

I N      M E M O R I A

TED AINLEY

who has been Secretary of the History Group of the Communist Party for several years, died on Tuesday, 19th April. Without his lively interest and constant practical help OUR HISTORY would not have appeared, nor would the other activities of the History Group have taken place. He was typical of the best in the British working-class, a lifelong Communist, educated by the Communist Party and by his own wide experiences and self-study. In recent years he had been responsible for many developments in the educational and cultural work of the Party. His vast knowledge of people and his deep humanism, was always at the service of professional and specialist groups. His modesty was an example to all who worked with him; it cloaked but did not conceal from the perceptive a penetrating mind and considerable learning.

We shall miss him greatly, : His monument is in the developing influence of Marxist ideas in many varied aspects of our culture.

Page One

FOREWORD

Mr. Peacock's "Bread or Blood" (Gollancz, 1965) did not receive the attention which it deserved. We suspect because its combination of massive documentation in the local press and local records with unwavering sympathy for the cause of the exploited and oppressed made the academic and reviewing establishment uneasy. Mr. Peacock has now turned his attention from the 'agrarian riots in East Anglia in 1816' to 'the agricultural trade unionism of the 1870s' in the same area. (1) We are pleased to be able to publish this study, although Mr. Peacock is not a member of the Communist Party History Group. It is a model of what a local study should be and reveals the complex cross-currents of social and church-chapel alignments during a major class struggle. We have decided to publish Mr. Peacock's extremely lengthy References, even though it means making this a double issue, because we hope his study may be taken as an example by others.

"THE REVOLT OF THE FIELD" IN EAST ANGLIA

by Alf Peacock

A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

Although the events in Wellesbourne (Warwickshire) were eventually to provide the greatest stimulus to agricultural unionism, the East Anglian labourers were stirring long before it became national news. The Tichborne case, as George Mitchell eventually pointed out, was no longer news, the press was anxious for a story and local newspapers began to report even tiny meetings in other parts of the country, and these undoubtedly had an effect in preparing the labourers for unionism. The Cambridge Express, for instance, gave great prominence to a remarkable meeting in Leicestershire on 10 February, 1872, which is interesting in itself as showing at work both the religious influences mentioned by Ernest Selley (2) and Dunbabin, (3) and also one of the less obvious reasons for the labourer's unrest - namely education charges. A Mr. Tyler opened the proceedings with a prayer that "those who labour and toil for their bread may be permitted to receive a supply according to their deserving," and the Chairman, a Mr. Tailby, delivered the main speech. He had been thinking of a union for years, he said, and the creation of a school Board had clinched his ideas.

"We shall have to sacrifice our children's money by letting them to go school," he went on, "or else we shall be pulled up before the Magistrates. Well, if we don't get more money from our employers we can't afford for our children to go to school until they are 13 years of age. I will leave it to the meeting whether we can or not. (Voices! No, we can't)." (4)

Meetings of this kind took place throughout East Anglia in the early months of 1872. Two hundred labourers at the Chequers Inn, Guyhirn, near Wisbech, for instance, met in March and signed a memorandum, asking for 15s. a week or 3s. a day for day-labourers. (5) A similar meeting was held in the same week at Chatteris.

An advance in wages was the prize objective of the labourers, and there was no mention of creating unions at the very early meetings, many of which were followed by almost immediate increases. There was a scarcity of labour in some parts of East Anglia (6) and this undoubtedly prompted many farmers to make the awards, but another motive was certainly to nip the development of combinations in the bud. At Ely (where the Nine Hours Movement had been attracting a lot of attention) rates went up very quickly from 12s. to 13s. a week, (7) at Chatteris the farmers gave an extra 1s. the week after the Rev. M.A. Gathercole had presided over a meeting that set up a committee to form a union, (8) and the farmers at Longstowe decided to increase wages from 11s. to 12s. in early April for the same reason. (9)

In March there were innumerable meetings, however, that did lead to the creation of unions. On the 7th, the Brampton (HuntS.) Agricultural Labourers' Society came into being, with a weekly subscription of 2d. and an entrance fee of 6d. (10) Three weeks later a meeting was held at Alconbury Weston, addressed by the Brampton leaders, where 100 enrolled themselves "as a Society", (11) and in South Cambridgeshire a remarkable movement began at Duxford. George Smoothy, a labourer, posted notices throughout the village at midnight, announcing a meeting on Good Friday to consider the creation of a union, which 400 attended. (12) It was decided to set up an organisation and at a later meeting at Sawston 2,000 people turned up, and 94 became members of the South Cambridgeshire Agricultural Labourers Society. (13) In Wisbech a decision to form a "Labour Protection Society" for agricultural and riverside workers was taken early in March. (14)

The Unions made rapid progress, at first it seems, in the villages where there was a labour shortage and later everywhere in the area. These were undoubtedly aided by the tremendous publicity now being given them. The Wellesbourne strike was fully covered in all three Cambridge newspapers from about 30 March. The South Cambridgeshire was the most widely noticed Union. By the beginning of May branches had been formed, in places like Sawston, Linton, Whittlesford, Babraham, Brinkley and Abington, and the leaders of the union had been invited into Essex, where branches were created, for example at Great Cheaterford. The Brampton Union (later called the Huntingdonshire Labourers' Union) was reported to have had between 14,000 and 15,000 members in the county by the first week of May, (15) While new movements were reported from places like Botesdale (Suffolk), where a Union was formed (this was an area where labour was scarce) from amongst the labourers of Riekinghall, Wortham, Burgate, Wattisfield, Hinderolay, and Walsham-le-Willows. (16) By the end of June 1872 over 1,000 were said to be "in the Union" in Wisbech and the neighbouring villages, (17) In the same month there were reports of the beginnings of what was to become the Peterborough

Page Three

District Agricultural Labourers' Union, (18) and by July there was in existence a Haverhill (Suffolk) Agricultural Labourers" Union with 200 members.

Events moved fast. The creation and growth of the unions brought rapid wage increases in many places. They also produced aggressive attitudes which led to strikes and some violence. The first strike (it is not clear if those involved were union members or not) seems to have taken place at Newton, near Sudbury, in April. (19) In May labourers at Bottisham struck for an increase of 1/- a week (they were receiving 11/-), (20) and many at Southoe ceased working for "one of the most indulgent and liberal masters in the kingdom", after having been refused an extra pint of beer at noon (they also wanted a wage increase of from 12/- to 15/- a week). (21) In Yaxley a pitched battle took place between farmers and labourers after a union meeting (22) and at St. Ives a meeting organised by the Huntingdonshire Union ended in violence (23) - as did another held on the same day at Alconbury. (24) These are but a few of the many strikes and fights reported in the local press.

As the unions spread the movement achieved some cohesion and help was obtained from outside East Anglia. In April several of the organisations sent representatives to the famous Willis Rooms meeting in London which was called to discuss questions relating to agricultural unions, and presided over by George Howell. Among these representatives were Lane and Cooper (the President) of the Huntingdon union, Coles from Wisbech and John Savage of the South Cambridgeshire. (25) The meeting created the London Central Aid Committee which publicised the labourers' movements and may have been responsible for sending the first "outsiders" into East Anglia. Early in May unionists at Whittlesey had the assistance of John Bedford Leno of London, once a prominent Chartist, who delighted his audience, or so it was reported, by telling the local vicar, Dr. Burgess, to "hold his noise and go home to dinner," and urged the labourers to organise and trade only with "tradesmen who sympathised with the present movement". (26) Three months later the Huntingdonshire Union held a huge meeting at Brampton at which messages of encouragement were read from people like George Dixon, Benjamin Lucraft, Auberon Herbert, A.J. Mundella, and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, and at which the guest speakers were George Odger and George Brooke of Leadenhall Market, London, a Guardian and a member of the Common Council. (27)

Representatives of the East Anglian Unions were also present at the Leamington Spa Conference in May 1872 that led to the creation of Joseph Arch's National Agricultural Labourer's Union. Among these were H. Jarrold of Thetford (where a "local association" had been formed in April), J. Wright of Norfolk, Oldham from Feckenham, Norfolk, and A.J. Challis a representative of the South Cambridgeshire. (28) The 'National' appeared in the East in the summer of that year (29) and made rapid progress, particularly in villages near Cambridge itself (where a violent builders strike had been going on for many weeks). (30) Arch and Henry Taylor, Chairman and Secretary of the N.A.L.U., spoke at large meetings and strong branches were formed at places like Willingham, Cottenham, Landbeach and Waterbeach. In July 1873 the South Cambridgeshire (by then the South Cambridgeshire and North Essex Agricultural Labourers Union) amalgamated with the National, (31) while earlier in the year

the Huntingdon (32) and Wisbech organisations (33) had also joined Arch. The Peterborough District Union, however, refused the approaches of National officials. At a meeting in Manea (an Owenite centre earlier in the century), (34) for instance, Edward Richardson, a unionist from Parson Drove, was administered a severe rebuke for trying to get labourers to desert Benjamin Taylor (the leader of the Peterborough) who "had done more for the labouring cause for nothing than Mr. Richardson would do if his pay continued, and if he lived to be as old as Methusela." (35) The Peterborough Union, which was a breakaway from the Huntingdon, stayed outside the N.A.L.U. and eventually became, along with William Banks Lincolnshire Labour League and James Flaxman's Eastern Counties Union, (36) a part of the Federal Union of Labourers which was established in November 1873, (37) an organisation often at loggerheads with the National.

