

The *Morning Chronicle* survey is a unique attempt to describe all forms of working-class community life in England at a particular point of time. A large proportion of material has been selected from the original survey in order to provide information on all major aspects of social life of specific communities, and I hope in this introduction to illustrate how this part of our edited survey lends itself to sociological analysis. Not only will I attempt to illuminate the survey through the perspective of sociological ideas, but also in turn evaluate those ideas through the empirical case studies provided by the survey. The type of analysis that I shall adopt is only one of several to which the material might lend itself, and my aim is to merely illustrate the value of the survey to sociological and historical study. The starting point of my analysis is Lockwood's work on working-class images of society,¹ which takes the variations in the economic structure of community life as given and attempts to explain associated social and political attitudes as outcome variables.

It is possible to distinguish three types of worker: the traditional deferential, the traditional proletarian and the privatised. The deferential and proletarian workers both occur in their purest form in closed communities. The deferential worker typically lives in villages and small towns with a mixture of social classes, whereas the proletarian lives in one occupational communities like mining villages and working class town enclaves such as docking and shipbuilding neighbourhoods. The deferential works in a small workshop or in service and agricultural occupations where his relationship with his employer is personal and paternalistic; the proletarian worker is to be found in work situations which isolate him from his employer but unite him with his workmates. The deferential worker has a hierarchical "status" conception of social stratification whereas the proletarian has a conflict "us v. them" power model of social class. The privatised home-centred worker differs from both the deferential and proletarian workers in that he is not involved in local community life-this is a result of his residential mobility and lack of attachment to his workmates through the alienating quality of his factory work. This type of worker has a money model of social class and an "instrumental" attitude towards his work which is viewed primarily as a source of income; he forms the core of "the increasingly large section of the working class emerging from traditionalism".

Turning to the survey itself, deferential attitudes were found less among groups such as agricultural labourers but were found among certain classes of factory worker: Ashworth's country cotton factory of Egerton, Messrs. Arrowsmith & Slater's cotton factory on the outskirts of Bolton and Crawshay's ironworks at Merthyr-Tydfil.² Deference in all these cases manifested itself in respect and admiration for the paternalistic employer, and the absence of industrial conflict in the form of strikes. The key sociological factor in explaining the deference of these workers appears to have been the residence of the employer in the workers' community, combined with the paternalistic provision of model cottages, free medical provisions and the like.³ It was possible for the employer to get to know his workers personally even in the context of a large factory work situation because of his prolonged residence in the community in which many of his workers had spent their whole working lives. This of course was not typical of factories in large towns such as Manchester where frequently workers had never even spoken to their employers; for example the Manchester cotton worker who stated that "I have worked in that mill sir, these nineteen years, and the master never spoke to me once".⁴ But even in Manchester some of the factory owners were involved in a more personal capacity with their workers through the Sunday School movement, which appears to have helped spread their values of self-help and individual achievement and discouraged radical political activity such as Chartism.⁵

The deference of factory workers is of greater historical importance than most sociologists or even historians have recognised. During Luddite attacks on cotton-factories during the beginning of the nineteenth century it was often the factory workers who helped their employers defend their property

and there are examples of factory workers actually firing on and killing Luddite attackers.⁶ Many of these early factories were in rural areas where the employers lived in an almost gentry-like relationship with their workers, generating a classical deference situation. Perhaps as important as this social situation though, was the fact that these early factory workers were very highly paid in comparison to their contemporaries such as hand-loom weavers. As well as high income, these factory workers benefited from the sort of paternalistic provision of model cottages etc. discussed above. The influence of paternalistic intervention on behalf of workers is illustrated by the case of the London coal-whippers: the quality of their lives had been dramatically improved through the intervention of the government in legislating against payment of wages in public-houses. They and their wives appear to have been highly appreciative of the government's action, which would go some way in explaining why they "were extremely proud of their having turned out to a man on April 10, 1848, and become special constables for the maintenance of 'law and order' on the day of the great Chartist 'demonstration' ".⁷

The relative absence of deferential attitudes amongst agricultural labourers in the survey can be explained in terms of the fact that they benefited so little from their "personal" relationship with farmers and gentry.⁸ The poverty and destitution of the agricultural labourers is more than adequately described throughout the survey, but in order to indicate the unfeeling way they were sometimes treated by farmers I quote the following casual description of their treatment in an area of Norfolk from an unpublished letter:

