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PART THREE

Miner, Community and Politics.
In Part Three, the analysis will be directed away from the collieries as places of work and concentrate on the communities in which miners and their families lived. It must be borne in mind, however, that, to a greater or lesser extent, the nature of workplace relations (that have been the subject of Part Two) coloured the social and political life of the surrounding communities. The miner will still hold the centre of the stage, but the blackcloth will be different, the stage wider and the other players more varied.

Having examined a number of aspects of the miners' work experience, including elements of the controls some employers exerted over their miners' non-working lives, it is important now to see how and to what extent the miners became integrated into and contributed to the community at large. We must also consider how the roles they played affected their consciousness of their own socio-political status. This enquiry will begin by examining aspects of the miners' objective experience in the community at large: their mobility and living standards (especially in terms of housing) in particular. It will look briefly at other socio-economic groups - working class, middle class and landed - and their involvement with the miners and in the communities in general. The bulk of Part Three, however, will consist of an examination of the institutional and political infrastructure which will provide evidence of both continuity and change in the position of various interest groups in the local network of power and influence. The manner in which the miners were accommodated into this infrastructure will be the main focus of attention.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Long Term Mobility and its Implications.
The South Yorkshire coal industry was certainly a net importer of labour during most years between 1855 and 1874 and probably for several in the following two decades. The reputedly high birth rate of miners in the nineteenth century\(^1\) could not have explained the massive population increases in mining communities in those decades. The relatively high wage levels in the local industry partly reflect the employers' attempts to attract labour from outside the area. Although wages remained relatively high, except in the worst years of the depression, there is no evidence that labour shortages, in general, were a real problem, even if the quality of recruits sometimes gave cause for the concern of both management and miners.\(^2\)

The railways, of course, played an important role in stimulating and facilitating this mobility, even though in other sectors of industry, the main impetus of migration to the manufacturing districts was spent. Tramping, apparently never very prevalent among miners, had declined (especially as the phenomenon of depression travel).\(^3\) Yet the railways did establish specific recruiting flows, swelled by family contacts. The attraction of high wages in the Barnsley area (not solely confined to the coal industry) in 1874 was recognised as the cause of a considerable increase in visitors to the vagrant wards of the workhouse. There were 1,001 registered in the third quarter of 1874 as opposed to 734 in the same quarter of 1870.\(^4\) The vagrants were seen to be


\(^2\) The problem was tackled at various times but never solved. See Barnsley Chronicle, 31 July 1867; Mexborough and Swinton Times, 7 Feb. 1890.


\(^4\) Barnsley Chronicle, 7 Jan 1871 and 26 Sept 1874.
'migrant labourers' and not 'professional' tramps. To South Yorkshire there was a predominant movement from the East and West Midlands coalfield areas, aided by the activities of men like Paul Roper of Bilston, a full-time recruiting agent, used by employers both during strikes and normal periods of high demand.

Table 14 testifies to the role of the Midlands as a major donor area for South Yorkshire. For these townships - which cover the whole spectrum of mobility from the highest number of local-born residents (in 1871) to very nearly the lowest - the broad donor districts outside Yorkshire were the same, although the percentage of local miners recruited from these districts varied considerably among the three townships. Within the broad districts (West Midlands, East Midlands, etc.), no one particular sub-district dominated, although there were a few towns or parishes (Duckinfield and Poynton in Cheshire, Bilston in Staffordshire and the more westerly townships of the West Yorkshire coalfield, for example) which cropped up again and again as the birthplaces of the miners. Recruiting of Scots and Irish was negligible and few immigrants were born in the two northern English coalfields. South Wales was only a minor contributor to the West Midlands group. What is most significant, perhaps, is that very few miners in 1871 were born in non-coalfield areas of the country; this was especially true of the younger miners. From a

1 Ibid, 19 Dec. 1874.
2 See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 9 May 1868 and 20 March 1869.
3 Clearly the only systematic data available on donor areas is that relating to birthplaces and one cannot assume that the district in which a migrant was born is necessarily the last place of residence before entry to South Yorkshire. This caveat, however, must be ignored if any use is to be made of the birthplace data.
general impression of the enumerators' returns for other townships in the district, the overall pattern of origin of miners holds true, although, as Table 15 reveals, the proportion of miners born outside the immediate locality and outside the West Riding varied enormously.

Normansell told the Select Committee on Coal in 1873 that few miners were coming from agricultural counties like Essex. The majority of the recruits from far afield were probably miners before they came, but, as Normansell testified, others were moving from lesser paid and declining industries locally and, within about two and a half years, learning the skills necessary for working at the coal face. Many West Midlands and some West Yorkshire immigrants were moving from relatively low paid and slow growth coal industries for the same reasons; while the men from the East Midlands may have been seeking not only higher wages, but the security of a relatively strong labour organisation after 1858.

The burst of colliery expansion in the late 1850s, continuing at a steadier rate through the 1860s, accounts for the high proportion of recent immigrant labour revealed by the 1871 Census. 32% of the miners (household heads only) in the large sample in Table 15 were born outside Yorkshire (29% in the three sample townships); and of those miners from the sample parishes who had children living with them in 1871, 92% of the non Yorkshire-born had come to the district in the preceding fifteen years. Before 1850, the

1 See, for example, J. MacFarlane's figures for Denaby Main, Mexborough and Conisborough in 1871 in Counter-offensive for a South Yorkshire Mining Community, (Typescript) Appendix 1.

2 S.C. on Coal (1873), QQ 7368-70.

3 Ibid, Q 7371.

4 This was deduced from the birthplaces of the children given in the 1871 Census.
growth of the South Yorkshire coal industry was undoubtedly slow enough for it to be supplied by natural increase (although there was some necessity for short distance transfers of this type of new labour) or by men moving from declining local industries, especially handloom weaving, wire and nail-making and from agriculture. Many miners at this time were part-timers, combining pit work with farming, farm labouring or perhaps a craft. By the mid 1860s, the local pool of labour ready, able and willing to work in mining was undoubtedly insufficient to meet the demand. Moreover, it is likely that pressure from miners' representatives and Mines Inspectors on employers to limit the entry of unskilled adults into underground work did bear fruit for a short period until the early 1870s. The 1881 Census will probably reveal that, like Glamorganshire, South Yorkshire experienced its biggest injection of outside labour in the 1870s, reaching a peak about 1879 when the last of the 'boom-inspired' collieries finally opened. Whether, as Jack Lawson suggests, the inflow had abated altogether by the turn of the century, despite the renewed colliery expansion in the east, is a matter for argument.