From this time onwards the history of agricultural unionism in East Anglia became a part of Arch's (or the Federal's) story. Membership (and wages) continued to increase, and the number of strikes grew to embarrassing proportions. At Exning, near Newmarket, for instance, there was a strike for 16/- a week, (38) and the Peterborough got involved in a prolonged dispute at Haddenham. (39) Migration was another remedy the Eastern labourers very soon turned to, and within a few weeks of their bestirring themselves in 1872 manufacturers began offering to move them to other areas. William Cafferata, for example, the owner of the Great Northern Plaster Works, wrote in April to the Mayor of Cambridge promising work at Newark in "the mines, quarries, and mills". (40) The following month fifty agricultural labourers left East Anglia for Liverpool, where they earned 27/- a week in the docks - as strike breakers! (41)

The labourers had other means of conducting their struggle than the sophisticated ones of strikes and migration, and some harked back to the methods of a century earlier. Poaching and egg stealing to eke out a living went on so openly as to shock the rather prim Clifford. (42) Fences were destroyed, blacklegs were beaten up, sheep were let into com fields, corn was trampled down (43) and rick burning was by no means uncommon. There were said to be fears, after fires at Kirtling, "that the old scenes of rick burning ..... might be repeated. (44) In Duxford someone "warmed up" stacks belonging to Swann Ellis who had shut his coprolite pits to send his 400-500 non-union men out as blacklegs "in search of a harvest." (45) In September 1874 John Smith's stacks were fired in Littleport, after the men there had been forced back to work, (46) and a week later there was an outbreak of incendiarism at Great Wilbraham, and more at Chatteris. (47)

Less dramatically, the labourers in some places made attempts at exclusive dealing by setting up co-operative stores, (48) and a rather bizarre (if unoriginal) suggestion for keeping the men strong for the union came from a prominent leader of the agricultural labourers, George Mitchell, who urged "the damsels not to marry swains who were not members of the union, and suggested to the married women that they should forsake their beds if their husbands forsook the Union." (49) It has not been possible to discover whether Mitchell's advice was heeded or not.

All this provoked retaliation, once it was realised by the farmers that the concessions they had made had failed in their intention of stopping the appearance of unionism. They were not above raising mobs to break up union meetings and they frequently appeared at open-air gatherings to provoke violence. Other weapons in the farmers' armoury were, of course, dismissals and evictions, and G.M. Ball contended during the lock-out that evictions explained much of the emigration from the area that took place. (50) Thurgood, a labourer who was prominent in the South Cambridgeshire, and who had been employed on "crank" work at 8/6d. a week at Littlebury, was sacked for union activities during the harvest month of August 1872 (an action which led to a strike) (51) and he may have been the first unionist victimised in East Anglia. At Six Mile Bottom men were locked out in the following May, (52) Benjamin Taylor's men on strike at Haddenham were confronted with the rural equivalent of "the document" in the same month (53) and there was a full scale lock-out over a restricted area of Essex at the same time. (54) At Homingsea two coprolite diggers who had joined the N.A.L.U. were prosecuted by their employer, Thomas Banyard (who assaulted the unfortunate Edward Richardson) and were later refused their jobs back until they renounced the union. (55)

The farmers had other means of combating the labourers. Some reduced wages at the slack time of the year - at Exning, for example, where cuts of 2/- a week were implemented in November 1872, only a month after a strike that had won a four shillings rise. (56) Some replaced striking workers by machinery. At Littleport the fear of the growing rise of threshing and reaping machines was certainly a cause of the labourers creating a union, and there were cases of violence against people who drove the new implements. (57) Other employers used "blackleg" labour (usually coprolite diggers, Irish or soldiers) during the harvest. (58) This, too, often led to violence and prosecutions. Charles John How of Lavenham, Suffolk, for instance, was given six months for inciting a crowd to put nails in sugar-beet to break the rasps in Duncan's sugarbeet factory after the firm had taken on twelve Belgian blacklegs. (59) At the Saffron Walden Petty Sessions George March (a local union secretary) and three others were imprisoned for 14 days for assaulting a strike-breaker at Ashton, whom they "coerced ..... to quit his employment." (60) In the same week Stephen Cracknell and Thomas Newman received 21 days for similar offences at Swaffham Prior." (61)

The farmers found prosecution an invaluable weapon. Most of these (like Banyard's prosecution of the erring coprolite diggers) were under the Master and Servant Act of 1867 and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871, which rendered criminal a breach of contract on the part of the employee (whereas a similar dereliction by the employer only constituted a civil wrong). The unions shared the urban workers' hostility to these laws, and, in May 1872, a meeting of the Peterborough at Ellington decided to give every branch member a copy of the Master and Servant Act. The following year repeal of both Acts figured among the major aims of the newly inaugurated Federal Union, (62) not surprisingly since proceedings under them were extremely frequent. The Cambridge Division Petty Sessions Register records that between March 1872 and August 1874, 30 people were prosecuted under the Master and Servant

Act, with fines and compensation varying from 12/- to £2/-/-. (63)  
Some of the proceedings were against groups of workers. At Cottenham, for example, (where there was a strong N.A.L.U. branch) six people were collectively charged and fined a total of £8/16/6d. (64)

In addition to prosecutions under the Master and Servant and Criminal Law Amendment Acts, farmers prosecuted scores of men for trivial offences. At Great Cheaterford labourers were fined (the prosecutors waited until after the harvest was in) for lighting a bonfire and burning Jonas Webb in effigy within fifty feet of the highway, (65) and in the Huntingdon County Court, Lane of the Huntingdon Union was charged with the non-payment of a trifling sum for food consumed at a rally. (66) A particularly vindictive prosecution was reported from Linton when "George Preston, of West Wiokham, labourer," was charged with "feloniously stealing one faggot of wood, of the value of 2d. the goods and chattels of Mr. John Allen, his master, on the 22nd instant (and) committed for a month." (67) Three months later George Taylor of Cottenham prosecuted Seville and Sarah Maskell for stealing wood valued at 6d. The wife was discharged, the husband found guilty, fined 2/6d. with damages 2d. and costs - a total of £1/2/8d. (68)

Dismissals, the eviction of union labourers, increased use of machinery and prosecutions, did not exhaust the ways of attacking the unionists. A crowd of 1,500 on Parker's Piece, Cambridge, heard of an old woman at Cherry Hinton who had had her parish relief withdrawn when her son joined a union. "When she applied to the Chesterton Board, she was told by a Guardian that she could not have relief out of two unions - the Chesterton Union and the Labourers Union." (69) Private benefactions were also withheld, as at Ramsay where it was reported that Mrs. Fellowes (the wife of a county M.P.) had "curtailed her gifts of clothing this year through the labourers joining the unions ....." (70) and selective wage increases were often given to non-union labourers. (71)

Faced with the tremendous union activity of 1872 and 1873 the farmers, and particularly the large owner-occupiers, began to combine. At first the local Chambers of Agriculture were the places where anti-union sentiments were aired and means of combating the evil discussed. (72) Later, specific organisations to break the unions came into being, based, or so it seems, on an Oxfordshire model. (73) The first of these was the Newmarket Farmers' Association, a body said to have been originally intended to protect farmers and labourers alike from the "itinerant agitators" who were reckoned to be responsible for the unrest. Membership subscriptions were based on a payment of 6d. an acre which was "to form a fund to reimburse any farmer who may be unjustly treated by his men." (74) In March 1873 the West Walsham Farmers' Defence Association was created in Norfolk, (75) and two months later the Huntingdonshire Farmers' Defence Association came into being. (76) Within a month the latter was said to have had over 100 members representing a total of 50,000 acres. (77) The Isle of Ely Farmers' Defence Association, "under the able presidency of Joseph Martin Esq., of Littleport," (78) came into being specifically to fight Taylor's Peterborough Union in the Haddenham district of Cambridgeshire, and within a week had locked 200 men out. (79) The Return of the Owners of Land,

the 'new Domesday Book' of the "seventies, shows all the leading opponents of the union, as very substantial owner-occupiers - Hunter Rodwell, for example, and John Dobede of Exning, the squire of the village where the lock-out began (see notes 128 and 130).

The purport of the Defence Associations was clear from the outset. Meetings of the Huntingdon were held monthly and great power was vested in an elected management committee. If there was an incident the committee was to investigate, give advice and had the power to order a lock-out in either one or a group of parishes. Where a farmer could not do without union labour he could be given permission to retain men "not exceeding one man for every hundred acres of land in his occupation,," Members pledged themselves "to obey all orders and directions of the committee of management." (80) The Isle of Ely Association was far more militant, its members agreeing to employ no unionists, and pay no more than 13/- a week. (81) The Norfolk F.D.A., on its creation, requested the Board of Guardians of each district "to form a committee to help and advise the general committee of the Association" (82) - but without success it should be added.

The Labourers at Exning, near Newmarket, where there had been an increase in the use of drills at seed time, made wage demands early in 1874 and were locked out by the local Defence Association. Frederick Clifford has made the story familiar, but many details of the struggle still need to be filled in. The unions were exhausted by the drain on their resources when thousands of labourers went on strike pay. They obtained a tremendous amount of help from sympathisers outside their movement - particularly when they went on their celebrated fund-raising pilgrimage from Newmarket to Halifax - but it was not enough. The farmers created more and more effective defence organisations, (83) used more and more machinery (84) and more and more girls and boys (and others) as strike breakers. (85) Gradually the labourers were forced back to work and the lock-out finally ended when the union decided, in June, that it "no longer felt justified in supporting the labourer in enforced idleness." (86)

So much for the nature of the conflict in East Anglia between 1872 and 1874. In the remainder of this paper I would like to discuss the backgrounds of the labourers' enemies and sympathisers, to bring out the local origins of some of the disputes, and finally, briefly to mention the sequel to the great lock-out.

#### AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONFLICT

The importance of religious disputes in determining men's attitudes to the union struggles of the 1870s has often been noted (87) and the significance of Dissent in East Anglia is evident from the reports of scores of meetings and speeches. Cole Ambrose, a farmer from Stuntney Hall, Ely, who was often allowed to speak (hostilely) at union gatherings, declared at Newmarket during the lock-out that the labourers were "being led by a lot of

meeting parsons." (88) W.H. Hall, a landowner and a union sympathiser, told a farmers' meeting that "A large number of the agitators were Dissenters and had got the gift of the gab and he knew some of the most religious of the labourers were Dissenters." (89) A Baptist from Newmarket said early in the dispute that the "spouting demagogues" who were leading the labourers were "chiefly Methodist local preachers of the labouring class, which accounts for their freedom of speech, and for the religious element observable in the meetings they hold" and two years later wrote to the Cambridge Chronicle saying that he and his fellow ministers dare not "utter a word opposed to the union sentiment (or the labourers) ... will leave the chapel in a mass" and went on to deplore the fact that this was happening when so much was expected from "the coming revival wave" (90) (Moody and Sankey were touring the country). During the lock-out unionists preached pro-labour sermons from the pulpits of various dissenting chapels. In Waterbeach, for example, where C.H. Spurgeon had once been minister, Edward Richardson preached in the local Baptist chapel and collected £5 from the congregation for strike funds. (91) G.M. Ball was a Methodist and so too was George Mitchell. On a national level, of course, the labourers received tremendous support from leading nonconformists, notably Spurgeon, who came to the East at the height of the dispute. (92) Bendigo, the ex-pugilist, now a Revivalist preacher, complete in black frock-coat, hat and gloves," (93) preached on their behalf on one occasion and raised over £15. (94)

The labourers' literature expressed nonconformist dislike of the established church, and the labourers' hostility to the clergyman - the farmers' friend, the landowners' lackey and the upholder on the bench of laws that were oppressive, harsh and cruel. (95) "Thou shalt not take my name in vain, nor speak disrespectfully of my ways" went a travesty of the Commandments circularised by unionists, "for I am on the Bench of Magistrates. If thy children have not sufficient food ..... thou shalt not call this murder." (96) A part of a union parody of the church catechism went as follows:-

What is your name?	Clodhopper.
Who gave you your name?	My masters, the landowners and farmers, when I was a tiller of the soil, a scarer of birds, a keeper of cows and sheep, follower of the plough, a producer of wealthy that my masters might live in idleness and luxuriousness all the days of their lives." (97)

The Church of England was overwhelmingly hostile to the unions, and clergymen were prominent in the Defence Associations. The Bishop of Peterborough publicly attacked the unions in his area. (98) \*

\* It is revealing of later changes, but also of the rosy effect of memory, that a later Bishop of Peterborough wrote to R.H. Tawney on 22.6.1921 supporting the agricultural minimum wage and ended his letter: "I am indeed anxious that the Church should not display the same apathy as she did in the days of Joseph Arch."

Page Nina

The Rev. John Martin, of St. Andrew the Great, Cambridge, used his pulpit to preach anti-union sermons, (99) and the Rev. Conway was an early opponent of the union at Alconbury. (100) The Rev. W.J. Josling of Moulton, however, was perhaps the most vehement of Arch's clerical critics. In a stupid and arrogant speech to the Newmarket F.D.A. (101) he described himself as "an out and out Tory", and went on to say that the Bishop of Manchester's Times letters on the lock-out (102) were "bosh" and "Oxford rhetoric." He would tell the Bishop, he said,

"that walking between Newmarket and his parish church, he could see more sense under the bodies of horses there training, than he could find in the parish school or around his labourers' hearths..."

Although members of the Church of England were prominent among the labourers' opponents there were exceptions, and in a few places clergymen were among the strongest union sympathisers. At Wisbech the Rev. W.E.Winks spoke at the inaugural meeting of the local union, (103) and the Rev. R. Hoskin acted as chairman of some of the meetings held by Taylor's Peterborough union. (104) The Rev. Joshua Cautley, Vicar of Thomey, was another union sympathiser, (105) and the Rev. C.E.T. Roberts (curate of Holy Trinity, Ely) contributed a very powerful letter to the press at the beginning of the lock-out warmly supporting the labourers and complaining of a cathedral dignitary's attempts to prevent him "speaking the truth in a minister's proper place." (106) The following month the Littleport labourers invited Roberts to arbitrate on their behalf. Later in the lock-out a Diocesan conference was held at Ely to discuss "the duty of the church, clergy, and laity, in relation to the dispute between labour and capital," and by no means all of the clerics present were guilty of airing anti-union sentiments. (107) Many of the early sympathisers withdrew their support as the movement grew, but there were a number of Church of England clergymen who sacrificed a tremendous amount to help the labourers, and remained loyal to them throughout the struggle of 1872-1874. The most notable of these was a remarkable man, the Rev. Dr. Burgess of Whittlesey.

Whittlesey was a strong union centre with many members, in the Peterborough organisation. Burgess, (108) who had long been a noted opponent of the 'gang' system, (109) appeared (along with his colleague the Rev. William Waller) amongst the early subscribers to union funds and as a speaker on union platforms. He was a blind temperance advocate who used his pulpit to preach pro-union sermons that were widely noticed in the press. The labourers were referred to by him as "journeymen farmers", and he chose texts like "Be content with your wages" (Luke, iii, 15,) to prove that "the present rate of wages must be increased if the work of children in the fields is to be superseded by their effective attendance at school." (110) Burgess also appeared in the press as an opponent of the Isle of Ely Farmers' Defence Association (111) and (shortly after a serious operation) stood up for the labourers during the lock-out.

As on previous occasions, when the agricultural labourers bestirred themselves, practically all of their leaders were drawn from other than their own ranks, from people independent of the farmers. Arthur James Challis, the

first secretary of the South Cambridgeshire union, was "a very respectable tradesman and valuer of Sawston," (112) and his colleague Philpott was a publican (sic). Day Wiles, an originator of the union in the Wisbech area, was a toll bar keeper, and among those prominent in the early days of the Peterborough were Harding, a shoemaker, Tigerdine, a coal porter, while Benjamin Taylor, the leader, was High Bailiff of Peterborough. Anthony Fisher, who was active among the labourers at Exning, was a carpenter. Lane of the Huntingdon union (the "Garibaldi of Peterborough") (113) was a plasterer and among his colleagues were John Cooper, a tailor from Huntingdon, Pestell, a publican from Brampton, and Watson, a baker from Ellington.

The motives of people like these must have been mixed. Some undoubtedly acted purely out of a sense of justice. Others, Dissenters like Cooper and John Savage, may have seen the labourers movement as a means of advancing their religious and educational ideas. (114) Yet others may have had less creditable motives. The hostile press never tired of "exposing" people, like Edward Richardson, who became full-time officials of one or other of the unions, at far greater wages than they had been earning. Rather more damagingly it was possible to point to the benefits secured by people like Challis who was forced to admit in court that he was paid a commission of 10/- for each labourer who emigrated to Queensland from his district. (115)

The labourers were not without some support from farmers. One of Lord Rendlesham's tenants was reported to have "sporting union colours" in Saxmundham. (116) Jex Blake spoke up for the workers before the Norfolk Farmers' Defence Association (117) and farmers J.P. Denson and James Toller actively helped the N.A.L.U. in Waterbeach. Toller was a Baptist who had, as will be shown later, been involved in disputes over charity lands, and religious motives may have been of prime importance in determining his (and many of the other sympathetic farmers) attitudes. Certainly in his village religious feelings ran very high, so high as to have given rise to "several religious battles" that caused great concern. (118) Other reasons for supporting the unions were concern with tenants' rights (as evinced by John Todd of Cottenham) (119) and hostility to the preservation of game (which was vigorously attacked from union platforms in South Cambridgeshire by a farmer named Bennett). (120)

During the lock-out some attempts were made to exploit the farmers' grievances and drive a wedge between them and the landlords. The Anti-Game Law League represented by George Odger and Randall Cremer put in an appearance in the East; (121) and when Arch visited Sawston he attacked the Game Laws and taunted the farmers with having to "vote as your landlord tells you." (122) The Liberal Cambridge Independent jeered at the farmers for allowing the movement "that was begun during the cattle plague of 1865-1866, and speedily resolved itself into a union of tenant farmers, known as Chambers of Agriculture" to collapse and become "another landowners' forum." (123) G.M. Ball told the farmers they were suffering from the same evils as the labourers - "landlordism .... they had sent people to represent them," he said

"who were diametrically opposed to their interests. They had sent men who had done all they could to place burdens on the farmers and

take them off their own shoulders ,... If the farmers had acted like men, and said they would form political clubs, and planned .... for their own protection, they would have taken a step in the right direction. But instead of that they had been lickspitting to the landlords and were themselves the slaves of that class of people...." (124)

All thi was to no avail, and Ball must have realised that there was no hope of splitting the bulk of the farmers from the landlords, and he ended his speech with an attack on the farmers on Cobbettite lines, charging them with extravagance, with drinking and having hordes of servants and governesses, he told the labourers that they "must remember that they are only entitled to what remains after all the servants and expenses are supplied .... The labourers (were) stepping stones to other people's prosperity."

There was not, however, a solid front of landlords allying themselves with the farmers in the struggles, of 1872-1874, Despite, attempts by the farmers to persuade the landowners to join actively with them, the vast majority remained outaide the dispute. A few, however, did join the Farmers Defence Associations and became objects of tremendous hatred. Lord Walsingham, for example, presided over the Norfolk F.D.A. and said the union was "a nuisance disseminating false principles and theories producing discontent and setting class against class?" (125) Later he became a patron of the National Farmers Union, set up in Leamington "to prevent and repress strikes, to counteract the dangerous influence of union delegates" and "to liberate labourers from union control." (126) The Marquis of Bristol was prominent in the fight against the Lincolnshire union (127) and so was Hunter Rodwell, chairman of the West Suffolk F.D.A. who turned all his unionist labourers out and gave non-unionists a shilling rise. (128) Lord Stradbroke, Lord Lieutenant of Suffolk, who had talked of "vagabonds who went about the country making speeches," (129) supported the farmers, as did John Dobede) of Exning (130) and Duleep Singh. (131) Not all landowners remained out of the dispute or helped the farmers. Some made genuine attempts to bring the struggle to a close. Speaker Brand was one (132) and Lord Waveney urged arbitration on people like Stradbroke (133) and those who supported the "blood and no surrender policy of the farmers." (134) Sir Edward Kerrison, of Oakley Park, Suffolk, asked that there be an attempt at reconciliation (135) and J. Tollemache, M.P. for Helmingham Hall met his tenants and stated his disapproval of locking-out and left them in no doubt about his desire that they should not behave as the Newmarket farmers had. (136) Sir Harry Verney was another landowner who tried to act as an arbitrator, and one landowner, an M.P., as early as April 1872 ordered his tenants to pay their labourers an extra 3/- a week and reduced rents by 2/-a (137) The occasional landowner, moreover, positively sympathised with the unionists. The most famous of all, on a national scale, was undoubtedly Lord Edmond FitzMaurice, but the most notable in East Anglia was W.H. "Bullock" Hall, a friend of Baldwin Leighton, and a landowner at Six Mile Bottom, who returned from France to find his employees locked out, even although they had not asked for a rise. Hall appeared on union platforms, and spoke up for the labourers at meetings of the Newmarket F.D.A. where he urged arbitration and attacked the intolerance of the Church, farmers and landlords with great gusto.