It is the usual custom, I was informed in a great many of the adjoining parishes, for the farmers to send their teams in order to convey their labourers with their families to the union workhouse for the winter months, and as many as seventy persons have been seen thus to pass through Trimmingham on their way to the union workhouse.⁹

It is not surprising that rick-burning was a frequent occurrence in East Anglia (where large-scale capitalist farming was most frequently to be found), and in this respect agricultural labourers were solidly proletarian in their attitudes.¹⁰ This reference to rick-burning should however remind the careful reader of Hobsbawm and Rude's book on the riots of the agricultural labourer in 1830 that in many cases landlords managed to recruit "respectable labourers", "servants and retainers, grooms, huntsmen, game-keepers" as special constables to put down the riot.¹¹ There is some evidence to show that domestic servants were the most deferential occupational group during this period,¹² and it is unfortunate that the survey was terminated before they were studied (they were about the largest single occupational group in the country). The "respectable labourers" referred to above were presumably labourers who worked on the estates of paternalistic landowners and lived in the "closed" villages attached to these estates. These labourers benefited substantially in economic terms from their relationship with their employers,¹³ as did domestic servants particularly those of the aristocratic rich.

Deference arose not only out of a personal relationship with a paternalistic employer but also with other elites such as the clergy. This is illustrated by a description of the religious behaviour of agricultural labourers:

In small parishes, where the clergyman is frequently brought into personal contact with the labourers, and where, from other causes, he exercises a direct influence over them, they may be found pretty regular in their attendance at church; but generally speaking their attendance is neither large nor constant, most of them moping about on the Sunday, smoking and drinking, and some of them spend nearly the whole day in bed.¹⁴

This suggests that without the influence of the clergy, labourers had very similar attitudes towards the Church as did their urban proletarian contemporaries. The term influence is rather ambiguous with

respect to the analysis of deference, for although there is some evidence that labourers did on occasions genuinely identify with the hierarchical values of the Church, there is even more evidence that many of them attended church in a rather mechanical way as a result of economic pressure.¹⁵ The clergy were often in a position to exercise control because of the desperate economic plight of their parishioners. A labourer's wife living in Cambridgeshire told the rural correspondent in October 1850:

I've just put the last twig of wood on the fire. I went to the clergyman this morning, and I asked him for God's sake, to give me sixpence to buy a bit of firing with; and he said he could not afford it, and that he was as bad off as I was.¹⁶

When the clergy were able and willing to use their wealth, they were capable of increasing their congregation significantly. An example of this is when the new vicar of Sutton Courtenay discovered the neglect of church attendance by the labourers living in his parish, partly through the use of his wealth he "got the people into the habit of attending church, which he deemed to be his first duty".¹⁷

Several communities described in the survey show some sociological features typical of the proletarian worker: the London and Liverpool shipwrights, the Middleton weavers, the Cornish fishermen and miners, the Swanage stone quarriers, and the London coopers and hatters.¹⁸ However, the fullest description of the proletarian worker in purest form is the account of the Durham and Northumberland miners.¹⁹ The sharing of egalitarian values in these village mining communities took a religious form during this period and most of these miners were members of Methodist congregations. The class basis of Methodism and the linked antagonism towards the Church of England was explicitly recognised, as the manufacturing correspondent revealed:

The Church of England is, I believe, from what I have seen, regarded by a large proportion of the mining community with feelings of positive and active enmity. They almost invariably class it with the aristocratic institutions and influences which they believe to be hostile to them. The church clergymen, they say take the part of the masters, but the Ranters (Primitive Methodists) take part with the men, addressing their comrades in their own patois, and treating every scriptural subject in the peculiarly technical tone which is common to the whole community.²⁰

This class basis of Methodism was expressed during the great strike of 1844:

A religious feeling came to be strangely mixed up with the movement. The Ranters' chapels were crowded, and the success of the strike was prayed for from the pulpit. The people went to chapel and prayer meetings, as they said, to "get their faith strengthened".²¹

This description of the use of religion as a way of expressing and reinforcing community solidarity is a classic example of what Durkheim conceived as the main function of religious activity, although the religious "rationalisation" of class interests is more akin to a Marxian analysis.