High mobility within the various coalfields had long been a feature of many miners' lives. The short life and the erratic production of most pre-railway era pits must have forced many full-time miners to change their place of work, if not their home, at least three or four times in their working lives and probably many more times. In the late nineteenth century, this mobility was still an essential part


2 B.Thomas, 'The migration of labour into the Glamorgan coalfield 1861-1911', Economica, x (1930), 284.

3 See. for example, J.Lawson, op.cit., p.92.

4 A.Redford, op.cit., p.49.
of most miners' experience. Jack Lawson depicts a paradox in this experience: 'the miner was a conundrum in that he was, and is, highly communal, yet masses of them could not settle for long in one place'. Part of this mobility was imposed on men by structural necessity and part by choice. Pits still closed, even in the 1870s; strikes and lockouts obliged many to move elsewhere; and the occasional major pit disaster would be followed by new recruitment. On the other hand, a skillful and experienced miner (similar to Herbert Smith's father, as portrayed by Lawson), might travel from pit to pit in search of the best jobs sometimes leaving the coalfield, but not always uprooting his home. With few tied cottages, a dense network of employment opportunities and, by the 1890s at least, good local transport, this was often unnecessary.

2 There are many reports, especially in the early part of the period, of up to a half of a colliery's labour force finding work elsewhere in the course of a strike or lockout. The steady decline in men receiving strike pay from the union in many disputes bears this out. See Barnsley Chronicle, 15 Sept. 1860 (Lundhill), 15 Oct. 1864 (Oaks); J. Evison, op. cit., (M. Phil. thesis), p. 285 (Denaby in 1878); S.Y.M.A. Balance Sheets; E.A. Rymer, op. cit.
3 Only 33 out of 159 miners living at Hoyle Mill in 1871 were born in the home parish or an adjacent one.
4 J. Lawson, op. cit., p. 8.
5 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 7 Feb. 1890. Buses left Mexborough in five directions; and the South Yorkshire railway (though probably little used by workmen this early for reasons of cost) linked several large colliery townships with Barnsley and Rotherham.
In South Yorkshire, the pattern of residential mobility varied considerably, but on the whole, was probably not excessively high.¹ To illustrate the variation that occurred, every miner living in Swinton (with Kilnhurst), Dodworth and Silkstone (sub-divided into seven more homogeneous neighbourhoods) in 1861 was checked against the 1871 Census to see if he was still living in that same township. The percentage of miners still resident in 1871 ranged from 58% in Silkstone village to 14% in the ecclesiastical parish of Kilnhurst. The overall percentage of the original 914 miners who were still resident in 1871 was 41.5%. Further evidence of comparative mobility is produced by analysing the birthplace data for two generation family units in 1871. Mobility can be expressed as a ratio of the number of distinct birthplaces to the number of members of the family (parents and children only). A quotient of one would indicate that every member of the immediate family was born in a different place, implying a high degree of mobility; a quotient of eight would indicate that all eight members of a family were born in the same place (from which one could assume that the parents had never moved out of the parish for any significant period of time). The mining families of Swinton and Kilnhurst produced a quotient of 1.52, with less than half of their family members sharing a common birthplace. For Dodworth, the figure was 1.72 and for the most static township, Silkstone, 2.42.² How much of this mobility was confined to one coalfield or involved long-distance moves, is

¹ Compare, for example, Alan Campbell's findings for Coatbridge where 'persistence rates' varied between 14.2% and 23.3% in the decades 1841-51, 1851-61 and 1861-71. Persistence of miners in Larkhall was much higher. See Honourable Men and Degraded Slaves: a comparative study of trade unionism in two Lanarkshire mining communities, c. 1830-1876', Table 8a (Typescript).

² These parishes did not differ significantly with respect to the size of miners' families. See p. 384.
more difficult to compute. But if it was not a particularly high rate compared to miners in other coalfields, it undoubtedly concealed a higher degree of unenforced job mobility which forced employers, at least until the late 1870s and again from 1889, to bid for labour in a fairly dynamic market.

To a certain extent, we can regard migration between Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire as more of an intra-coalfield movement than the flow between the West Midlands and South Yorkshire. Not only were the former three districts geographically closer together than the latter two, but the type of pits and the markets for their coal bore more similarities than did the West Midlands and South Yorkshire. It is likely that the many low wage, non-unionised collieries in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire pulled down the general level of wages and their workmen even helped to perpetuate the anti-union traditions of many of the employers. But the isolation of the West Midlands immigrant from the culture and work experience of the South Yorkshire miner was even more complete. His was a district of small short-life pits (an average of eighty miners in 1874 in pits which were never deeper than 300 yards before the 1870s) heavily constrained by a great deal of faulting. Competition, especially in the Black Country, was said to have been 'fierce and unremitting' and the management - almost always butty masters of one type or another - was forceful and often unprofessional. The heart of the West Midlands coalfield as well as isolated districts in its periphery was also a low wage area, having experienced a period of 'rapid and uncontrolled growth' in the first half of the century, and

1 J.E. Williams, op.cit., p.127.
2 G.J. Barnsby, op.cit., p.31.
4 J.W.F. Rowe, op.cit., pp.85, 150.
5 G.J. Barnsby, op.cit., p.32.
from then on being left with some form of labour surplus.

For much of the period under study, the West Midlands was also an inadequately unionised coalfield, although bursts of activity in 1858, the mid 1860s and the mid 1870s (while part of the Amalgamated Association of Miners) showed that, when mobilised, the West Midlands miner could be more militant than his counterpart in the more organised districts like South and West Yorkshire.¹ Not surprisingly, the South Yorkshire miner saw the immigrant from Staffordshire as the greatest threat to his livelihood, especially during disputes. The image of that coalfield that was put about was of a 'rough and isolated'² one. The men were said to belong to a 'class that prefer a dirty bone and a pot of beer half a dozen times a day rather than work'.³ This type of black propaganda tended to be reserved for the strikebreakers, but it did colour the resident South Yorkshire miners' opinion of the newcomers in more normal circumstances. There is evidence of the deliberate isolation of Staffordshire miners, especially when they sought to join more established communities, like that of Darton:

for some time past there has been by no means friendly feeling between the miners employed by the Woolley Coal Company at their New Begin Colliery and the miners residing in the adjoining district. The men employed at the colliery named are, for the most part, natives of Staffordshire, and their conduct on many past occasions seems to have been none the best.⁴

There had been frequent quarrels between the natives and the newcomers, culminating in a riot at the Darton feast in 1867.