He provided the labourers in his village with a reading room, helped some others form a co-operative store, and gave financial assistance to the National union. During the dispute of 1874 he employed workers who had been locked out elsewhere on his "pleasure ground." (138)

The few people like Bullock Hall from among the ranks of the land" owners, who supported the labourers, were Liberals who were using the labourers movement locally in the way Chamberlain, Morley, Mundella and others did nationally to embarrass the Conservatives and build up support for their party among the labouring classes. This was sound policy, their opponents realised it, and this probably explains the actual timing of the great lock-out. Wage demands, strikes, letter to farmers, even lock-outs on a small scale, as the above will have shown, were common in East Anglia in 1872 and 1873, but were not subject to the vicious counter attacks they met later. This may have had something to do with the fact that a General Election was in the offing. Gladstone dissolved Parliament in January 1874. The election, with the Conservatives winning handsomely for the first time since 1841, took place in February, and the lock-out began in the immediate aftermath of victory. Hitherto the farmers may have hesitated to attack head-on a popular movement for fear of the political consequences; now the restraints had gone. It is true that when the lock-out began prices had also started to fall, (139) but A.J. Whellams, an emigration agent of the Government of Ontario, went on record as saying that the election had "more than a little" to do with the timing of the lock-out. (140)

The labourers of East Anglia had powerful Liberal support from another quarter, the University of Cambridge. Sedley Taylor, a Fellow of Trinity College, appeared on union platforms, in Cambridge, and so did W.H.H. Hudson and Alfred Marshall, both of St. John's. Their role in the labourers agitation was to explain Liberal objections to the laws of supply and demand which opponents had used in their propoganda from the very beginning. As Mr. Dunbabin points out deductions from these varied, but the prevalent conclusion was that unions were useless. The Rev. John Martin in a harvest thanksgiving service, for example, warned labourers that farm profits were net high enough to permit wage increases, and elaborated on the theme, that wages depended on supply and demand. (141) Robert Stephenson of Burwell, a member of the Newmarket F.D.A., wrote many letters to the press in the same vein. "Whether that value (wages) be high or low," he said, "that the labourers must take, and we must pay. The labourers may possibly say - Perhaps the rate won't be sufficient for our family wants. I reply to that it must be so in the nature of things....." (142) The Cambridge Chronicle published a series of articles in the same vein entitled "Notes of Alarm" and signed 'C.S.M.', number thirteen of which particularly agitated the friends of the unions. (143) The labourers, the author contended, had become "the tools and dupes of unscrupulous democrats," and he urged the landowners and farmers to stop employing union members. Farmers could not meet higher costs by increasing prices, he went on, as these were regulated by foreign price levels. If the unions succeeded, profits would be reduced to bare interest and investment would cease. Rents could not be lowered because they paid the proprietor a bare three per cent. If the unions were victorious land would be forced on to the market in smaller and smaller lots (as the Radicals and Liberals wanted).

Sedley Taylor and Marshall attacked C.S.M.vehemently from public platforms. The former said his arguments were "fallacious", but that he welcomed anything that would make land cheaper. Furthermore, it was not feasible to talk of the laws of supply and demand in the abstract. "To apply abstract conclusions of political economy unmodified in their (the labourers) case would be like expecting a mass of treacle to obey the laws laid down in treatises on mechanics regulating the motion of water," he said. "The Union, however, by supplying information on the price of labour elsewhere, and exhorting and encouraging the labourer to go where it is more highly remunerated, tends to bring about a state of things more nearly corresponding to the assumptions of political economists." (144) Marshall spoke in a similar fashion. The laws, he said, "when applied to Newmarket labourers .... make some false assumptions." First it was assumed that the farmers competed for labour and second that wage increases would not make labour more efficient. The farmers, Marshall went on, were not attacking the evils but the principles of unionism. "The farmers have forced us to sympathise with the labourers, let us sympathise with our hearts and our purses." (145) "The farmers cling to a system that is happily passing away. That system keeps the labourers bound and therefore ignorant; ignorant and therefore bound .... if the farmers triumph, the old bad state of things must continue." (146)

The unions in East Anglia, as elsewhere, and as Sedley Taylor's remarks indicate, relied on migration and emigration as a means of improving conditions. Tacitly they acknowledged the fact that many farms were overstocked with labour, and it was the policy of the N.A.L.U. to set up a string of emigration agencies throughout the country to move the surplus labour, and very early on in the struggle emigration agents of various colonial governments were appearing at practically every union meeting. A Mr. A.B. Daveney, a Canadian agent who set up a special office in Norwich, appears to have been the first in the area. Later there were many more people from Canada, as well as representatives from the Dominion Shipping Line, and the governments of Queensland and New Zealand. Mr. Spencer A. Jones from Queensland had an agency in the Rev. Burgess's village of Whittlesey.

The emigration agents were regarded as allies by the unionists, but their actual role in the events of 1872-1874 ought to be examined in more detail. They may or may not have been invited to take part in union activity in the first place, but their constant references to idyllic conditions abroad, and their comparisons of the labourers' lot in England with that in the colonies undoubtedly added to the discontent prevailing at the time. They may also have helped prolong the dispute once it had started. It has already been mentioned that some union officials, like Arthur J. Challis, had a direct interest in persuading labourers to emigrate - and prolonging the lock-out would certainly have produced more emigrants! Cole Ambrose, a farmer of Stuntney Hall, Ely, and an emigration agent, appeared at union meetings urging emigration and in a Defence Association urging a lock-out. (147) Charles Jay, of Braintree., Essex, was another farmer/emigration agent who urged the labourers to increase their demands. Jay and Ambrose (who G.M. Ball said he would take on at anything except drinking)

actually argued about each other's motives at union meetings. (148) The press always held the agents responsible for much of the trouble in the East, and in August 1874 the Cambridge Chronicle reported that "In some of (the) agricultural districts the labourers have threatened that if any of these deceivers come amongst them again they will drive them out of the neighbourhood. " (149) Smythe, a Canadian agent, publicly apologised for the misleading things he and others had placarded about the countryside, (150) and Joseph Arch told a Royal Commission on Agriculture, many years later, that "the emigration agents and the shipping companies .... made our union a means to get into the various counties." (151) Edward Jenkins was actually Agent General for Canadian emigrations

#### THE LOCAL ORIGINS OF DISPUTES

Why, Mr. Dunbabin asks, did discontent become articulate at precisely this time in the seventies? Conditions had been deplorable for years and, as he stated, town unionists were worried about competition from farm workers and were able and willing to help organise them, or give considerable financial assistance to them. Advanced Liberals were also prepared to help, and wages were appalling and declining in real terms (152) partly because of education charges. These are all general reasons applicable everywhere (that is with the exception of education charges). There must have been other more detailed reasons why unions appeared in some places and not in others, however, for instance the size and type of farms.

It was a commonplace in the seventies that arable farming, being more labour intensive, was more prone to labour troubles than pastoral farming and it would seem that the strikes and disputes in East Anglia conformed to this rule, and also the rule that the employers involved in the disputes were the very large farmers. Martin Slater, chairman of the Newmarket F.D.A., farmed "about 800 acres under the Duke of Rutland" (153) and Mr. Henry Stanley of Bury, the secretary of the West Suffolk Defence Association farmed "close on 700 acres .... at West Thorpe". (154) In that area, a trouble spot, "holdings (did) not average less than 500 or 600 acres." (155) Exning was dominated by large holdings, and Edward Staples, the most hated of the labourers' enemies, farmed 1,000 acres there and Sabin, another of the labourers' enemies held 1,200 acres. (156) The majority of the members of the various Defence Associations were also large farmers. The first hundred entrants into the Huntingdonshire F.D.A. had an average of 500 acres each, (157) for example. The twelve employers in the Wilfred Hundred (of which Woodbridge is the centre) who were presented with wage demands from the National Union in March 1874 employed between them "about 170 men." (158)

Clifford, throughout his book, repeatedly suggests that the dispute was not only a farmers' dispute, but especially an owner-occupier contest. These were people employing large numbers of labourers, on whom the (sometimes) sobering effect of the landowners could not apply. "The great landowner", he quotes a Newmarket farmer as saying,

"did not answer our appeal, The backbone of our Association consisted of men who farm their own land, along with land belonging

to others - owning, say, from 100 to 1,000 acres. As owners and occupiers .... we had to measure the strength of our opponents; and we did so without fearing the action of labourers, or the lukewarmness of landlords. We found many tenant-farmers afraid to join us for fear of giving offence to their landlords, though they were glad enough to see the cudgels taken up by us." (159)

The existence of large arable farms is one possible reason explaining the appearance of unionism in certain villages. Another may have been the existence of a radical tradition dating back to the early post-Napoleonic war years. Until a detailed study of discontent throughout the century is made for East Anglia as a whole it is impossible to be definite about so nebulous a thing as this, yet it is a fact that some of the trouble centres of the seventies were also the trouble centres of an earlier time. Littleport, for example, where feeling against the introduction of machinery led to unionism in Arch's time, was the very centre of the Fenland troubles in 1816. Exning had a reputation of being one of the greatest trouble spots in the East in the early part of the century, (160) and Cottenham appears to have had a tradition of incendiarism and violence. (161) The town of Ely, if contributions to the Chartist land company are an indication, was a fairly strong Chartist centre (for that part of the world) and Whittlesey was prominent in the events of 1816 and the 'Swing riots.' (162)

In many of the villages where unions appeared in the seventies there had also been continuous trouble over the local charities - trouble often (perhaps usually) exploited by the Nonconformists. The labourers had long resented the way charities were manipulated, and at a time of declining real wages these had become of more and more importance. Only three years after the Fenland had been "pacified" after the labourers' rising at Ely (and in the year of Peterloo), "a daring spirit of insubordination" broke out at Coveney, in the Isle of Ely, "which," the Cambridge Chronicle reported,

"had it not been timely checked might have led to serious consequences. After four days' previous deliberation the poor (all receiving alms from the parish) made a regular Oyes Oyes proclamation though the streets, notifying that the poor would meet at the church-yard gate on Easter Monday in order to take possession (out of the hands of the feofees) of the charity lands annually let for the general benefit of the poor, and divide them severally among themselves. Notice of such illegal intention having reached the magistrates at Ely, Sir Henry Bate Dudley issued his warrant for apprehending nine of the ringleaders, who were committed for further examination." (163)

There are many reports of trouble over charities in the years between the incident at Coveney and the appearance of the unions associated with Arch, and during the struggle of 1872-1874 the local press contained scores of stories of disputes at village level. At Whittlesey a rumour had it that the sums of money collected by the unionists were to "be used for the

purpose of remedying the abuse of charitable trusts left for the poor.... (the maladministration of which had) supplied fuel to the sparks around us. The subject now excites intense interest here" the report went on, "and no one can see where the controversy will end." (164) In Over there was trouble, (165) in Ely, (166) in Babraham, where the South Cambridgeshire union was strongly entrenched, and in Waterbeach. At this place the union "publicly acknowledged the liberality and kindness of Mr. James Toller," a deacon of the Baptist Church and a popular farmer and trustee who had tried to get the charity lands rented higher, (167) G.M. Ball continually dwelt upon the running of charities during his speeches and told the labourers that they had been robbed of £75 millions, (168) and during the lock-out J.E. Matthew Vincent, the editor of the Labourers Union Chronicle was prosecuted for a libel on the Rev. John Spurgin, the Vicar of Hockham, who had levied a tithe on twenty tons of coal annually distributed to the poors (169) At Clopton, in Suffolk, the Rev. R.F. Palmer gave notice to quit to all unionists who held parish allotments, and announced that their names were to be struck off the list of coal and bread charities. (170) The place where most trouble took place in these years, however, was Cottenham, a village some six: miles from Cambridge.