Unlike the Durham and Northumberland miners, those living in Staffordshire showed little class solidarity amongst themselves. One major reason given for this difference was given by a Staffordshire miner when commenting on the fact that miners in the North were much more active in organising a trade union than those in Staffordshire itself: "They may get it (the union) up again ... in the North, but we're people from a great many counties here, and we don't trust each other."²² This is a good illustration of the importance of geographical mobility in determining class solidarity. Two other major reasons for the lack of unity amongst the Staffordshire miners were: (i) they did not live in small separate villages as did the northern miners but inhabited undifferentiated areas of sprawling township shared with iron-workers and others; (ii) they worked in relatively small mines run through middle-

men with whom they had some kind of personal relationship, again unlike the north where the mines were run on much more bureaucratic lines. One of the effects of the lack of community solidarity amongst the Staffordshire miners was the absence of any religious consensus such as an attachment to Methodism, and their style of life was characterised by a pub-centred culture and a liking for rough traditional sports.²³

One of the difficulties in giving a clear-cut theoretical analysis of a survey like that made by the *Morning Chronicle* is its richness of empirical detail. However, this sometimes allows us to extend the analysis by directly using comments reported in the survey; for example, the London turner who noted because of the noisy nature of his work "no talk can be carried on, as in a tailor's shop, by which men can pick up a little politics or knowledge".²⁴ This adds to our understanding about the range of variables to be considered when attempting to account for social facts such as proletarian class consciousness. The noisiness of their work is also stated to be one of the reasons why the "honourable" cabinetmakers were so little interested in politics and might also help to explain their relative indifference to trade unionism. Other reasons only implicit in the survey were the absence of any noted concentration of the trade in any particular area of London and perhaps most importantly the fact that most of these London cabinet-makers were "countrymen" in origin.²⁵ By contrast the London shipbuilders were "mainly natives of the metropolis" who lived "chiefly in Poplar and the adjacent parts"- and presumably these geographical foundations of a closed community life go some way in explaining the fact that "not a few of the shipbuilders have brought up their sons to their own calling". All the three above factors can be seen as contributing to the political awareness of the shipbuilders described as follows:

The shipbuilders are, I found, great politicians. It is customary during their half hour's luncheon at eleven o'clock, for one man to read the newspaper aloud in the public-house parlour; a discussion almost invariably follows and is often enough resumed in the evening.²⁶

It is not possible to tell from the survey which factor is the most important in determining such political consciousness, a question which could only be settled by a sophisticated methodology of statistical comparison directed at an explicitly formulated theoretical proposition. Although the survey has none of this, at least it produces a richness of description which forces us to recognise the complexity of situations to be explained, and the inadequacy of generalisations to account for all the detailed variations. It is for this reason that there is no effective summary substitute for the survey itself.

The privatised worker is more difficult to find in the survey than the deferential and proletarian types and this is what would be expected from the formulation of the privatised worker as belonging essentially to the twentieth century. There are however indications that there was a nineteenth-century equivalent to the privatised worker, particularly where there was an absence of deferential or proletarian community life. For example, the London cabinet makers were not only relatively indifferent to politics and trade unionism but were described by Mayhew in the following terms:

The great majority of the cabinetmakers are married men and were described to me by the best-informed parties as generally domestic men, living, whenever it was possible, near their workshops, and going home to every meal. They are not much of playgoers, a Christmas pantomime or any holiday spectacle being exceptions, especially where there is a family. "I don't know a card-player", said a man who had every means of knowing, "amongst us. I think you'll find more cabinetmakers than any other trade members of mechanic's institutes and literary institutions, and attenders at lectures."²⁷

This was the labouring aristocracy of "respectable" artisans who not only prided themselves on their education and their "rational" amusements, but also on the fact that they could maintain their family without their wives having to work; for example, according to a bedstead-maker

Several of us are house-keepers and can support our wives and families comfortably. I don't think one of the wives of the members of our society work in any way but for the family.²⁸

One of the results of this type of family-centred respectability was that the homes of these artisans were very well furnished; for example, in the homes of the "honourable" cabinetmakers

you have the warm red glow of polished mahogany furniture; a clean carpet covers the floor; a few engravings in neat frames hang against the papered wall; and bookshelves or a bookcase have their appropriate furniture. Very white and bright-coloured pot ornaments, with sometimes a few roses in a small vase, are reflected in the mirror over the mantleshelf.²⁹

Given that the privatised worker is not only family-centred but also home centred (the two are obviously intimately connected), we can take this evidence about the well-furnished homes of the "respectable" artisan as a further indication of their relatively privatised state.

