated on one side at least by intense personal grievance – but no less community comforting for that – identified the moral base-line, whether or not *Vulcan* had pecuniary satisfaction in increased sales. Little else was published in *Vulcan* about the strike or labour. "Engineer" wrote attacking Smith, and the word "rubbish" was used in connection with a temperance employer's remarks on drunkenness and nine hours.¹¹² The journal, itself, had its own troubles.¹¹³

In the summer, Carruthers despaired of the economy and society officials were of a like mind.¹¹⁴ This reflected the strength of Smith's position in the war of words. From

capital's perspective, the picture in Barrow was not all gloom. Even if it "was heavily overdrawn at the bank", Hindpool "was able to record a profit of over £100,000 in the accounting year 1876-7",¹¹⁵ which suggests *Vulcan* had been near the truth, and this perhaps explains the *Times*' sensitivity. However, Smith did not bend when he and the mediator Simpson discussed the affair. Subsequently, Samuel Swindlehurst, the Duke Street hat seller with progressive views, chaired a Town Hall gathering of the workmen. Countering Swindlehurst's declaration that working men were justified in seeking most favourable rates for the work of their hands – their "capital" – the *Times* argued that the engineers were being manipulated (a charge Carruthers had felt he had to rebut in 1871), that society support stemmed from what was best for the A.S.E. rather than resulting from employers' blunders and that society loyalty prevented workmen seeking most favourable conditions.¹¹⁶ This was a good argument because ". . . when one man, or a small group of men have knowledge and expertise not possessed of others, they *appear* to be in a position to manipulate others".¹¹⁷ The genuine fears of society members could be and were played upon. The *Times*' assertion that the Steel Works' Sick Club and the tenancies were not legitimate issues, simply excuses for generating anti-employer emotions, was understandable from their viewpoint, but they were legitimate issues as events proved. Yet again, points were being strictly pigeon-holed.

Finding for the engineers

The *Times* was more objective in its handling of the affair than Leach's fellow journalists and the engineers might have anticipated. The table below shows coverage in numbers of words. Of course, the *Times* had the resources to provide plenty of space, and in themselves numbers mean little. However, if in addition to giving greater coverage, the capitalists' paper was fair in its reporting, then that is of some significance: if only in suggesting how right they felt!

	Coverage given to meetings in numbers of words ¹¹⁸			
	<i>Times</i>	<i>Pilot</i>	<i>Herald</i>	<i>Vulcan</i>
Jan 23	2376	0	150	0
Jan 30	3225	*	*	0
Feb 2	2175	1680	494	0
Mar 4	4875	1840	2795	0

* Covered in report of 2 February

Comparison of Carruthers' and Leach's reports of the second meeting between Simpson and the men indicates nothing to which the latter could fairly have taken exception. The judgement of the Dalton miner in 1871 has to be modified. Simpson submitted to the men his account of his visit to Smith, and, substantially, in both *Pilot* and *Times* this was that mediation had been unsuccessful; that Smith was sore because the engineers had neglected to talk to him prior to going; that Smith (according to himself) would have made strenuous efforts otherwise keeping them in employment; that unavoidable, costly equipment was a factor; that a return now could not secure every job because of insufficient demand; that annoyance about benefits puzzled him; that nine hours was inappropriate to their business; and that conciliation was not on.¹¹⁹

Where the accounts differed was in the following particulars: the *Times* reported (and Carruthers in the *Pilot* did not) that Simpson apparently accepted the justice of Smith's soreness; declared that the engineers ought to rectify their stance on benefits (no elaboration was reported); that Smith was polite; that painstaking reflection was needed – about economic conditions, masters, families, about the time needed for making up the deficit, and the possibility of securing alternative employment. Should this equation suggest abandonment of their policy, Simpson trusted this would be accepted bravely, recognising defeat. That Carruthers did not report these points may suggest the strength of his agreement with the men.