A dispute over the Cottenham charities had been raging for six or seven years before the unions appeared, and the leading figure in the dispute was John Todd. Politics in the village were sharply divided along the lines of Church versus Dissent, and Todd was the leader of the Nonconformists who were strongly organised to contest School Board and other elections. The dispute over the charities became a part of the religious struggle. The Rev. Anson admitted that "For many years the distribution took place with a partiality as unblushing as it was shameful, and with a view to advance political and denominational purposes." (171) Todd, after many years of struggle, had, with the help of a local M.P., obtained a public enquiry with the result, first of all that the poor were given eighteen more acres of land, and secondly that the vicar was forced to publish accounts - which showed that the charity lands were all "held by a rich farmer and butcher, at a low rent" (172)

When the labourers began forming unions in Cottenham their agitation was treated as an extension of the Church versus Dissent squabble. George Sanderson, who worked for Todd, was the moving spirit in calling the first, meetings in the village, (173) and later on Todd himself became very active on behalf of the unions using the campaign inter alia to air his views on tenants' rights. Eventually he was presented with a testimonial "by the working men of Cottenham, in grateful recognition of (his) self-denying labours towards improving the administration of the Cottenham charities." The inscription on it was from Psalms xii, 1, "Blessed is he that considereth the poor." (174)

In Cottenham, then, were present all the elements needed for discontent to become articulate - plus a possible labour shortage. (175) Low wage rates prevailed, (176) there were obvious injustices over the charities, there was Church versus Dissent feeling made worse by the coming of a School Board, (177) and there was a reply-made leader in John Todd.

In other villages these elements were also present; in Exning, for example. There, although there was no labour shortage, large holdings predominated, and, as early as June 1872, the village was referred to as "a depot of malcontents", (178) Wage rates were low, (179) and housing there, according to Clifford, was a "crying evil." (180) There had also been trouble over the schools John Dobede, the squire and a J.P. (before whom appeared a number of unionists on assault charges) (181) had contributed one-third of the money necessary to maintain a school under the voluntary system but "the institution had languished", (182) and at the time the unions appeared the School Board were trying to obtain land opposite Dobede's house which he maintained he wanted to add to his park.

In Sawston and Waterbeach, the N.A.L.U. stronghold, these factors were also present, a School Board, strong Church versus Dissent feeling, trouble over the charities and leaders like James Toller able and willing to take part in the labourers' struggles. In some villages, however, there is no mention of any attempts at organisation among the labourers, and it is interesting to speculate why. In Histon and Impington, for example, twin villages only three miles from Cottenham, there were no stirrings - and neither were there, for that matter, in 1816, during the 'Swing riots," or in the nineties,, when the next wave of unionism took place in East Anglia. The two villages have a history in which labour movements have played no part whatsoever:

In 1871 Histon and Impington had a population of around 1,400 (as against almost 2,500 in Cottenham). (183) Wage rates do not seem to have been particularly high, according to farm record books preserved in the Cambridgeshire Archives, but some of the old paternalistic practices, like the "Horkey" (an end of harvest feast) remained, (184) and these may have had an inhibiting effect on the labourers. The paying of differential rates to workers went on and although nonconformity was present (the Chivers, who were to become the chief employers, were Baptists), (185) the Primitive Methodists were not established there as they were in union centres like Waterbeach and Sawston. (186) Clifford seems to suggest that he considered the absence of village allotments (as at Exning) largely accounted for unionism's appearance in many places, (187) but it has not been possible to find any details about the situation in Histon and Impington. There was no history of trouble over the charities, which in Impington anyway were very small, (188) no School Board existed to heighten Church versus Dissent feeling, (189) and the industry that the villages have become famous for was only twelve months old at the time of the lock-out, and so unlikely to have had much effect. (190)

### THE SEQUEL

The causes of the labourers' defeat in 1874 are manifest. They were not absolutely essential to the harvest, and the farmers were helped by the extraordinary good weather, and able to cripple the unions financially by the lock-out. (191) The results of the defeat, however,, are not so clear at this remove of time, but certainly many of the wage increases the unions had obtained were soon lost. In January 1875 it was reported from

Sawston that "farmers have reduced..... wages by 1/- or 2/- a week," (192) and at the end of the year Grimwood Cooke, of Horseheath Park, Linton, (Cambs.) said that at the harvest "men (had) been more plentiful, willing, obliging, and satisfied with less harvest wages than they were willing to let themselves at last year." (193) Reports of this kind abound in the local press.

Machinery, as has been shown, was used increasingly during the lock-out and this continued after it was over. More drills were used at seed time, more steam cultivators (194) and more harvest machinery. Large numbers of labourers were not re-employed after the dispute was over, (195) and piece-work it seems became more prevalent - at least for a time (a Royal Commission in the 1890s found that trends towards piece-work were purely local, but that the practice had diminished in recent years more often than it had increased). Many of the perquisites the farmers made so much of in their propaganda may have been lost, and the paternalism that was equally lauded by the opponents of unionism received a severe blow. East Anglian landlords in the aftermath of defeat often transferred cottages to their tenants enabling them to increase their control over their employees - as Edward Staples of Exning wanted at the height of the struggle. (196)

The labourers' lot was considerably worsened, as they expected. by the effect of the Agricultural Children's Act when it came into force in January 1875. This was strictly carried out in some areas. The Newmarket correspondent of the Cambridge Chronicle reported in February that the "Act (was) being strictly carried, out by the Boards of Guardians" in that area, (197) Prosecutions under the Act were common from then onwards. (198)

The strict carrying out of the legislation regulating children's employment in agriculture, the refusal to re-employ many workers (and the considerable outbreak of rick burning) are indicative of a hardening of class attitudes from which the labourers suffered. This can also be shown - or so it was maintained by contemporaries - by the events connected with a by-election that took place in Cambridgeshire within a very short time of the ending of the lock-out.

Immediately this by-election became necessary a squabble broke out in the Cambridgeshire Conservative party. The landowners' nominee for the seat was Francis Sharp Powell, once member for the county, who received a majority of votes at the selection conference over Benjamin Bridges Hunter Rodwell, the farmers' candidate. Rodwell, as leader of the West Suffolk Farmers' Defence Association, and the East Anglian Farmers' Consultative Board, had taken a leading part in the lock-out and was hated by the labourers. (199) Powell was eventually forced to withdraw and the Liberals decided that beating Rodwell was impossible and ran no candidate against him. The Cambridge Independent represented Rodwell's success as a victory for the farmers in the Conservative party "'manifesting their independence and upsetting the nominee of a caucus of landlords." (200) Powell, in his valedictory address, said that "It is now manifest that the tenant farmers who nave votes will, in larger numbers- support a candidate who, in their

judgement, has von their battle in a controversy with a class not in possession of the franchise." (201) The following year in a by-election in West Suffolk, which resulted in a Conservative victory for Lt. Col. Wilson over Easton, the Liberal, similar circumstances were said to have been at work. (202)

Unionism, like the labourers, suffered severely from the defeat of 1874. Many labourers were said to have retained their cards when they returned to work, but many more, angered at the harsh and abrupt way the strike had been terminated, gave up their membership and were lost to the movement for ever. Contributions to the union from Exning, for example, which had been £19/-/- in the three months April to July, 1874, were down to £4/6/- for the period October 1874 to January 1875 (203) Furthermore, emigration had taken away many of the best labourers and erstwhile leaders - so weakening what organisation remained,, In Waterbeach, for instance, Berry Robinson, the president, (204) and Elias Clay, the treasurer of the local branch of the N.A.L.U., both emigrated to America. (205) The movement was also discredited by internecine squabbles, when even Burgess and the Peterborough disputed in public over charity lands. (206) Nationally it suffered from the adverse publicity following a dispute between Howard Evans and Gibson Ward (207) and Arch and J.E.M. Vincent. Later a rival union to the National was created and one-time colleagues fell to calling each other names. Arch, according to Ward, was "a charlatan" and the cause of the N.A.L.U. "one of brigands." (208)

All this did insurmountable harm on a local level. The labourers felt themselves betrayed and did not respond to the newly orientated policies of the unions - the appeal for political reform, law reform and land reform, including a scheme produced by Alfred Simmons of balloting for land that harked back to Chartist times. (209) Throughout most of 1875 many branches remained in existence, but by the end of the summer there were reports, like that from Wisbech, that branches were refusing to send money to Leamington until there was "a great reform" there. (210) A year later correspondents wrote that branches as strong as that at Waterbeach were dead. (211) The "deadly sweeping away of members" that got worse and worse as "the serious economic slump in the farm industry came about" (212) was under way and it was another fifteen years before any more really significant movements took place among the labourers of East Anglia. Prospects in the mid-seventies were grim as a labourer's lament complained.