¹ Ibid, pp.55-67. South Staffs., especially, was a stronghold of the Towers group.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 13 April 1872.
³ S.Y.M.A. minutes (Normansell's notes), 11 Nov. 1867. He was referring to West Midlands blacklegs at Church Gresley in South Derbyshire during the long lockout there.
⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 31 July 1869.
Easily recognised by their dialect and by their inexperience in the type of colliery working common to South Yorkshire and parts of the East Midlands, the West Midlanders, more than other newcomers, may have found integration into the older, more static communities to the west of Barnsley difficult.

Study of the Census enumerators' returns does not, however, point to the residential segregation of any particular group of miners with common birthplaces. Nor is there any evidence that, except when they were brought in as strike breakers, immigrants were more of a prey to paternalism and tended to remain outside the union, as Evison suggests.¹ Some of the colliery communities with the highest proportion of immigrants, including a large number from the West Midlands, served collieries with the most stable union branches and the highest dispute incidence. If conditions were right, an immigrant labour force could establish its own tradition of militancy. One of these conditions was a certain level of provocation from the employers; the other, perhaps, the very creation of a large new community in a neighbourhood without a history of mining on any scale. The melting pot into which these men were thrown in their search for a livelihood welded a workforce searching for an identity. The newcomers were free, moreover, to take full advantage of the benefits offered by the S.Y.M.A. without any inhibitions bred by past, pre-union relationships between them and their employer. Again we look to Denaby as the best example of this phenomenon.

Table 15 organises information on the origins of mining heads of households in a wide and generally representative sample of civil parishes and smaller, more specific neighbourhoods in the district. The household heads only have been dealt with because they were more likely than any other member of the household to have been the decisionmakers

in the process of migration. We should bear in mind, however, that, despite the presence of lodgers (a highly mobile element), the heads of household were far more likely to have been born outside the district than the others taken as a whole. Table 14 bears this out as far as the three sample townships were concerned.

The proportion of local born miners in the places selected varies enormously. Of the variables at work on creating this pattern, the most potent seems to be the period when large scale mining operations commenced in any particular locality. In general, the spectrum of 'parochiality' in the miners' origins follows the chronological development of the coalfield fairly closely; in particular, the further the place was from the main outcrops in an easterly direction, the more likely it was that a large number of outside-born miners would have been recruited by 1871. Thus, four of the five communities with over 50% of its mining heads of households drawn from outside the West Riding were well to the east of Barnsley and the Barnsley outcrop. Conversely, all those with over 50% local-born mining heads were very near, or to the west of, the Barnsley outcrop. The constraints on local recruitment of labour after the 1850s seem to have been significant. Moreover, whatever level of intra-district residential mobility there was, it does not seem to have distorted the pattern suggested.

Besides this trend of operational chronology, some special factors had an influence on the type of miner working at certain pits. Hoyle Mill, the community that largely served the Oaks pit, though a pre-1850 mining settlement, was decimated by the 1866 disaster at the local pit and was soon filled with new labour. The Oaks widows may have been obliged to move out of the colliery houses, although some would have re-married fairly soon. In a rather different manner, a high proportion of miners recruited from outside the district came to be living in a particular neighbourhood of the old-
established mining district of Tankersley. This was the Westwood colliery hamlet built by Newton, Chambers and Co., for the blacklegs brought in mostly from the Midlands during the 1869-70 lockout.

Some employers had identifiable policies in their recruitment of labour. Earl Fitzwilliam's preference for local-born miners (usually members of the families of old employees) has been noticed. This placed the communities from which he drew his labour - West Rawmarsh, Elsecar and Wentworth - firmly at or near the top of Table 15. Normansell testified to this unusual phenomenon in his evidence to the Trade Unions Commission. Some non-union pits, he claimed, would employ any sort of itinerant labour (possibly a reference to Denaby Main, at that stage without a union branch and with a very cosmopolitan labour force); but at Fitzwilliam's collieries, the miners 'have ever been distinguished from other miners by not possessing what may be terms a migratory character ... They must ... have become very attached to the soil'. 1 The same type of centripetal force implicit in the Clarkes' paternalism kept several generations of their miners loyal to the family enterprise. Fifty years' service to their mines was, apparently not uncommon.2

A stable, local-born workforce may have been both a symptom and a cause of untroubled labour relations at collieries in this period. The Barnsley area of the South Yorkshire coalfield had, as we have seen, no tradition of organised labour activity in the coal industry before 1858 to draw on. The older pit communities on and to the west of the Barnsley outcrop tended to conform to the concept of the 'family pit' and the traditions of a more inward-looking and deferential period in the industry. There were obvious exceptions to this

1 Rotherham Advertiser, 18 Dec. 1858.
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geographically based typology: in particular the several militant pits mining the Silkstone coal in the 1860s and 1870s. But these pits - Church Lane, Hoyland Silkstone and Barrow in particular - were relative newcomers to the district, with a fundamentally different type of employer and industrial policy. By a similar process, the two most important paternalist employers, Fitzwilliam and the Clarkes, suffered setbacks in their attempts to maintain workforces with family-bred loyalties. These occurred when for reasons of economic advantage, they decided to sink new, relatively large pits - at Stubbin and New Sovereign - in the 1860s and 1870s. Both pits were involved in independent industrial action soon after they opened.
TABLE 14  
Birthplaces of miners living in Swinton, Dodworth and Silkstone at the time of the 1871 Census. 

Note these definitions of birthplace areas:  Adjacent - any township with a contiguous boundary with the home township. Study area - anywhere in the district that is not in the home township or adjacent townships. East Midlands - Notts., Derbys. and Leics. West Midlands - Staffs., Warwicks., Worcs., Salop., Gloucecs. and South Wales. North - Durham, Northumberland and Cumbria. 

H.o.H. = Head of Household. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home parish</th>
<th>Adja-</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sheffield/</th>
<th>Other West</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Lancs./</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cent</td>
<td>area</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.o.H.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.o.H.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.o.H.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As %</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1871 Census enumerators' returns. Kilnhurst (including the part in Rawmarsh township) is treated as part of Swinton.
TABLE 15

Birthplaces of miners (household heads only) resident in selected townships and neighbourhoods in 1871.