The association between a comfortable home and the emotional importance of the family is hinted at by the manufacturing correspondent who implied that "respectability" was not confined to particular occupational groups:

Before leaving the subject of house and street architecture I may be permitted to observe on the constant recurrence of a phenomenon which I have remarked on in many industrial districts in England. In the houses of the worst class - in those the inhabitants are slatternly and poor - the seldom failing pictorial decoration upon the walls is derived, with significant frequency, from the illustrations of some highwayman novel. In more comfortable dwellings although occupied, perhaps by individuals of the same nominal rank in the social scale, you may find a stiff family portrait or two - probably a crown or half-a-crown's worth from some vagrant artist; or, perchance, there are engravings of some Chartist or Radical leader belonging to the political school of the pater familias.³⁰

The two categories of person described in this passage correspond more or less to the distinction familiar to sociologists between the "roughs" and the "respectables". One of the chief differences between these two groups lay in the focus of their leisure activities: the "roughs" spent most of their spare time in the pub, the "respectables" at home with their family. The survey provides much more evidence about the first than the second, although the constant references to the sobriety of the respectable artisan is indirect confirmation of the latter. An example of this distinction within virtually the same trade is to be found amongst the tanners and the curriers; the London tanners were traditional "roughs" with a pub-centred and prize-fighting sub-culture, as contrasted with the educated home-centred "respectable" curriers. Part of the explanation for this difference lay in the fact that the former all worked in the area of Bermondsey and thus formed a traditional community, whereas the latter worked and lived in different parts of London leading to a degree of privatisation.³¹

There is one problem with using the term privatisation with reference to the mid-nineteenth century period and that is that it assumes a sharp distinction between the work and home situations. Domestic workers by definition worked in the home and where they worked long hours they were effectively privatised; for example the London fancy cabinet-makers were

far less political than they used to be. The working singly, and in their own rooms, as is nearly universal with them now, has rendered them more unsocial than they were, and less disposed for the interchange of good offices with their fellow workmen, as well as less regardful of their position and their rights as skilled labourers.³²

Lockwood however has used the term privatisation to refer to non-work activity, but with these domestic workers leisure-work activity hardly existed. This was not always the case for the small master turners living and working in Spitalfields were

rare fellows for skittles, cards, and dominoes, and badly as they're off, numbers of them don't work on a Monday.³³

There are also cases in the survey of workers not working at home but working such long hours that they in effect had no leisure time at all, and perhaps an extreme example of this is the London omnibus drivers and conductors who did not have the time to attend church on a Sunday.³⁴ Although it is technically correct to apply the term privatisation only to non-work activity, the social and political effects of both work and leisure situations are considered in the analysis, and it is only necessary to add amount of leisure time as a variable in order to extend it to nineteenth-century conditions.

One theme which constantly recurs in the survey is that of wives who had spent their childhood and adolescence as factory workers being less capable of looking after their families than women who had been domestic servants before marriage. One of the results of the lack of domestic competence of ex-factory wives was to discourage husbands from spending their leisure time at home and lead them to spend more time in the local pub. Perhaps even more important than this in creating a pub-centred culture was the lack of elementary domestic comforts such as adequate lighting, heating, furniture, space and cleanliness - all particularly important to make a home an attractive place during a period when fertility and the number of children living was so high. The effect of the lack of lighting and heating in creating a pub-centred culture is beautifully illustrated in a letter on the Liverpool docks where ships were forbidden to have either heat or lighting because of the fear of fire.³⁵ In this respect the privatisation of the worker can be seen as a function of improvements in the quality of the home, and this was tentatively suggested by the rural correspondent in a discussion of the labourer's home.³⁶ In fact the home situation is an equally important sociological variable as the work situation, and not only with respect to the comfort of the home but also home situated technology. For example, the introduction of running water instead of water from wells increased women's home centredness and eliminated the social relationships based on the communal collection of water.³⁷