Each day growing older  
We gat the cold shoulder  
By farmers thrust out in the cold  
Who jeeringly say "get cut of the way."  
That's how you get served when you're old. (213)



- (1) A new study of this is long overdue. The best work on it is F.E.Clifford, The Agricultural Lock-out of 1874 (1875). For the events involving the Federal Union see Rex C. Russell, The 'Revolt of the Field' in Lincolnshire (Lincolnshire no date). Also Reg Groves, Sharpen the Sickle! (1949). There is a fairly long report of the lock-out in The Annual Register pp 115-121 which quotes extensively from an article in Blackwoods Magazine.
- (2) E. Selley, Village Trade Unions in Two Centuries (1919) p 47.
- (3) Past and Present, No. 26 (1963) pp. 68-97; Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, xi (1965) pp 6-8.
- (4) Cambridge Express (C.E.) 17.2.72. The complaint about school fees is heard repeatedly, and in Cambridgeshire Boards were established in many villages where unions became strong. See later, and also a report of the speech by Joseph Arch in A. Clayden, The Revolt of the Field. (1874) pp. 17-18. See too the reference to the Rev. Burgess's sermon on the subject, p.16. The Education Act of 1870 "allowed for the charging of fees (up to a maximum of 9d a week) while it was left to the local School Boards to decide whether or not they made attendance compulsory". They had limited powers of remitting fees. Brian Simon, Education and the Labour Movement. (1965) p. 126. The labourers were probably equally worried about the provisions of the Agricultural Children's Act which was made law the following year (although it did not come into force until January 1875). This forbade the employment of children unless they had attended school a certain number of times. For the way the Act was used see reference to Newmarket p. 31.
- (5) Cambridge Independent Press (C.I.P.) 16.3.72.
- (6) C.I.P. 30.3.72 on the Ely area.
- (7) Ibid.
- (9) C.E. 13.4.72
- (10) C.I.P. 16.3.72

Page Twenty One

- (11) C.I.P. 33.3.72
- (12) C.E., 6.4.72
- (13) Cambridge Chronicle (C.C.) 6.4.72
- (14) C.I.P. 30.3, 13.4.72
- (15) C.I.P. 4.5.72. A report in the C.C. 22.6.72 says that at that date there were 15 branches in existence.
- (16) C.I.P. 25.5.72
- (17) C.I.P. 29.6.72
- (18) C.C. 15.6.72
- (19) The Beehive. 20 April 1872
- (20) Ibid... 25 May 1872
- (21) C.I.P. 18,25.5.72. C.C. 18.5.72
- (22) There are conflicting reports on the Yaxley incident. See C.I.P. 25.5.72, 25.5, 1.6.72, C.E. 25.5.72, The Beehive. 25 May 1872
- (23) C.C. 15.6.72
- (24) C.I.P. 15.6.72
- (25) The Beehive. 27 April 1872
- (26) C.C. 4.5.72. This is an odd report as Burgess became an ardent supporter of the unions. See later.
- (27) C.C. 3.8.72. S. Hutchinson Norris, Auberon Herbert: Crusader for Liberty. (1943) pp. 132-3

- (28) The Beehive. 31 May 1872
- G.M. Ball seems to have been the first 'delegate' in the area, helping around Wisbech. C.I.P. 13.7.72. The East Anglian Unions, however, had been in touch with Arch's Warwickshire organisation, the precursor of the N.A.L.U., several months before. See e.g. the C.C. 6.4.72 for a report of the South Cambridgeshire Union deciding to ask the Warwickshire Union for copies of its rules (quote from the Daily Telegraph, 3 April 1872)
- (30) See e.g. C.C. 25.5.72
- (31) C.E. 5.6.72. Speeches by Challis announcing the decision to amalgamate (there had been objections) in the Labourers' Union Chronicle. 7 and 21 June 1873
- (32) C.I.P. 30.11., 7.12.72., 4.1.73
- (33) C.I.P. 11.1.73
- (34) W.H.G. Armytage, Heaven Below: Utopian Experiments in England. 1560-1960. (1961)1 pp. 145 f.f.
- (35) C.I.P. 29.3.73
- (36) For the Norfolk Unions see Marion Springall, Labouring Life in Norfolk Villages 1834-1914. (1936). Chap. 7.
- (37) C.I.P. 8.11.73. Reg Groves, op.cit. pp. 65-66. Russell, op.cit. for details of the Federals' activity in Lincolnshire. Also George Edwards, From Crow-Scaring to Westminster (1957 edit.) p. 40 f.f.
- (38) C.C. 5.10.72
- (39) C.C. 3.5.73 (for details of the formation of the unions in Haddenham and of the lock-out)
- (40) C.E. 20.4.72

Page Twenty Three

- (41) C.I.P. 4.5.72
  
- (42) Clifford, op.cit. pp.113-4. C.C. 5.9.74
  
- (43) Capital and Labour, 19 August 1874, reporting incidents from the Bury St. Edmunds district
  
- (44) C.C. 27.6.74. See the threatening letter from Woodbridge sent to Lord Rendlesham, Ibid., 15 August 1874.
  
- (45) Capital and Labour. 19 August 1874, C.E. 15.8.74
  
- (46) C.C. 5.9.74
  
- (47) C.C. 12.9.74. C.E. 12.9.74
  
- (48) See the second annual report of the Wisbech District of the N.A.L.U. in C.C. 23.I.75, which states that cooperative stores had been started by three branches. The Waterbeach branch of the National considered setting up a store in March 1873 (C.C. 29.3.73) and W.H. "Bullock" Hall helped establish the Westley Waterless Industrial and Provident Society in January 1874. (C.C. 17,24.4, 1.5.75)
  
- (49) C.C. 25.4.74. The antiquity of this suggestion is well known: it was seriously put forward again as recently as 1962 by a Petersfield supporter of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Sunday Telegraph, 11 February 1962.
  
- (50) On Evictions see e.g. C.E. 11.4.74, report from Newmarket. In the Exning area Edward Staples, a farmer regarded as the labourers' greatest enemy tried to obtain the cottages from the local squire so as to be able to evict unionists. C.I.P. 4.4.74, report on the origins of the lock-out "from careful and impartial enquiries". Also Clifford, op.cit. p.35
  
- (51) C.E. 17.8.72
  
- (52) C.E. 17.5.73, and letters on 24.5.73

- (53) C.C. 3.5.73
- (54) Clifford, op.cit. pp.9-12. The Essex lock-out is fully reported in the Labourers' Union Chronicle, e.g. issue of 21 June 1873. The end of the struggle is report on 28 June 1873.
- (55) C.C. 26.4, 10,24.5.73. "Cambridgeshire enjoyed "a boom" from about 1850 onwards through the setting up of a coprolite industry. The sale of these minerals not only raised the value of the land by some £150 per acre, but created such a demand for labour that ordinary wages went up to twenty four shillings per week, whilst a good "fossil digger", working in the piece, could almost double that sum. Population increased accordingly, and for nearly a generation our county was the most prosperous in England, the rent running from £2 to £3 an acre." Edward Coneybeare, History of Cambridgeshire (1897), p. 259. Also on the coprolite industry see Victoria County History of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely, Vol. 2., pp. 119-20, 367-8 Coneybeare's estimate of wages seems very high. The work was incredibly hard and many of the labourers who had been enticed away from the farms to work "on the fossils" returned to ordinary agricultural work. C.E. 1.3.73. Letter from F. Barlow on the dangerous nature of work in the coprolite pits, Ibid., 4 September 1875
- (56) C.C. 5.10, 30.11.72
- (57) C.C. 13.6, 10.8.72. See also the editorial of 6.4.72, and the report from Huntingdon on the increased use of machines at harvest in C.I.P. 1.8.74
- (58) Report of the Irish "invading" the harvest fields for the "first time for twenty years" in Capital and Labour, 15 July 1874. See the letter from the Peterborough Union to Gladstone complaining about the use of soldiers. C.I.P. 5.10.72. Despite the shortages of labour in some parts of East Anglia many of the farms were over-stocked and so the removal of labour by their workers had less effect than it might have done, and of course the farmers themselves, as Clifford continually points out, were often able to do much of the essential work themselves. C.I.P. 16.5.74 quotes an amusing story from the Norwich Mercury about a farmer who locked his men out, started to work himself, and fell into a well from which he had to be rescued by a locked-out labourer - but not until after his employer had agreed to re-instate them at 2s. more a week "with nothing said about the Union".
- (59) C.C. 29.3.73

- (60) C.I.P. 16.8.73
- (61) C.I.P. 16.8, 18.10.73. The sentences were later modified. Details of the case also in the Minute Book of the Cambridgeshire Quarter Sessions in the Cambridgeshire Record Office.
- (62) C.I.P. 18.5.72, 8.11.73
- (63) Cambridgeshire Record Office, reference PS/C/R4
- (64) Ibid.
- (65) C.I.P. 14.9.72. Brighton Daily News, 11 September 1872. The case was dismissed. The prosecution was brought by the Parish Authorities
- (66) C.C. 11.1.73
- (67) C.C. 1.2.73
- (68) Cambridge Division Petty Sessions Register, op.cit. 17 May 1873 Bates Tolliday, 76, a pauper, of Histon was prosecuted by a farmer of Girton for stealing a piece of wood valued Id. which had blown off a tree. C.E. 3.7.75
- (69) C.E. 5.7.73. See also Clayden, op.cit. pp 91-95 and Howard Evans, Radical Fights of Forty Years, (no date) pp. 54-55
- (70) C.I.P. 11.10.73. See the report of the speech by Mrs. Fellowes at the annual meeting of the Eynesford Agricultural Association, where she advised the girls to "avoid unbecoming dress" and talked of the "two evils drink and dress". C.E. 2.11.72
- (71) See e.g. C.C., 9.5.74 for the Ely F.D.A.'s decision to advance non-union wages by 1s. a week, and Ibid., 23.5.74 for a report of one West Suffolk landlord making a condition in his leases that non-unionists be paid 1s. more than unionists.