A comparison of the reports of the subsequent discussions among the men reveals that the men's views were given more fully in the *Times*, whose report of the Town Hall meeting would appear very fair. It published more of what was said by Swindlehurst and Eccles, a Lock-Out Committee member, than either Carruthers' *Pilot* or the *Herald*. The Manchester A.S.E. spokesman's contribution was reported in the *Times* just as in the other two papers. Leach, indeed, published much of the criticism of Smith and his fellow capitalists, and was unafraid of giving (perhaps wanted to give) publicity to the idea that Barrow, being out of the way, was to be the starting-point for demolishing nine hours. The difference between the *Times* and the *Pilot* was that whereas the *Pilot* simply said that William Brown, who had brought in Simpson, talking disconnectedly, got an unfavourable reaction, the *Times* gave him over 400 words. According to Brown, Smith's denial of excessive rents and his proof of the financial burden represented by the Sick Club, carried conviction. Brown promulgated acceptance of the wage cut whilst conditions remained poor. Workmen elsewhere in the Steel Works would suffer.

"Lack of success had attended the engineers' every attempt at securing a friendly conclusion", Carruthers' *Pilot* summed up ten weeks after the beginning of the lock-out.¹²⁰ Apparently, Smith sought only submission without terms. "Labour aristocrats who were genuinely interested in behaving rationally, responsibly and courteously" – and Smith's *Times* commented upon the men's good behaviour during the Town Hall meeting – "found that the only trait that really counted with their masters was subservience".¹²¹ Carruthers saw the struggle as being about "principle" rather than payment. Workmen wanted nine hours continued; capitalists ten hours restored. The former would agree a cut – *in payment*, and surely this was what concerned masters battling for orders. A 57½ hour week on identical wages as probable par for the course upset them. There was shame in abandoning the reward for tremendous struggle. Carruthers' commiseration was genuine. Their proposal was sane; neither tenet nor profit was endangered if the Steel Works agreed. For someone who preached the badness "at all times" of such actions as striking and locking out, this was a sure sign of his commitment. In this quarrel he was a labour aristocrat.

Credit and debit

Carruthers' support did not put money into the pockets of the engineers; it didn't prevent women and children being turned out of their homes; it was scarcely likely to intimidate, indeed, even ruffle, J. T. Smith. His support, both in 1871 and in 1875, proved unavailing. There were profound limits to whatever power the Fourth Estate possessed. Barrow's capitalists determined the rules; they gripped the borough adminis-

tration; they managed the laws; they decided what were to be the goals and the levels of investment and the strategies needed to achieve them; they signed the rent-books of many of the working men; and they actually owned one editor's pen. This *milieu* was made still more piquant by the faint-heartedness, in the second of the two periods of the paper that had been established, to speak for those affected by that inner brotherhood, the very paper "saved" by Carruthers, himself. Yet *Vulcan's* short, sharp tussle with Smith's *Times* revealed that the capitalists were not insensitive to well-directed barbs; they too, jumped. Richardson would have relished the reaction of Leach. And George Carruthers, for his part, could have the satisfaction of knowing that in 1871 he had shown that he knew his place (and it wasn't where the masters would have liked it to have been), and that in 1875 he had shared in making clear the quintessential nature of the episode: not only to protect "principle", but also to aid working men beyond Barrow.

What remains, if not surprising (because it was certainly not unique!), at least somehow disappointing, was the limited forward movement of his thinking. Carruthers did not fake his support of the workmen. For many years he enjoyed a "secular communion" with the unionists and the craftsmen generally. On the occasions cited in this text, at least, he was aware that sanity, restraint, and good behaviour got nowhere. His role as editor meant continuing reflection upon many inter-related topics, including those whose urgency was emphasized by their daily appeal to his senses. And yet these things did not expand the boundaries of his "modest and moderate"¹²² unionism; did not fundamentally challenge this "mildest of radicals";¹²³ did not enable him to appreciate the basic imbalance in the dispositions of power, and the implications thereof. Indeed, he seemed to misinterpret the position. In 1875 it was left to Richardson's *Vulcan* to express, both in substance and in manner, the real, outraged sense of social injustice. "Where do *we* go from here?", Carruthers could logically have asked himself, having concluded, rightly that Smith simply wasn't going to budge, wasn't going to be flexible. It is not unfair to remember Higgs' contemporary (1872) comment upon an Erewhonian judge: "He could not emancipate himself, nay, it did not even occur to him to feel, the bondage of the ideas in which he had been born and bred".¹²⁴ If a supposedly caring editor could not develop, who could? Perhaps here is exposed the real weakness of the Fourth Estate.