Although the survey can be interpreted in very general terms as confirming the analysis of different types of working class, the characteristics of nineteenth-century "respectables" do not fundamentally fit into the appropriate classification. This class was not only relatively privatised but also much more aware of itself as a social class with distinct radical political views than the "roughs" who, in spite of their shared community style of life, were not as aware of being a part of the "working class".³⁸ One of the major reasons for this difference was the greater literacy and education of the "respectables"- and in the nineteenth century working class education was intimately linked with "self-improvement", "temperance" and relative political awareness. In sociological terms "self-improvement" and "temperance" can be translated into privatisation, whereas political awareness can be seen as growing out of the rationality of an educated class. Even the evidence which most appears to support Lockwood's analysis presents contradictions and ambiguities; for example, the mining communities of Durham and Northumberland were in some sense both traditional proletarian and privatised. A lot of the leisure time of these miners was spent at home working on and around the house and even their pub-culture had become a residue of its past importance. One of the reasons for their home centredness

was that there was no employment available for women in the area and as a result wives were "the great agents in getting the houses as well furnished as they are".³⁹ Miners also had a relatively short working week which enabled them to spend leisure time at home and they could afford to furnish their houses comfortably because of their relative affluence compared to other working class groups. One probable effect of their home centredness was their Methodism, for it was a religion which emphasised and expressed what for the sake of brevity one might call the domestic virtues: cleanliness, temperance, and family respectability.⁴⁰

With reference to the contradictions and ambiguities in the classification of different types of worker, it could be argued that the categories are "ideal-types" and that we should not therefore be concerned with empirical exceptions. This type of argument which is popular amongst some sociologists would mean that analytical power of any classification could never be evaluated, nor an analysis refined so as to more adequately explain empirical evidence. An example of how Lockwood's analysis would have to be modified to explain an awkward fact is provided in the survey's account of the relationship between workers and their employers in Oldham.⁴¹ This town was noted for its large number of small employers who rented "floors or small portions of factories dirty and constructed in the old-fashioned unventilated style".

One informant stated that

these masters ... are just the same as if they were the fellow-workmen they employ. They dress much in the same way, they live much in the same way, their habits and language are almost identical, and when they 'go on a spree' they go and drink and sing in low taverns with their own working hands.

These "operative employers" had themselves been ordinary workers before becoming employers, which explains their similar styles of life. On Lockwood's analysis the close relationship between workers and employers would be expected to lead to a sense of community between them, inasmuch as he implicitly assumes a one-to-one relationship between social interaction and social solidarity. In fact the survey informants could not agree on whether the social relationship between the Oldham employers and their workers was more harmonious than that between large capitalists and their workers. The position was summarised by one informant when he stated that "although masters and men often caroused together yet, on occasions of difference arising between them, the masters would get terribly abusive and terribly bad blood would ensue". In extreme cases this "bad blood" led to a complete transformation of the social relationship between employer and employee; for example in Banbury "the workers of one small firm applied to join the union only when this personal relationship had broken down: the boss said to be worse for drink had abused and sworn at them".⁴² This type of situation suggests an emotionally ambivalent attitude as characterising the relationship between employer and worker, leading to a mixed deferential/proletarian type of response. The emotional ambivalence is presumably the result of a tension between friendly personal interaction on the one hand and the latent economic conflict between employer and worker on the other.

The use of the term emotional ambivalence is a pointer to the way in which the descriptive analysis employed in this paper can be developed so as to make the assumptions employed theoretically explicit. Implied in this analysis is the assumption that the common theoretical ingredient to all the sociological classifications is a psychological one. This is a position which has most recently been associated with Homans's work, which has increasingly emphasised the importance of rewarded behaviour in determining the effects of social interaction.⁴³ In this paper the two main "rewards" of social interaction considered have been economic benefits and friendly personal interaction. Although Homans's analysis would go a long way in explaining the social processes discussed under the various