Explanation of columns: A - born in home townships or adjacent townships. B - born elsewhere in the West Riding. C - born outside the West Riding. All are expressed as percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total Miners (H.o. H.s only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh, West (Stubbin)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawthorne and Stainborough</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, North</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsecar</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel town and Tankersley</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excl. Westwood Rows and Wharncliffe Silkstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharncliffe Silkstone</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombwell</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Rows</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyle Mill (by Oaks colliery Ardsley)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh, South (Parkgate)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexborough</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilnhurst*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denaby Main</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For small neighbourhoods, the home township is that within which it is located. For Kilnhurst this has been taken as Swinton. Swinton here consists of the township minus Kilnhurst.

Source: Census enumerators' returns.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Living Conditions of the Miner and his Family.
Household structure and standard of living.

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the domestic environment of miners in this district and to assess the impact that the overall standard, and variations within it, had on miners' attitudes and behaviour. Data is scanty and unsystematic, and only general conclusions will be attempted.

As we shall see in Chapter Seventeen, occupations for females were scarce in the study area, confined almost exclusively in the out-townships to services like dressmaking except where handlooming weaving lingered on. As early as 1841, when female employment in mining was not uncommon in this district, Symons, one of the Children's Employment Sub-Commissioners, noticed that females from collier families in the district were rarely employed after they reached marriageable age and that it was a common saying that "colliers' wives lead ladies' lives". The reality, of course, was that by 1840 there was social and moral pressure enough (plus the periodic shortages of employment for male miners) to restrict female labour in the mines beyond late adolescence; yet, while the adult women would have been far from leisured in their maintenance of colliers' homes, it was true that few would have found full-time paid work in or outside the home.

Table 16 explores the basic pattern of employment of women over the age of thirteen (excluding those ostensibly at school) for the three sample communities. Overall, only about 4% of married women in these communities were stated as being

---

1 Children's Employment Commission (1842 xvi ), p.194. A local coalowner and J.P., John Thornley, had a different opinion of their behaviour: 'the wives of the present generation of colliers are a degenerate race owing to their being brought up in the pits and neglecting to learn how to perform common domestic duties' (ibid, p.246).
employed in 1871, although many, especially in Dodworth, would be actively engaged in their husbands' domestically-based trade - as shopkeepers, publicans, or linenweavers, for example. Swinton and Kilnhurst, with more diverse employment opportunities, registered more working wives, yet nothing on the scale of some West Yorkshire and South Lancashire mining communities. When we turn to look at the employment status of daughters, other female relatives and female heads of households, there was far more balance between those who were in paid work and those who ostensibly were not. Yet the very limited range of occupations they undertook indicates that quite a few probably found it difficult to find paid work if they wanted or needed it. There was little observable difference between mining and non-mining households in any of these respects.

The result of this dearth of employment opportunities for women was intensified economic pressure on the active males. In a 25% random sample of households in these three communities where the head was a miner, there was an average of a little over 1.5 dependants to every economically active man or woman in the household in 1871. The population of glass and ironworker households in Swinton and Kilnhurst was similarly surveyed, revealing no important differences in this respect, nor were there any important differences between the communities in terms of the average number of dependants or actual family size. The taking of lodgers influenced the statistics considerably. This practice was most common in Swinton where 30.5% of a 25% random sample of all households took one or more lodgers, compared to the 'older' industrial community of Silkstone with 21.5% of households. Dodworth was in between with 26.9%. Lodgers were most ubiquitous in households where the head was a widow, but many young immigrant families co-habited with one or more lodgers, often from the same part of the country (as identified by birth-places) and usually following the same occupation. Lodgers provided not only a boost to the household economy, but also moral support for newcomers to a district.
Overall, the Barnsley area in 1871 and after was probably typical of expanding industrial districts with a high birth rate and early average age of marriage.¹ Miners usually reached their maximum earning potential at an early age—around 20 years—but this did not prevent hardship, aggravated by the dependence on male earnings, when work was scarce, the miners were involved in disputes, or if the family was deprived of its breadwinner in one of the frequent industrial accidents. The Oaks disaster left 658 people dependent on the relief fund,² while the Denaby Main strike of 1885 created the problem of feeding '5500 mouths'.³

It has been suggested that miners' dependence on formal relief agencies was less than that of most other large scale industrial groups in the district. Yet while workhouse orders were generally not accepted,⁴ outrelief for widows and test labour for men were a not uncommon resort in exceptional circumstances like disputes and after fatal pit accidents.⁵ The often niggardly attitude of the Guardians, coupled with the tightening of Poor Law administration in general in 1869 and 1871,⁶ did not prevent a big expansion in expenditure on outrelief in the Barnsley Union in the late 1870s (a rise of nearly 19% between 1876/7 and 1877/8, for example).⁷ Many of these recipients must have been the

¹ See J. Evison's comparison of the Barnsley Poor Law Union with that of the neighbouring, predominantly rural Hemsworth Union. op.cit., (M.Phil. thesis), pp.362-78.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Jan. 1867.
³ See Chappell's appeal for support, Mexborough and Swinton Times, 16 Jan. 1885.
⁴ See, for example, the attitude of the Oaks miners in 1864 (Barnsley Chronicle, 23 April 1864).
⁵ Barnsley Chronicle Almanack 1865, p.89. See also, J. Benson, op.cit., p.3.
⁶ See E.J. Hobsbawm, Labouring Men, p.135.
⁷ Barnsley Chronicle, 30 Nov. 1878.
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families of men unable to find regular work in mining. The depression years undoubtedly witnessed hardship, although probably not for miners who were regularly employed. Pickard, in 1882, claimed that miners were earning 21/-d less per week on average than in 1874. Miners, he said, could barely afford the necessities of life. In 1893, shortly before the lockout, widespread unemployment in the local mining industry created a flood of appeals to be addressed to the Y.M.A.'s contingency fund; some of the miners were said to be 'on the verge of starvation'. Others relied on alternative community institutions to help them out of difficult times: double the normal withdrawals (about £60,000 in all) were taken out of the Barnsley British Co-operative Society's savings fund in 1869 due largely to the effects of the lockouts and bad trade of that year.