Notes and References

- ¹ *Barrow Advertiser*, 21 May 1868.
- ² J. D. Marshall, *Furness and the Industrial Revolution* (Barrow, 1958), 353, 355.
- ³ *Barrow Herald*, 4 March 1879.
- ⁴ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 315, 362, 358 n.
- ⁵ W. H. G. Armytage, A. J. Mundella, 1825-1897, *The Liberal background to the Labour Movement* (1951), 50, 51; D. F. MacDonald, *The State and the Trade Unions* (1960), 35.
- ⁶ Asa Briggs, *Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes 1851-1867* (Penguin, 1970), 197, 198.
- ⁷ E. J. Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire* (Penguin, 1969), 127.
- ⁸ Alan Birch, *The Economic History of the British Iron and Steel Industry, 1784-1879* (1967), 275.
- ⁹ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 319.
- ¹⁰ E. H. Hunt, *British Labour History 1815-1914* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1981), 261.
- ¹¹ Trygve R. Tholfsen, *Working Class Radicalism in Mid-Victorian England* (Croom Helm, London, 1976), 268 ff.
- ¹² *Barrow Herald*, 12 April 1902.

- ¹³ *Barrow Herald*, 1 January 1876.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 5 January 1878.
- ¹⁵ E. J. Hobsbawm, *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1976. Edition first published 1968), 34-63.
- ¹⁶ *Barrow Herald*, 10 January 1863.
- ¹⁷ *Tercentenary Handlist of English and Welsh Newspapers, Magazines, and Reviews* (1920), Section II, "The Provincial Press", 248, 249; *Barrow Advertiser*, 21 May 1868.
- ¹⁸ *Barrow Advertiser*, 28 May 1868.
- ¹⁹ First issue 9 April 1868. See also 14 May, 30 July, 15 October, 1868; 4 February 1869; 17 February 1870. It initially appeared in summer, 1867. The 9 April 1868 issue was the first as a medium size penny weekly.
- ²⁰ *Printers Register*, extract published by *Middlesbrough Evening Gazette*, 23 January 1872.
- ²¹ *Barrow Herald*, 25 December 1869.
- ²² Tholfsen, *op. cit.*, 269.
- ²³ *Barrow Pilot*, 7 December 1872; 27 September 1873.
- ²⁴ For example, *ibid.*, 17 August 1872. Pages dotted with house advertisements like "Cheap printing at *Barrow Pilot Office*" and "The Cheapest Printing Office in Barrow".
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 19 April 1873.
- ²⁶ His first issue. 1 May 1877.
- ²⁷ Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872* (Faber and Faber, London, 1971), 117 ff.
- ²⁸ *Barrow Herald*, 4 March 1879.
- ²⁹ François Bédarida, *A Social History of England 1851-1975* (Methuen, London, 1979. Translated by A. S. Forster), 70, 71.
- ³⁰ *Barrow Pilot*, 13 May 1871. This man may have been the John Morris who was one of the working men who confronted the capitalists on wages by the week. Marshall, *op. cit.*, 358 n.
- ³¹ Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 71.
- ³² *Barrow Herald*, 20 July 1867.
- ³³ Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 80.
- ³⁴ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 315.
- ³⁵ *Barrow Pilot*, 26 July 1873.
- ³⁶ Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 80.
- ³⁷ *Barrow Pilot*, 6 September 1873.
- ³⁸ Tholfsen, *op. cit.*, 271; *Barrow Pilot*, 26 July 1873.
- ³⁹ The federation 'was begun . . . in response to union initiatives (the establishment of the TUC and the successful public relations campaign after 1867) . . .' so, perhaps, Carruthers had an excuse. Hunt, *op. cit.*, 388, reference 71.
- ⁴⁰ *Barrow Pilot*, 13 July 1872; 6 September 1873.
- ⁴¹ Quoted by John Roach, *Social Reform in England 1780-1880* (B. T. Batsford, London, 1978), 185.
- ⁴² *Barrow Pilot*, 22 June 1872; 1 March 1873; 20 March 1875; 25 March, 24 June 1876. J. T. Smith was manager of the Hindpool Iron Works from 1859; Marshall, *op. cit.*, 221.
- ⁴³ Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1969).
- ⁴⁴ *Barrow Herald*, 13 May 1871; 7 October 1871; 4 January 1873.
- ⁴⁵ See 42 and 44 above.
- ⁴⁶ *Barrow Herald*, 7 October 1871.
- ⁴⁷ *Barrow Herald*, puffing Barrow: 15 December 1877. In the first six months of 1878 articles puffing a particular aspect of Barrow's development appeared once a month: the steam saw mills, the steel casting company, a launch, Ramsden Dock, and Barrow's health. 12 January, 16 February, 23 March, 20 April, 11 May 1878. Frequent and handsome praise of the capitalists: 22 September, 27 November, 15 December 1877; 30 March 1878.
- ⁴⁸ *Barrow Pilot*, 1 June 1872.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 28 June 1873. Marshall, commenting on the big men, writes: "They were mutually suspicious and sometimes openly jealous and critical", *op. cit.*, 410.
- ⁵⁰ *Barrow Times*, 17 April 1875.
- ⁵¹ *Barrow Herald*, 18 November 1871.
- ⁵² *Barrow Times*, 27 March 1872.

- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, 1 November, 30 December 1871; 23 March, 24 December 1872; 29, 30 January 1873.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 9 October 1871; 27 February 1875; *Middlesbrough Exchange*, 11 July 1872.
- ⁵⁵ *Barrow Times*, 18 January 1879.
- ⁵⁶ Perkin, *op. cit.*, 277.
- ⁵⁷ W. H. G. Armytage, *The Rise of the Technocrats: a Social History* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1965), 113.
- ⁵⁸ *Barrow Pilot*, 15 January 1876.
- ⁵⁹ Harrison, *op. cit.*, 241.
- ⁶⁰ Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 69.
- ⁶¹ Harrison, *op. cit.*, 170.
- ⁶² Hobsbawm, *Labouring Men*, 274.
- ⁶³ Tholfsen, *op. cit.*, 271, 275.
- ⁶⁴ Harrison, *op. cit.*, 304, 305.
- ⁶⁵ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 360.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 357-359, 364, 385, 386.
- ⁶⁷ For example, none such appear in the *Herald* during the first six months of 1867, and in the arbitrary period June, July, August 1872, of 10 letters in 13 issues, only two definitely came from workmen. A similar conclusion results from *Barrow Pilot*, July, August, September 1872, 3 out of 14 in 14 issues; February, March, April 1873, none out of three in 12 issues; May, June, July 1874, none out of 15 in 13 issues. *Middlesbrough Evening Gazette* (Wednesdays only), two out of 12 in thirteen issues. *Middlesbrough Weekly News*, July, August, September, one out of 12 in 13 issues.
- ⁶⁸ *Barrow Pilot*, 9 September 1871. "The educational provision of the mid-sixties is far from impressive", Marshall, *op. cit.*, 332.
- ⁶⁹ R. D. Altick, *The English Common Reader* (1957), 87, 90, 91, 92, 93.
- ⁷⁰ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 373.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 360, 361.
- ⁷² *Barrow Pilot*, 20 January 1872.
- ⁷³ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 318, 330, 360.
- ⁷⁴ *Barrow Times*, 28 January 1871.
- ⁷⁵ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 361.
- ⁷⁶ *Barrow Herald*, 4, 11 and 18 November 1865, given in Marshall, *op. cit.*, 316 and f.n.
- ⁷⁷ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 357.
- ⁷⁸ *Barrow Pilot*, 16, 23, 30 September; 7 October; 4, 11, 18 November 1871.
- ⁷⁹ *Barrow Herald*, 4, 11, 18, 25 November 1871.
- ⁸⁰ *Barrow Times*. Throughout October there were no letters on weekly wages. During November there was a letter from a workman on nine hours: 18 November 1871.
- ⁸¹ *Barrow Pilot*, 30 September 1871.
- ⁸² *Vulcan*, 23 May 1874. The journal's sales immured it from keeping in mind the results of comment!
- ⁸³ *Barrow Times*, 18 November 1871; *Barrow Pilot*, 23 September 1871.
- ⁸⁴ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 358.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*; Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 71.
- ⁸⁶ *Vulcan*, 4 March 1879.
- ⁸⁷ Bédarida, *op. cit.*, 69.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 71.
- ⁸⁹ David Vincent, *Bread, Knowledge and Freedom: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Working Class Autobiography* (Europa Publications, London, 1981), 176.
- ⁹⁰ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 357.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 358.
- ⁹² S. and B. Webb, *History of Trade Unionism* (1920), 316.
- ⁹³ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 359.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 385, 386.
- ⁹⁵ All Saturday issues 16 January to 25 September, 1875. *Barrow Herald* 13 March missing from Barrow files. The working class letters to the *Herald* include three from the secretary of the working men's club. There were five working-class contributors. The working-class letters to the *Pilot* include two from the