classifications of different types of worker, there are a number of key problems which fall outside of the scope of this type of work. One such problem has already been briefly touched upon in the discussion of labourers' attitudes towards the Church. Although they rarely appeared to have identified with the values of the church, they frequently attended it as the result of economic and social pressure of the local gentry etc. This type of behaviour may be seen as socially "defensive" against the power of controlling elites, and it is possible to find many examples of domestic servants and agricultural labourers presenting a deferential front to their employers, and then giving vent to their true feelings of hostility when amongst themselves.⁴⁴ It is therefore necessary to make the distinction between social behaviour and the internalisation of values in order to explain some of these ambiguous and ambivalent situations. The only psychology to attempt an explanation of the internalisation of values in any convincing manner is psychoanalysis,⁴⁵ and I will try to develop the theoretical assumptions of the typology of different types of worker by examining the category of deferential worker in the light of psychoanalysis. I will then illustrate how this theoretical development can be applied to the survey in such a way as to further illuminate it, although with the explicit recognition that any sociological generalisation does inevitable violence to the complexity of empirical reality and to that extent must always remain at the level of "ideal type" analysis.

The attitude of the employer towards the deferential employee has invariably been described as "paternalistic"; an example of this is to be found in Sturt's *Wheelwright's Shop* where he describes how "the men sought his (father's) advice as if they were his trusting children".⁴⁶ Psychoanalysis interprets deference as the employee "transferring" his admiration and acceptance of parental authority onto his employer. As well as transference, it is possible to detect the psychological process of identification in the deferential social relationship, with the employee identifying with his employer's social value and imitating his style of life. Transference and identification are both grounded on the long period of dependency during childhood socialisation, although identification occurs through the child gradually succeeding to a position of equality with its parents (identification can also occur with brothers and sisters-this form of identification plays an important part in the formation of proletarian egalitarian values), whereas transference represents the unconscious residue of childhood dependency. Where a deferential social situation takes the form of a hierarchy with limited social mobility, such as that among domestic servants, deference is likely to occur as described by Lockwood and be primarily a question of transference. In this type of situation identification is mostly vicarious, although the literature suggests that the servant imitates aspects of his employer's style of life as well as identifying with him at the level of phantasy.⁴⁷ The hierarchical nature of the servant household allows the upper servants to imitate certain features of their employer's authoritative behaviour, which fosters identification through a narrowing of power and status differences. The model that the deferential upper servants have of the hierarchy (and social stratification in general) is likely to be a three status-group one, with himself in the middle and socially superior to the lower servants and the "lower" classes. Lockwood has also mentioned the small workshop as an example of a deferential social situation, and where there is a minimum of social mobility this is likely to be the case.⁴⁸ During the nineteenth century however, the small workshop was still associated with the traditional pattern of apprenticeship and journeyman status (to some extent) being preparations for succession to independent master status. Such a social situation fosters identification rather than transference, a point which will be returned to at the end of this introduction.

Identification and transference constitute the key psychological ingredients for distinguishing genuine deferential attitudes from deferential behaviour presented as a defence against the power of the employer. The key sociological factor in producing genuine deferential attitudes (via transference and identification) is the presence of an enduringly rewarding relationship with the employer, particularly with reference to economic benefits and friendly interaction.⁴⁹ This rewarding relationship may be seen as producing transference and identification through the reactivation of the experience of being

loved as a child by a parent, although psychoanalysis has developed a number of highly complex ideas on this subject which go far beyond this rather simple formulation of the problem (for example Anna Freud's notion of "identification with the aggressor"). It would be possible to extend the present analysis in a number of ways in order to more fully account for the complexities of the social relationships under discussion. Deference can be seen as a "reaction-formation" designed to disguise the unconscious hatred that the powerless feel towards those who exploit and wield power over them - a disguise that the exploited accept through the repression forced on them by their social situation of powerlessness (the classical example of this is of course the "Uncle Tom" syndrome amongst negroes in the American South). The complicating of the analysis in this way leads us away however from the *Morning Chronicle* survey which only provides information sufficient for a simplified form of analysis.

The value of extending the sociological classification of types of worker in a psychological direction may be illustrated by an analysis of religious belief and affiliation. The survey provides us with a starting point through its description of the religious life of various communities. I have already touched on the Methodism of the Northumberland and Durham miners; the survey also suggests that the Cornish miners were also almost exclusively attached to Methodism. Other than the miners, the community which showed the greatest attachment to Methodism were the Cornish fishermen. The common features of these occupational communities were the relative autonomy of the men in their work situations, freedom from a hierarchical relationship with employers, the isolation of the community from other occupational groups and the absence of feminine employment and the resulting home-centredness discussed above. Of these factors, perhaps autonomy and freedom from hierarchical control were the most important in determining religious non-conformity with its emphasis on the ultimate moral responsibility of the individual and the rejection of religious hierarchy.⁵⁰ The Cornish fishermen were typical of the social strata of small tradesmen who were the social backbone of religious non-conformity, and they shared in the additional personal freedom associated with the ownership of capital and self-employment. The Cornish miners also shared in the profits of the mine, although they owned little or no capital and were partly subject to the authority of the "captain" of the mine who represented the economic interests of the mine owners. Many of these "captains" had previously themselves been ordinary miners and rose not only to positions of authority within the mine but also in local Methodist chapels where they were frequently lay preachers.⁵¹