In 1893, all the normal agencies failed to meet the difficulties of over 50,000 miners and their families without their major source of income, and September of that year saw a large scale mobilisation of almost all sections of the local community in the supply of food, primarily to the children. This was less than two years after a special committee of miners was set up to provide relief services to meet distress among the dwindling population of handloom weavers. While in normal times and given regular work, the miner without an excessively large number of dependants would have had a part of his wage surplus to basic requirements, few could save enough for many contingencies. As the Mexborough and Swinton

2 Y.M.A. minutes, 22 March and 20 June 1893.
3 Cusworth Hall, Newton Chambers MSS, Trades Disputes File.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Dec. 1891.
Times commented in 1890: 'It is very rare that a miner with a large family can deplete himself of his wage-earnings resources for a period of three weeks without entailing great suffering and hardship on his family.'¹ The number of miners making use of friendly societies and other such agencies was considerable, but their ability to stave off the effects of long-term unemployment was negligible.

Nevertheless, for the majority of mining families in the district, employment was in general, fairly consistent. For the young especially, there were always new opportunities nearby even if their workplace closed temporarily or permanently. The steadily rising output and labour force (except in the late 1860s and the late 1870s) testifies to this. By the mid 1860s, the South Yorkshire miners were an advantaged group compared with those in less prosperous and less well organised coalfields and in many other trades - skilled and unskilled. Those who did not suffer redundancy at one of the few really erratic collieries (like Church Lane or Hoyland Silkstone) or were not involved in long strikes or lockouts, were likely to have survived the depression years without major crises in their domestic economies and would have had little or no contact with relief agencies. They were cushioned, moreover, from the worst effects of the general decline in wages by falling consumer prices.²

It is possible that the material gains of the early 1870s, for the most prudent, may have created a permanent rise in living standards. The Barnsley Times commented, in 1873, that trade was so good that 'excepting in the cases of the operative weavers, there cannot be many able and willing to

¹ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 21 Feb. 1890.
² K. Laybourn (op. cit., p. 51) suggests that was generally true of the working classes in Yorkshire at the time.
work, who are unable to find the means of keeping together body and soul'.\(^1\) For many this must have seemed a conservative statement. A roving correspondent of the Manchester Guardian noticed that same year that miners' houses in Silkstone were 'well furnished'.\(^2\) Some had harmoniums or even pianos which Wood, a Barnsley music seller, confirmed had recently been bought by miners at prices over £30. More expensive tobacco was being smoked and there was said to have been a marked increase in marriages. Similarly, in 1890, the recent wage advances had, in the opinion of the Mexborough and Swinton Times, noticeably reduced 'the squalor which disgraced our collier villages'.\(^3\)

Pollard tells us that the labour aristocracy in the Sheffield of the mid 1860s was using carpets and wallpaper.\(^4\) Similar trappings must have been enjoyed by miners in the district in the more prosperous years, if the Guardian's correspondent presented an accurate report. Yet the miners as a whole did not have such an acute awareness as the conventionally recognised labour aristocrats of the benefits that acquisition of 'niceties' might bestow. For many, an increase in wages did not mean a long-term change in material resources. As the Guardian correspondent suggested, the prosperity of the early 1870s had probably widened the gulf between the miner aspiring to respectability and the archetypal proletarian with rough edges. 'If he was addicted to drink, he now drinks more; if he was steady and saved, his savings

---

1 Barnsley Times, 22 March 1873.
2 Manchester Guardian, 14 May 1873.
3 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 10 Oct. 1890.
now amount to a larger sum'. Nevertheless, temptations to assume that the early 1870s moulded a large labour aristocracy in mining should be avoided until one considers the brutalising and proletarianising aspects of underground work and, to a certain extent, of life in the more squalid mining villages.

**Housing.**

The miner, skilled glassworker, engine driver or any other worker capable of saving a little of his weekly wage could equip himself with a houseful of furniture for £50, and turn his home into a repository of family virtues and sobriety. He could even buy his house through the Barnsley Permanent Building Society or one of the agents (like Isaac Haigh) for an outside institution of this type. However, we must consider whether the standard of much of working class housing and its attendant amenities in the district met the aspirations of the most socially ambitious. If it was uniformly cramped, insanitary and dreary, like much early Victorian working class housing (and even late Victorian, outside the reach of bye-law controls), it must have put a brake on many socially aspiring miners' pretensions.

Average population density per house is not an infallible guide to the living conditions inside. Houses may have been of different size and quality and the inhabitants' ability to make good use of the space available varied. Children on the

---

1 *Manchester Guardian*, 14 May 1873. The correspondent gave an example of a Sheffield miner who was 'one of the most irregular men in the colliery; some weeks he would put on a spurt and carry away 50 shillings - and another time he would content himself with three days work and receive from 25 shillings to 32 shillings. And he is only one of a very large class whose families have not improved in any way, but have rather become worse off, since wages have risen to the present rate.' (2 May 1873).
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whole needed less indoor space and some townships registered high population densities because they were bottom heavy with young, child-rearing families. However, we know that the majority of tenements in the district near the end of our period were four-room units (there was very little distinction between tenements and houses): only Worsborough had less than half its tenements in this form. Only Barnsley and Wath seem to have a significant stock of larger houses, so with the other townships, we can assume a high degree of comparability of units.

Table 17 reveals that in 1881, the year of the first census after the major influx to the district's collieries had abated, all but seven communities - Denaby and Tankersley at the upper end and Silkstone, Stainborough, Darton, Conisborough and Cawthorne at the lower - had densities of from 5.0 to 5.5 per house. In 1861, before the major expansion was well under way, eleven civil parishes were under these limits and only one - Wombwell - was above them. This trend in itself points to a combination of an increasing number of child-rearing families, more lodgers and cohabiting families, amongst other possible demographic factors: features one might expect to find in new colliery communities importing labour on a large scale. Within this general trend, it was the fastest expanding communities with a largely non-industrial base before the 1850s - Wombwell (early on), Darfield, Bolton, Denaby Main, Tankersley - which experienced the greatest positive change. Whereas the early mining settlements which expanded slowly, if at all, in the 1860s and 1870s - typified by Cawthorne - did not experience increased densities, but rather the opposite. Denaby Main and the Wharncliffe Silkstone houses (plus the Newton Chambers' Westwood Rows), the only important examples of mass colliery company housing in this early period, were clearly

1 Census Abstracts 1891.
responsible for pushing the densities of Denaby and Tankersley above six persons per house in 1881, suggesting that old people and widows were obliged to vacate colliery property making way for younger, economically active miners who were more likely to have relatives living with them.