- same working man. It is probable that there were at least four other working-class contributors, including a labourer. The secretary of the working men's club was one of the contributors to the *Times*.
- ⁹⁶ *Barrow Pilot*, 20 February, 6 March 1875; 13 March 1875; 26 June 1875.
- ⁹⁷ *Barrow Herald*, 24, 31 July; 14 August 1875.
- ⁹⁸ *Barrow Times*, 20 February 1875. Insobriety attributed to "miserable minority" i.e. not all workmen were drunken terrors!
- ⁹⁹ *Vulcan*, 6 February 1875.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Barrow Herald*, 27 March 1875. Note that this is nearly three months into the affair. Why hadn't the men used the press before?
- ¹⁰¹ Keith Burgess, *The Challenge of Labour Shaping British Society 1850-1930* (Croom Helm, London, 1980), 26.
- ¹⁰² *Barrow Herald*, 20, 27 March; 10, 24 April 1875.
- ¹⁰³ *Barrow Herald*, 10 April 1875.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Barrow Times*, 2 January 1875; Marshall, *op. cit.*, 385.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Barrow Times*, 9 January 1875.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Barrow Herald*, 9 January 1875.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Barrow Pilot*, 16 January 1875.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Vulcan*, 16 January 1875.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Barrow Times*, 18 January 1875.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 23 January 1875; leading article datelined 22 January.
- ¹¹¹ *Vulcan*, 23 January 1875. Answering "Barrow Daily Times, Esquire B.A."
- ¹¹² *Ibid.*, 6 February, 20 February 1875.
- ¹¹³ Peter Lucas, 'Provincial Culture and the "Penny Brotherhood"; The case of Joseph Richardson', CW2, lxxviii, 187-98.
- ¹¹⁴ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 386.
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 386.
- ¹¹⁶ *Barrow Times*, 6 March 1875.
- ¹¹⁷ Tony Lane, *The Union Makes Us Strong: The British Working Class, Its Politics and Trade Unionism* (Arrow Books, London, 1974), 78.
- ¹¹⁸ *Barrow Times*, 25 January, 1, 3, 6 March; *Pilot*, 6 February, 6 March; *Herald*, 30 January, 6 February, 6 March, all 1875. The meetings of 30 January and 2 February were reported in the *Pilot* and the *Herald* on 6 February. To calculate the length of an article or news item the number of words was counted in sample inches (the number of samples varying according to the length of the article) and the number of words per inch multiplied by the total number of inches.
- ¹¹⁹ *Barrow Times*, 6 March 1875.
- ¹²⁰ *Barrow Pilot*, 20 March 1875.
- ¹²¹ Tholfsen, *op. cit.*, 268.
- ¹²² Marshall, *op. cit.*, 315.
- ¹²³ *Loc. cit.*
- ¹²⁴ Samuel Butler, *Erewhon* (Penguin, 1976 reprint), 121.