This example of the "captain" lay preachers points to the importance of the psychological mechanism of identification (in this case with the authority of the employer) in spreading the Liberal religious non-conformity of the manufacturing middle class. We have already seen how Manchester manufactured and fostered this identification through the Sunday School movement, and this was particularly effective in the cotton industry because of the very large numbers of owners and managers recruited from the operative ranks.⁵² The spread of Liberal self-help values through the identification of workers with their employers probably occurred most frequently in the traditional workshop situation. Small workshop situations have not therefore always been associated with hierarchical Conservatism, but also (and perhaps more frequently) with Liberal individualism. The psychological process of identification was more important in the spread of the latter, transference in the diffusion of the former. With the growth of large-scale industry however, many non-conformist manufacturers acquired the same characteristics as their Anglican counter-parts, until by the twentieth century it was difficult to distinguish them in terms of their behaviour towards their employers.⁵³

NOTES

1. D. Lockwood, "Working Class Images of Society", *Sociological Review*, 14 (1966).
2. Where letters have been included in our edited survey, I shall simply state the relevant district and letter number. In the present instance, these are Manufacturing IV (Manufacturing District, Letter IV) and Merthyr Tydfil VI (Merthyr Tydfil District, Letter VI).
3. For other historical examples of deferential factory workers, see J. D. Marshall, "Colonisation as a Factor in the Planting of Towns in North-West England", in Dyos, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-8; C. Townson, *The History of Farington* (1893), pp. 23, 24, 31, 33.
4. Manufacturing III.
5. Manufacturing IX.
6. The most famous of these incidents is the attack on Cartwright's Rawfolds mill, which was defended by a combination of workers and soldiers. See J. L. and B. Hammond, *The Skilled Labourer* (1919), p. 305. More interesting from a sociological point of view is the attack by colliers and weavers on Burton's Middleton factory in 1812, which was exclusively defended by Burton and his workers. The killing of a number of the attackers led to retaliation the next day when Burton's house and his workers' cottages were attacked. See S. Bamford, *The Autobiography: Volume 1* (1967), pp. 300-5, and the Hammonds, *op. cit.*, p. 289. No scholarly study has ever been made of the defence of factories subject to Luddite attack, but for evidence on the role of factory workers in their defence, see the Hammonds, *op. cit.*, pp. 195, 285.
7. Metropolitan XIX and XXIV.
8. Physical proximity did not guarantee a "personal" relationship. See Rural XV about East Anglian labourers who claimed that it was rare for the farmers "to condescend to speak to them, except in terms of reproach or abuse."
9. Unpublished Rural XIX.
10. See Rural XV for a description of rick-burnings and the bitterness felt by many East Anglian labourers towards their farmer employers.
11. E. J. Hobsbawm and G. Rudé, *Captain Swing* (1969), pp. 131, 155, 156.
12. For an almost pure case of deference of someone in the position of a servant, see H. Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor*, Vol. 2 (Dover Publications, 1968), pp. 467-71.
13. For a description of such "respectable labourers" and the model village in which they lived, see F. Thompson, *From Larkrise to Candleford* (1948), pp. 274-87.
14. Rural XIII.
15. These economic controls did not only involve the administration of charity by the clergy but also the use of threats about employment and tied cottages coming from farmers and landlords, forcing their labourers to church. For a vivid example of the use of a range of economic controls for this purpose, see F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1958), p. 304. For a description of labourers who appear to have genuinely identified with the values of the church, see S. Mays, *Reuben's Corner* (1969), pp. 78-88.
16. Unpublished Rural XXXVIII.
17. Unpublished Rural IV.
18. Metropolitan LXVIII; Liverpool XVII; Manufacturing XII; Rural X, XI & XIII; Metropolitan LXIX & LXXVII. The London dockers did not form a cohesive community despite living in a specific enclave in the East End. The main reason for this was the casual nature of the work and the rapid turnover of the labour force (see Metropolitan III & IV). The costermongers of London, on the other hand, were a highly cohesive class with their own very distinctive sub-culture, despite living in different parts of London. The explanation of their cohesion lay in the hereditary transmission of the occupation from father to son and the mobile nature of their work, leading to constant contact with each other. For a brilliant description of this sub-culture, see H. Mayhew, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1 (Frank Cass, London, 1967), pp. 4-104.