- (72) See the report of the Cambridge Chamber of Agriculture meeting as early as April 1872, a part of which read, "This meeting views with extreme regret the agitation that has been attempted by persons unconnected and unacquainted with agricultural subjects, with the object of implanting discontent in the mind of the agricultural labourer; and that in the opinion of this meeting such agitation is not calculated to promote the interests either of the employer or employed, whose welfare must depend on the law of supply and demand." C.C. 10.4.72. Beehive, 20 April 1872
- (73) An "Oxfordshire Association of Agriculturalists" was formed and resolved not to employ union members in future, Oxford Journal. 27 July 1872, C.C. 31389 19.10.72
- (74) C.C. 5.10.72
- (75) C.C. 15.3.73
- (76) C.C.31.5, 7.6.73. C.I.P. 24.5, 7,21,6. 73
- (77) C.C. 21.6.73. Statement of Honnybun, Secretary of the Hunts. F.D.A.
- (78) C.E. 7.6.73, C.C. 7.6.73. Eventually the Defence Associations joined together in the 'East Anglian Farmers' Consultative Board'. Ibid. 18.7.74
- (79) C.I.P. 3,31.5, 14.6.73
- (80) C.E. 7.6.73. The Huntingdonshire organisation did not engage in a lock-out, however
- (81) C.I.P. 3.5.73
- (82) C.I.P. 2.3.74
- (83) A West Suffolk Farmers Defence Association was created at Bury St. Edmunds. There were others. Clifford opp.cit. passim
- (84) C.I.P. 18.4.74. L. Kent's speech at the weekly meeting of the Newmarket F.D.A. "They could do very well without these Union men, especially if they used steam machines, to work which they could get mechanics for £2 a week."

- (85) e.g. C.C. 11.4.74. Speech by G.M. Ball
- (86) Groves op.cit. p.78. C.I.P. 1.8.74
- (87) e.g. "I do not believe that the mass of peasants could have been moved at ally had it not been for the organization of the Primitive Methodists.....". J. Thorold Rogers, Six Centuries of Work and Wages (1909) p. 515. The Primitive Methodists, however, were not entirely happy about the part many of their members played in the events of 1872-4. See the report of their 55th Annual Conference in C.I.P. 4.7.74. On the other hand see the extracts from The Methodist Recorder in The Beehive 20 April 1872, earlier in the dispute, which give a different impression
- (88) C.C., 4.4. 74
- (S9) C.C. 25.4.74
- (90) C.C. 6.7.72, 2.5.74, letters from James Smith. See, also, Smith's letter replying to G.M. Ball denying that the labourers' movement was one of dissent, and pointing out that the Liberation Society was divided over whether or not to ask Arch to address it. C.C. 9,16.5.74. Ball said that Smith in a pamphlet had said the labourers' condition was due to "beer, tobacco and bastardy". C.E. 16.5.74
- (91) C.C. 3.5.74
- (92) C.E. 18.7.74. See also Spurgeon's speech to the Liberation Society, C.I.P. 16.5.74
- (93) Denzil Batchelor, Big Fight, The Story of World Championship Boxing (Pan. Edit. 1956) p.55
- (94) C.C. 13.6.74
- (95) The most publicized incident of magisterial harshness took place in Oxfordshire when two clergy magistrates committed sixteen women at Chipping Norton for intimidating two blacklegs. Clayden, op.cit. p. 131 f.fo Groves, op.cit. pp. 59-61. Labourers' Union Chronicle, 7 June 1873. Arch and company made repeated demands for the clergy to be prohibited from the magistrates' bench.

- (96) Capital and Labour, 10 June 1374
- (97) Ibid,, See also the card circulated at a meeting in Newmarket "From the farm labourers of Christian England to their arch enemies...",  
C.I.P. 18.7.74
- (98) The Beehive, 13 and 27 July 1872
- (99) C.I.P. 12.10.72. Report from Pampisford
- (100) C.I.P.- 4.5.72
- (101) C.I.P. 2.5,74
- (102) The Bishop had asked, "Are the farmers of England going mad ?", and had said that they were driving the labourers to "a peasants war".
- (103) C.I.P. 13.4.72
- (104) C.I.P. 1.3,73
- (105) C.C. 21.6.73
- (106) C.I.P. 21.3.74. "Imagine poverty so distressing" Roberts wrote, "Imagine men, too, who have no change of clothes for Sundays imagine the straits they have to endure., and can we be surprised that they combine to get something more in the shape of wages, than the miserable pittance they are now receiving, but which their wealthy neighbours deem a sufficiency."
- (107) C.I.P. 25.7.74. See e.g. the speeches of the Rev- Lott and the Archdeacon of Sudbury
- (108) Review and notes on his book Essays Biblical and Ecclesiastical in C.C. 2, 9.8.73. Brief biographical sketch in Boase. Modern English Biography Vol, 4. Burgess's living in Whittlesey was crown patronage and worth £500 a year, He had gained considerable popularity among the labourers by making St. Mary's "free". C.C. 24.5.73

- (109) C.C. 11.4,74. Letter from Burgess
- (110) C.C. 17, 24.5.73. Burgess did not go far along the road to any-left wing ideas. See, for instance, the report of his sermon from Matthew xx.13. ("Friend I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny."), from which he made two deductions. First, "that the keeping of compacts and promises is God's method of the world being rightly governed", but that government could and should alter laws to prevent the accumulation of land into a few hands. Second "that the variety of social problems is a Divine ordinance" and therefore "labourers unions, must, as a very condition of prosperous working, dismiss all communistic or socialistic doctrines". C.E. 21.6.73
- (111) C.C., 28.6.73
- (112) C.I.P. 27.4.72. Jonas Webb in the C.C. 11.5.72, called Challis "a shopkeeper charging notoriously for his cottages". See Challis's reply, however, in C.I.P. 25.5.72. Harrod's Directory of Suffolk and Cambridgeshire 1873 described him as "grocer, draper, upholsterer, ironmonger, and valuer of general stock, fixtures, etc."
- (113) C.I.P. 8.2.73. Brief biographical details on Taylor in a letter from Savage in the Beehive. 27 July 1872.
- (114) Savage, in particular, was violently anti-clerical, and repeatedly made remarks about the clergy "grinding down the faces of the poor". See e.g. the report of a meeting in Whittlesey, where he said "God was with them", and the letter attacking him. C.C. 11, 25.5.72
- (115) Challis was giving evidence in a case in which a unionist was being prosecuted for assaulting someone who would not join. The prosecutor elicited the information that Challis was an agent of the Queensland Emigration Company. C.C. 14.3.74. Details of the case are also in Quarter Sessions Rolls, Easter 1874, Quarter Sessions Roll, Michaelmas 1873, and a transcript of evidence is in the Minutes of the Cambridgeshire Quarter Sessions. All in the Cambridgeshire Record Office
- (116) C.I.P. 25.4.74
- (117) C.C. 27.6.74

- (118) C.E. 3.7.73, report of attempts to close the village feast.  
See also issues of 5 and 19 June. For a description of the village  
by C.H. Spurgeon when he was there see J.C. Carlils, C.H. Spurgeon  
(1933) P.79
- (119) Speeches on the Agricultural Holdings Bill delivered at the  
Cambridgeshire and Isle of Ely Chamber of Agriculture. 1873 and  
1875,by John Todd, Also C,E, 5.7.73. Report of a meeting at Cottenham
- (120) C.E. 5.7.73
- (121) C.E. 6,6.73, C.I.P. 18.7.74. The Anti-Game Law League was  
created late in 1872 and its journal was The Circular, Brighton Daily  
News, 11 September 1872
- (122) C.E. 10.7.75
- (123) C.I.P. 30.5.74
- (124) C.I.P. 4.4.74
- (125) C.C. 27.6.74
- (126) C.E. 27.6.74
- (127) C.I.P., 25.4.74, C.C. 25.4.74
- (128) C.C. 9.5.74. The Return of the Owners of Land 1873 shows Rodwell  
of Ampton owning 824 acres, worth a rental of £805
- (129) C.E. 18.4.74. Lady Stradbroke became a noted opponent of the  
unions. See her letters on the struggle in J. Thirsk and J. Imray,  
Suffolk Farming in the Nineteenth Century, (Suffolk Record Society,  
Vol. 1. 1958)
- (130) C.E. 18.4.74. Dobede owned 2,700 acres worth a rental of £4,917.  
Return of the Owners of Land 1873. op.cit.

- (131) C.E. 25.4.74. George Mitchell wanted Duleep Singh to act as an arbitrator in the dispute. Ibid.
  
- (132) Clifford, op.cit., p. 78 f.f.
  
- (133) C.E. 2.5.74
  
- (134) C.I.P. 2.5.74
  
- (135) C.C. 25.4.74
  
- (136) C.E. 16.5.74
  
- (137) The Beehive. 13 April 1872
  
- (138) C.E. 25.4.74
  
- (139) Between Christmas 1873 and April 1874 the price of wheat went down by 6s. a quarter, beef and mutton by 2s. a stone. See e.g. C.C. 11.4.74, Capital and Labour 15 July 1874
  
- (140) C.C. 4.4.74
  
- (141) C.I.P. 12.10.72
  
- (142) C.I.P. 11.4.74
  
- (143) 25 April 1874. C.S.M. was said to be a member of the University, and could possibly have been C.S. Maine of Trinity
  
- (144) C.I.P. 16.5.74
  
- (145) C.E. 16.5.74
  
- (146) C.I.P. 16.5.74

- (147) C.I.P. 4.4.74
- (148) Ibid., Ambrose said that Jay, when he farmed, "was the worst farmer and paymaster in the district," Jay in return questioned whether Ambrose was in fact an accredited emigration agent (Ambrose's real role will perhaps never be known - one report said he had locked his men out!). At the meeting at which the dispute between Jay and Ambrose took place there were no less than three other agents among the speakers, Daveney, Whelland and Child, a railway agent
- (149) c.c. 22.8,74
- (150) C.C. 29.8.74
- (151) Royal Commission on Agriculture. (Parity. Papers 1882 xiv)
- (152) "Mid-Victorian prosperity brought little visible gain to the agrarian worker throughout this period (1850-1870).... Indeed in many ways the agricultural labourer was little if any better off in the 1870s than half a century before..." Derek H. Adcroft 'Communications on The "Revolt of the Field": Past and Present, No. 27, April 1964; P.109 and references cited there. Also Henri Taine, Notes on England (3rd. edit. 1872) Chap XI, and Richard Heath, The English Peasant (1893)
- (153) Clifford op.cit. p. 30 C.C. 30.5.74 reported that in Cambridgeshire only the large farmers were locking the labourers out
- (154) Clifford, op.cit. p. 58
- (155) Ibid., p.65
- (156) Ibid., pp. 47 and 97. C.I.P. 4.4.74
- (157) C.C. 21.6.73. See also C.C. 8.5.75, report of the annual general meeting of the H.F.D.A. where Hurmybun says that if all members paid up at 2s.6dc per 100 acres the Association would have had £74.10.0., which makes a total acreage of 59,600
- (158) Clifford, op.cit., p.90