Whatever the reasons, we can conclude from these figures that in general it was the newly expanded colliery communities serving the larger pits which accommodated a marginally larger number of people in each house than the more mature industrial centres. Evison reveals in some detail the way overcrowding occurred in the former type of community and the extent to which it was a problem. Whether the mining families were consciously aware of these small differences or subconsciously affected by them, we can only conjecture. Yet it is important to bear in mind that overcrowding did exist to a greater extent in some communities when we consider other aspects of the miners' domestic environment.

Seymour Tremenheere, in 1845, noticed that 'the colliers' houses throughout the district are, for the most part, clean and comfortable'. As a general rule, at this time, there were gardens attached and often facilities for growing potatoes. Cottages tended to be four room tenements. Around Fitzwilliam's pits in particular he praised the general facilities and sanitary arrangements. As far as the size and type of cottage was concerned, there was no major departure from this model in the second half of the century. Rate books, report of local board meetings, and the surviving plans submitted to boards of health show that there was general consensus on a basic minimum standard. The Swinton Board of

3 Ibid, p.25.
Health in 1889 established a Building and Highways Committee which had a fairly rigid and well documented control over the type of houses built in the townships. It rejected, for example, any houses with rooms less than nine feet high. Dodworth, a township of only about 2,000 people even at the end of the period, also exercised control over environmental standards. In 1867 and 1868, the local board persistently rejected the plans of one of its own members to build two-room cottages, even though there were no bye-laws prohibiting this. In 1890, a member of Mexborough Board of Health suggested that the rigid application of bye-laws would hold up expansion of the community at a critical time when plans were beginning to pour in after a long lull. Nevertheless, a motion was passed at the meeting which stated that certificates should only be granted when an approved road was built by the applicant along his section prior to house construction. This type of vigilance was not uncommon elsewhere of course. Richards and Lewis indicate that local government supervision was quite comprehensive in urban and semi-urban colliery areas in South Wales at this time. Even outside the jurisdiction of local boards in our district, there appears to have been no major examples of skimping on the size of houses; and from 1875, some rural districts acquired statutory bodies that were as vigilant as their urban counterparts. For size at least, houses in the district were similar to or slightly better than much of mid and late

1 Swinton B.H., Building and Highways Committee minutes.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 15 Sept. 1867 and 4 May 1868.
3 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 19 Dec. 1890.
5 See, for example, Wortley R.D.C. Offices, Grenoside, Wortley R.S.A. Minute books and house plans.
nineteenth century Ebbw Vale as described by F.J. Ball,\(^1\) and considerably better than some colliery housing built in Scotland in the early twentieth century.\(^2\)

In one respect, however, the miners' housing environment as a whole deteriorated after the post-railway expansion got under way. The gardens and smallholding facilities noticed by Tremenheere in 1845 were available only to those relatively few miners living in the shrinking number of rural hamlets. Housing density increased and settlements became more uniform and drab, with bricks tending to replace stone as a building material especially east of Barnsley. Neville's assertion that the 'typical pre-1900 Yorkshire mining village was laid out on a uniform plan which involved the minimum cost',\(^3\) however, overlooks the fact that most housing in the major part of South Yorkshire under study (and much of the older part of the West Yorkshire coalfield) was built piecemeal, albeit with haste in certain peak demand years. Large numbers of firms were at work and they did not necessarily benefit from a gridiron plan - if indeed there was any joint consultation or supervision at all with respect to overall design. Much of the new housing simply filled spaces in established settlements which usually straggled out along the main arteries. In Barnsley, the old central court pattern of building was superseded in the second half of the century by a semi-grid pattern, severely adapted by the topography of the town.


2 Coalowners of Scotland, Housing of Miners in Scotland (Glasgow, 1925-6).

There were examples of settlements built on green field sites to house the influx of miners prompted by a major local sinking. Denaby Main with its high density and uncompromising format, and the slightly more generous Wharncliffe Silkstone, have been discussed already. Most of the coalfield communities, however, were built by a varying number of independent operators. Gilroyd, in the southern corner of Dodworth, was built primarily for the miners of Strafford Main by a number of small building concerns and was supervised, reluctantly, by the local board who eventually extracted the cost of maintaining the roads from the owners of the houses in proportion to their frontage. Similar communities were built in Swinton (Roman Terrace), Darfield (Low Valley), Hoyland (Hoyland Common) and several other townships, especially towards the east of the district. None of these were occupied exclusively by miners' families nor dominated by employers' housing. In Swinton as a whole, for example, in the period 1855-65, the principle owners of houses of all types were Earl Fitzwilliam, the Charlesworth brothers, Enoch Darke, John Ashforth, Joshua Peckett and William Cresswell. Only the first two had important economic interests in the neighbourhood other than the houses themselves, and the houses they owned were only 30 and 25 respectively. Even as late as 1899, with accelerating demand, no local employers or any other interest had established a monopoly of house ownership. The largest owners were the Hattersley brothers, local foundry operators (with 132 houses probably as investments), Earl Fitzwilliam (87), the Manvers Main Collieries Co. (52) and Lineham, a speculative builder (44).

1 See, for example, Dodworth B.H. minutes, 26 Feb. 1894.
2 Swinton B.H., Rate Valuation Book 1855 and supplement.
3 Ibid, Rate Valuation Book 1899.
House rents in the early years of the period were generally much lower than at the end. In Silkstone in the mid 1860s, the Clarke colliers were paying about 2/-d on average for well-built four room cottages. Builders' costs at the time were fairly stable, but the accelerating demand of the 1860s and 1870s plus increases in the pay of journeymen masons and bricklayers began to push up the value and cost of houses, although pressure on land prices was not yet significant, except perhaps in Barnsley. A correspondent in the Barnsley Chronicle commented in 1866 that at that time, money invested in new houses did not yield 'ordinary' interest rates. But by 1874, the Barnsley Permanent Building Society could claim that there was a shortage of about 1,000 homes in the borough and that buyers were willing to pay inflated prices for those being built.

As house prices and rents rose steeply (Clarke's rents in Silkstone averaged 5/3d in 1880) they met a steady fall in family purchasing power and in the middle depression years, probably for the first time in the period, poverty and housing became interconnected. Housebuilding stagnated, despite a rising population, and overcrowding may have become more acute in the early 1880s. As Table 18 suggests, in Barnsley at least, the supply of new houses was always a little behind when one might have expected demand to have been highest. This points even more to the operation of small building firms unwilling to risk their capital. Colliery companies would have tended to build their houses in advance of the opening of their pits.