19. Manufacturing XVIII to XXII.
20. Manufacturing XXI.
21. Manufacturing XVIII. There is some evidence, however, that Wesleyan Methodist ministers opposed the strike, and that it was the Primitive Methodists that the survey was referring to. See R. F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England 1800-1850* (1948), p. 189.
22. Manufacturing XXIII.
23. It should be pointed out, however, that there was a residue of this traditional culture among the Durham and Northumberland miners as well.
24. Metropolitan LXVII.
25. Metropolitan LXIII.
26. Metropolitan LXVIII.
27. Metropolitan LXIII.
28. Metropolitan LXIII.
29. Metropolitan LXIII.
30. Manufacturing XXX.
31. Metropolitan LXXVIII.
32. Metropolitan LXIV.
33. Metropolitan LXVII.
34. Metropolitan LXXI.
35. Liverpool III.
36. Rural XXXIX.
37. For examples of such communal relationships, see Birmingham II and Merthyr Tydfil I. In our own day, television is by far the most important form of home-situated technology in bringing about privatisation.
38. See the evidence already quoted in this introduction; for the differences between "respectable" artisans and "rough" unskilled labourers, see Metropolitan XIX. The "working class" discussed by E. P. Thompson in his *The Making of the English Working Class* is mainly made up of skilled artisans and weavers, who, in the context of the present discussion, were relatively privatised.
39. Manufacturing XX.
40. For example, the "sober habits" of the Bilston Methodists led to domestic cleanliness and a relative immunity to the ravages of cholera. Manufacturing XXIV.
41. Manufacturing VIII. It should be pointed out that the "account of social relationships and the nature of industry in Oldham is at complete variance with that presented by Foster in his study "Nineteenth Century Towns: a Class Dimension", in H. J. Dyos (ed.), *The Study of Urban History* (1968).
42. M. Stacey, (1960), p. 28.
43. See G. C. Homans, *Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms* (1961).
44. See Powell, op. cit., pp. 79-81 for an example of this amongst domestic servants who at times came to expressing amongst themselves proletarian attitudes of "us" opposed to "them." A number of similar examples amongst agricultural labourers can be found in F. Thompson, op. cit., but see especially pp. 50, 51. The "defensiveness" of domestic servants is illustrated in Rural XIII, which gives a description of the secret language used by servants to hide from their employers' meetings with the opposite sex.
45. For an attempt to assess Weber's typology of internalised authority in psychoanalytical terms, see Donald McIntosh, "Weber and Freud: on the nature and sources of authority", *American Sociological Review*, 35 (October 1970).
46. George Sturt, (1963), p. 55.
47. See, for example, Margaret Powell, *Below Stairs* (1968), pp. 77-79.

48. Sturt, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 55, 113, 201.
49. Powell, *op. cit.*, pp. 129, 130.
50. One of the main reasons for the Nonconformist Liberalism of town tradesmen was their freedom from the hierarchical control exercised by the Anglican Tory gentry. See J. R. Vincent, (1967), pp. 15-18. This can be related to the tradition of the "free-born" Englishman, which found its most politically effective form in the Leveller movement - and the Levellers rejected the inclusion of servants in the franchise "because they depend upon the will of other men and should be afraid to displease them." See C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (1962), p. 123.
51. Rural XI.
52. S. J. Chapman and F. J. Marquis, "The Recruiting of the Employing Classes from the Ranks of the Wage Earners in the Cotton Industry", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 75 (1912), 293-306.
53. See the *Sunday Times*, May 10, 1970, pp. 3, and May 17, 1970, pp. 54, 55, for the paternalism of the Nonconformist Clark and Pilkington families.