- (159) Ibid., p. 10 f.n.
- (160) e.g. C.C. 23.6.20, 10.8, 14.9.21 (in the last issue there is a list of incidents in the village between 1808 and 1818)
- (161) The Northern Stars, 16 September 1847, See also the issue of the Northern Star for 25 September 1847 on incendiaries in Cambridgeshire at that time
- (162) A.J. Peacock, 'Captain Swing in East Anglia', Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, No. 8. Spring 1964. H.J. Hanham, Elections and Party Management, (1959)9 P.16. f.n.1.
- (163) C.C. 7.5.19
- (164) C.C. 17.8.72
- (165) C.C. 24.1.74. Letter from ON-LOOKER
- (167) C.E. 28.9, 12.10.72, 12.7.73. According to Kelly's Post Office Directory of Cambridgeshire 1875. the Waterbeach charities were worth £270 a year. Toller owned 516 acres of land. Return of the Owners of Land 1873. op.cit.
- (168) C.C. 28.3.74
- (169) C.C. p. 4.4.74, C.I.P. 4.4.74. The libel is in the Labourers' Union Chronicle, 3 July 1873
- (170) C.C. 11.4.74, C.I.P. 11.4.74
- (171) C.E. 28.6.73. C.I.P. 21, 28.6.73. The Cottenham charities were said to produce "about £450, for education and apprenticeships, Charity Houses, gifts for the poor, of money, bibles and prayer-books". Kellys Post Office Director of Cambridgeshire 1875. op.cit. Todd owned only 26 acres of land. Return of the Owners of Land 1873, op.cit.

- (172) C.E. 29.3.73
- (173) C.C. 20.4.72, where Saunderson is described as "night soil man".  
The Brighton Daily News, 19 April 1872 has him simply as "a single man",
- (174) C.E. 28.6.73
- (175) Cottenham had been famous for its cheese products a few years earlier, but just before the events described in this article took place the pastures had been taken over as arable land, and this may have led to a demand for labour.. On cheese making in the village see Val Cheke, Cheese Making in Britain (1959) PP.15 and 154
- (176) Details of wage rates, harvest rates, cottage rents etc. at Cottenham in C.C. 20.4.72
- (17?) Todd and his colleagues won the first Board elections overwhelmingly, with Todd at the head of the poll. James Toller similarly won in the election of 1875 at Waterbeach. C.E. 23.1.75
- (178) C.E. 8.6.72
- (179) C.I.P., a statement "from careful and impartial enquiries" on the origins of the lock-out 4 April 1874
- (180) op.cit. p.35- The Daily Telegraph called Dobede"s cottages in Exning "pigsties". Quoted in a letter from Benjamin Brown, Burwell, in C.C. 2.5.74. For the way tied cottages were used against the labourers in Exning see f.n. 50. See also a union song on housing in Josiah Sage The Memoirs of Josiah Sage (1951) P.29
- (181) e.g. C.E. 6.6.74, report of case wherein John Gault of Dullingham is charged with assaulting Robert Sanderson. The case appears to have been brought by the Farmers Defence Association
- (182) C.C. 25.4.74. As in many other almost revolutionary situations (for instance in Bradford in 1840) at the very critical point there occurred an epidemic to heighten feelings. This happened in the Newmarket area in 1874 when smallpox appeared in a serious form, the result of bad housing it was claimed. C.E. 8.15, 22.8.74

- (183) The strong union centres, it seems too obvious to stress., were nearly always the larger villages. Sawston had a population of 1,729, Whittlesey was very large indeed, Waterbeach had 1,619 and Littleport 3,869- Census of England and Wales 1871. 33 and 34 Vict. C. 107. Richard Jeffries, Hodge and His Masters (1949 ed.) made the same point, that densely populated com villages were those where "agitation takes its most extreme form". pp. 289-292
- (184) Smith H. Rowley Farm Account Books. Reference 300/A/2 to 300/A/12. On the "horkey" in Suffolk see J. Thirsk and J. Imray op.cito. It is also described by Richard Cobbold in Margaret Catchpole (1845)
- (185) J. Stanley Chivers, Histon Baptist Church 1858-1958 (n.d.) gives some details of village life in the fifties, and of the Chivers family
- (186) Harrods Directory of Suffolk and Cambridgeshire 1875 op.cit.  
Kelly's Post Office Directory of Cambridgeshire 1875. op.cit. Also T.F. Teversham, History of Sawston, (Sawston 1942) Vol. 2
- (187) op.cit. pp. 37-38
- (188) Harrods Directory of Suffolk and Cambridgehire 1873. op.cit.
- (189) C.C. 8.5.75 for a report of trouble at Sawston over the School Board. Letters on the business from E.S. Daniel and J.M. Uffon in Ibid., and issue of 15 May 1875. End of the trouble reported in Ibid., 6 November 1875
- (190) Jam making commenced in Histon in 1873, and Chivers' factory was set up two years later. H. Rider Haggard, Rural England, (1902) Vol. 2. p.51. Article on Stephen Chivers in Ernest Gaskell, Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Leaders, (no date probably 1908-10). Short history of the Chivere family and the factory in the firms publications, From Orchard to Home (n.d.) and Another Chapter (n.d.)
- (191) For an analysis of the union's finances in the Exning district of the N.A.L.U. from 4th April to 6th July 1874 see Capital and Labours, 19 August 1874
- (192) C.C. 20.1.75a report signed "Little Abington".

- (193) C.C. 9.10.75
- (194) C.C. 26.12.74, report on the Wisbech Steam Cultivating Company
- (195) East Anglian Handbook for 1875, pp. 8-9
- (196) See f.n. 50
- (197) 27 February 1875
- (198) e.g. C.C. 6.3.75. Also G.E. and K.R. Fussell, The English Countrywomans (1953), pp. 76-60
- (199) See Arch's comments at a meeting at Sawston. C.E. 10.7.75
- (200) 10 October 1874 quoting the Ipswich Express
- (201) C.C. 3.10.74. On the Cambridgeshire by-election see also H.J. Hanham, op.cit. pp.20-21, 29-30
- (202) C.C. 19.6.75, obituary note on Wilson in Ibid., 11 September 1875
- (203) Capital and Labour, 19 August 1874. C.C. 23.1.75
- (204) C.E. 12.4.73
- (205) C.E. 26.4.73
- (206) C.C. 27.2.75. It was reported in August 1874 that the county court was to be applied to "to test the right of the Union to stop the lock-out pay after taking subscriptions". Ibid., 1 August 1874
- (207) Capital and Labour, 26 August 1875
- (208) C.C. 8.1.76

Page Thirty Seven

- (209) Simmons was leader of the Kent and Sussex Agricultural and General Labourers Union. Details of his scheme in C.C. 11.9.75
- (210) C.C. 7.8.75
- (211) C.E. 4.11.76
- (212) E. Moore Darling, 'A Fair Deal for Hodge', The Listener, 14 June 1956 and correspondence in the subsequent issue from Rex Russell, E.D. Jaques, and Nevill, Masterman
- (213) Bulletin No 10 of the Cambridgeshire Local History Council Autumn 1956

THE  
HISTORY GROUP

MARXISM AND HISTORY

MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY GROUP  
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

is open to all members of the Communist Party interested in history.

There is an annual subscription of 10/-, for which members receive free copies of "Our History" and of the occasional publications of the Group, as well as notice of all meetings, public and private discussions arranged by the Group.

The Group exists to forward the study and writing of history from a Marxist standpoint, to put its members working in the same fields in touch with one another, and to organise discussions of mutual interest.

NON-MEMBERS OF THE GROUP

may subscribe to "Our History" through!-

Central Books Limited,  
37 Grays Inn Road,  
London, W.C.I.

10/- per year post free,

The bibliography by Lionel M. Munby and Ernst Wangermann, under the above titles, can be obtained direct from the History Group (15/- and 8d postage), This is a bibliography of some thousand historical works in the English language, whose authors have used the historical method of Marxism.

All correspondence to:-

Secretary,  
History Group,  
C.P.G.B.,  
16 King Street,  
London. W.C. 2.

The History Group would like to hear from anyone interested in recording interviews with veterans of the Labour movement.

Pilot projects on the General Strike are taking place.

O U R H I S T O R Y - titles available

Postage are out The majority of the forty-nine titles of print and some of them are in great demand. The History Group has decided to select titles for reprinting and the first six are now available.

Single copies - 6d. has

Each additional copy add 2d,

---

No. 7	Enclosure and Population Change (reprint)	2/-
No.18	Sheffield Shop Stewards 1916-1918 (reprint)	2/-
No.20	The Common People 1688-1800	2/-
Nor.22	The General Strike in the North East (reprint)	2/-
No. 24	The Lancashire Cotton 'Famine' 1861-65 (reprint) (Stanley Broadbridge)	2/-
No. 26/ 27	Tom Mann and His Times (reprint)	3/6
No. 32	The World of Homer (R.F. Willetts)	2/-
No. 33	Shakespeare's Idea of History ( <u>A.L. Morton</u> )	2/-
No. 35	Slave society - some problems (reprint) (Robert Browning)	2/-
No. 36/ .37	Prints of the Labour Movement (illustrated)	2/6
No.38	Tom Mann in Australasia - 1902-1909	2/-
No. 39	The Organisation of Science - A Historical Outline of Science as a social activity (S.C. Goddard)	2/-
No.42	Class and Ideology in a Provincial City (Bath) 1800-1850 (R.S. Neale)	2/-
No.43	1916-1918 The Easter Rising as History ( <u>G. Desmond Greaves</u> )	2/-
No. 44/ 45	History and Social Structure on the East African Plateau	4/-
No. 46	A Contemporary View of the Napoleonic Wars (Frida Knight)	2/-
No. 47	The Second Reform Bill	2/-
No. 48	Alexander MacDonald and the Miners ( <u>Raymond Challinor</u> )	2/-
No.49/ 50	The Revolt of the Fields in East Anglia (Alf Peacock)	4/-