1 S.C.L., CR 88, Check Wage Book,
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 15 Sept. 1866.
3 Ibid, 5 April 1874.
4 S.C.L., CR 124.
Many miners were paying about a quarter of their weekly income in rent (assuming no support from other economically active members of the family), a fact that undoubtedly put pressure on families to take lodgers, thus restricting their use of the available space. There was also downward pressure exerted on standards of building and maintenance as house-owners attempted to keep rents to a minimum in order to inject some life into a stagnant market. As Evison points out, speculatively-built houses with inferior materials, work and sanitation could be erected for less than half the cost of more enduring property, but with disadvantages that were soon made evident to the tenants. Houses were being built in Silkstone in 1884 for £50, while the average elsewhere in the 1880s seems to have been about £80 and in the 1890s, £120.

Bye-laws were increasingly brought to bear on these discrepancies, especially after 1875 and there remains today, visual evidence of their successful implementation with respect to basic physical standards. In neighbourhoods outside their control, in the standards of older houses and in maintenance there remained problems. But as with wage differentials, there could have been no violent contrasts among miners' houses due to their ability to pick and choose to a certain extent (except when supply lagged far behind demand). Only in the most static communities were these forces of the market minimised; yet the Fitzwilliam and Clarke housing seems to have been better rather than worse than average. One black spot that remained was Denaby Main and Conisborough which lacked a local board or urban district

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 14 June 1884.
3 Ibid, 29 March 1884. There were still a few cellar dwellings, one-room tenements for families with no through ventilation and dwellings with earth floors in Barnsley - isolated relics of the worst of the pre-Board of Health building.
council until well into the twentieth century, largely through the influence of the colliery company. Yet in one year alone - 1889, when the sinking of Cadeby Main began - 378 houses were scheduled for construction.¹

Amenities and health.

So far we have only dealt with the questions of space and of the general fabric of houses, and only touched on the more contentious issue of sanitation in so far as it is implicit in the relationship between the economies of house building and the constraints imposed by local authorities. Responsibility for public health, even as late as the 1890s, was not firmly apportioned in urban as well as rural areas. Builders and house landlords retained a considerable amount of leeway in the provision of water, design of middens and the removal of sewage, until comprehensive schemes were introduced late in the century by most local authorities in the district. Even then, new and outlying property was often equipped with these amenities only after delays of some years. By 1894, twelve townships in the district had urban powers, giving some indication of the awareness of the local ratepayers of the terms of the Public Health Acts and how they related to their own local problems, although it does not necessarily give us an infallible guide to differing levels of sanitaryness or to the likelihood that major efforts were taken to alleviate the problems.

Barnsley began to receive piped water from the River Dearne after 1837;² but in 1860, the Board of Health found it necessary to draw up an ambitious scheme to draw fresh water from a damned stream at Ingbirchworth in the hills to the west.³ After much opposition both within and outside the

¹ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 28 Feb. 1890.
² R. Jackson, op. cit., p. 140.
³ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 3 Nov. 1860.
Board, the scheme was implemented, costing the township over ten times the original capital raised for the 1837 Waterworks.¹ Many of the surrounding townships, including Dodworth, Silkstone, Monk Bretton, Ardsley and Worsborough, drew some of their supply from this source, thus instigating an early programme of public works which might not have been carried out for many years in isolation from developments in Barnsley. A tradition of high rate income was begun, made possible by the considerable rate liability of the colliery concerns.²

The more rural parishes around Barnsley, like Stainborough, did not benefit from these piped supplies and relied on wells until late in the period or beyond.³ Townships to the east also were thrown on their own initiative. Hoyland had laid on an adequate piped supply by 1882, but outlying hamlets like Stubbin tended to be neglected.⁴ Wombwell and Darfield did not commence a comprehensive scheme of their own until 1883.⁵ A reservoir was built at Swinton which began supplying houses from the mains in 1880, after the ratepayers petitioned to be excluded from the Dearne Valley Water Company scheme on grounds of its expense.⁶ This latter scheme supplied several townships to the north and west of Swinton, but was by no means a final answer to their water needs. Meanwhile, Swinton's autonomous scheme ran into trouble shortly after it was

¹ White's Directory of Sheffield 1879.
² Wombwell's rate value rose 354% between 1850 and 1868, the highest % rise in the district. Second was Dodworth with 264%, Barnsley Chronicle, 11 July 1868.
³ This was the situation in Stainborough and Billingley (just north of Darfield) in 1887, Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Feb. 1887.
⁵ Ibid, 1 March 1884.
⁶ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 11 March 1881.
completed in the central part of the township. From the mid 1880s, water was persistently in short supply in the summer and, as early as 1889, new supplies were sought to alleviate the health risk.¹ The Ingbirchworth scheme in the Barnsley area proved more enduring, but in the summer of 1890, the Barnsley Council warned some of the outlying parishes that, after the end of 1891, it could not guarantee to maintain supplies.² Nevertheless, a considerable degree of responsibility was taken off the shoulders of the bodies responsible for these townships in the period under study and the general health of those communities must have benefited.

The removal of sewage and the provision of adequate domestic sanitary arrangements was, however, the concern of each township and room for discrepancies was thus created. The Barnsley Rural Sanitary Authority was still responsible for two or three large mining villages in 1888, when it was reported that, except in a small part of Hoyland township, no scheme for the final disposal of sewage was in operation within its boundaries other than the removal of the waste to the nearest watercourse.³ At Hoyle Mill in Ardsley, in that year, pipes had been laid to service the Oaks colliery houses, but sewage still flowed in open ditches.

A similar state of inertia existed in the townships of Silkstone and Cawthorne, the responsibility of the Penistone Rural Sanitary Authority. In September 1893 the West Riding Solicitor gave notice that a main drains scheme must be implemented in those places due to their role in polluting the Rivers Dearne and Dove.⁴ A scheme costing £2,976 was

¹ Swinton B.I.I. minutes and Nuisance Inspectors' Report Books 1880-4; M.O.H. Reports 1889 and 1891.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 16 Aug. 1890.
drawn up for Silkstone, but rejected on grounds of cost. A cheaper scheme was eventually approved in February 1898 after further warnings from the County authorities. The intervention of municipal and administrative authority was clearly resented in paternalistic and still basically rural communities like Silkstone. Silkstone's well-drained topography enabled it to avoid many of the problems of inadequate sanitary engineering while creating hazards for their neighbours downstream. The ratepayers of Silkstone also had to be cajoled by the Local Government Board in 1899 into adopting building bye-laws and a system of public scavenging.

Dodworth, larger and able to boast of a board of health from 1865, yet still semi-rural, did not bite the cherry of comprehensive sewage disposal until the 1890s. As the Barnsley Chronicle expressed it in 1881, the Dodworth Board of Health, acted like many others, mostly as a mediator between offending and offended interests in cases of minor nuisances and infringements on property rights, concentrating until 1890 on 'street gullies, sink drains, ashpits and kindred subjects'. Like Silkstone, it was considered to be a relatively healthy township, largely because of its position to the west of and above Barnsley. In 1890, however, after complaints to the Local Government Board made by local residents about the pollution of streams in the township, a scheme for new mains drainage and a sewage farm was mooted and approved. The cost was estimated at £3,590, exclusive of land.

1 Ibid, February 1898.
2 Ibid, December 1899.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 July 1881.
4 Ibid, 3 May 1890.
5 Dodworth B.H. minutes, 30 June and 31 Oct. 1890.
In contrast, Swinton was typical of several of the larger townships to the east of Barnsley, expanding rapidly through the sinking of a large new pit in 1870 (Manvers Main) and the growth of older ones (Thrybergh Hall and Warren Vale). Approximately 300 houses were erected between 1871 and early 1875 and the Local Board was obliged to start work on mains drainage immediately after its formation in 1876. Work commenced on a sewage farm in 1881 after the M.S. and L. Railway Company threatened court action if sewage continued to be pumped into their canal. A similar scheme was completed in the central part of the large township of Hoyland (a community perhaps resembling Swinton more than any in terms of its economic infrastructure) at about the same time.

Provision of mains drainage and the efficient disposal of sewage were by no means sufficient conditions for a healthy community. Privy accommodation and the siting and drainage of individual properties, for example, remained intractable problems in Swinton as elsewhere and required the constant vigilance of full-time sanitary inspectors where they were employed. The local Medical Officers of Health often had an uphill task persuading the less motivated authorities to act.

Evison demonstrates that death rates from infectious diseases between 1856 and 1875 were in some cases (from diarrhoea, for example) as much as four times as high in the Barnsley Union parishes as in the largely rural Hemsworth Union to the north east. Infant mortality as a whole was also much higher in the Barnsley Union over the same period.

1 Rotherham Advertiser, 27 Feb. 1875
2 Swinton B.H., M.O.H. report 1876.
3 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 11 March 1881.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 17 Feb. 1883.
The reasons for the higher rates in the industrialised union, he claims were overcrowding, an insanitary water supply and a higher crude birth rate which inevitably had as its counterpart a high rate of infant mortality. Table 19 gives returns from Swinton which, supplemented by the M.O.H. reports, indicate that the public works of the early 1880s did have an immediate if minor impact on the previously consistently high death rate. This had, it seems, been aggravated especially by deaths from infectious diseases contracted in the first five years of life. It was these deaths that were reduced by implementing a 'safe' water supply and the tightening of bye-laws regulating the building of privvies. The evidence from the Barnsley Rural Sanitary Authority and several of the other townships is, unfortunately, patchy and inconclusive. The death rates in the former's area of responsibility varied between 19.00 and 23.47 from 1881-88, for example, with no obvious trend either way.  

The most consistent fact emerging from the plentiful but unsystematic data on health and public works in this area is that a certain type of neighbourhood almost always got a bad deal in relation to the rest. In 1889, the Swinton M.O.H. stated explicitly what could be deduced from the regular reports emanating from the officers of the local board of health. Kilnhurst, he claimed, was 'much the most unhealthy part of your district'. 2 Kilnhurst was a low-lying, almost exclusively working class appendage to the village of Swinton, containing no major through roads and thus rather neglected. A special report on privvies and pigsties accompanying the 1889 M.O.H. Report found that, apart from the houses owned by the enterprising local Co-operative Society in Kilnhurst, there was little to enthuse over. Many houses, especially the

1 See annual reports of the Barnsley R.S.A. in the Barnsley Chronicle.

2 Swinton B.H., M.O.H. report 1889.
older ones were built in yards not conforming to the local bye-laws. Kilnhurst's expansion - mostly in the 1850s and 1860s with the development of Thrybergh Hall and Warren Vale collieries and the local glassworks - had largely taken place before the establishment of the local board of health. Piccadilly, a similar outlying neighbourhood in Swinton, and one or two notoriously overcrowded and insanitary streets in the canal area of Swinton village itself also appeared regularly in the Medical Officers' reports in unsavoury circumstances. In 1883, an outbreak of enteric fever, originating probably from a contaminated well in one of the Kilnhurst yards, claimed seven lives in one of these streets alone out of a total of 22 deaths from that cause in the township in that year. The M.O.H., Dr. Blythman, resigned in August of that year because of the local board's neglect in closing the wells which had been found to be polluted. This was just one year before mains water was installed in that part of the township and there were only three deaths from enteric fever in the ensuing ten years.

The example of Kilnhurst was repeated in several locations in the district where the expansion of the period from the late 1850s to the mid 1870s created working class adjuncts to the more organically developed and socially heterogeneous older communities, like Dodworth, Mexborough and Hoyland, before the rigid application of bye-laws and the instigation of major public works schemes improved the environmental and sanitary conditions of the communities as a whole. These adjuncts tended to be the last to be served with the new amenities even though it was their state of public health that prompted the outlay on the schemes in the first place. Low Valley and Snape Hill, hamlets built in the main to house the miners of Darfield and Wombwell Main, tended to be the

1 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 31 Aug. 1883.
2 Swinton B.H., M.O.H. reports 1884-93.
unhealthiest neighbourhoods in Darfield township, Low Valley witnessing two thirds of the township's fatalities from zymotic diseases in 1875. ¹  Fincken, the manager of Hoyland Silkstone, found as a result of a private investigation in 1891 that Hoyland Common was by far the worst neighbourhood in the large township of Hoyland Nether, claiming that in one spot, 128 people shared four middens. ² Hoyland Common was a rapidly expanding community inhabited largely by the miners of Hoyland Silkstone, Barrow, Rockingham and Wharncliffe Silkstone, four of the largest pits in South Yorkshire. It had no piped water in 1881. ³ Hoyle Mill, the ageing company-built community in Ardsley, and Stairfoot at the other end of that township, were similarly neglected. Gilroyd, Dodworth Bottom and Silver Street were blackspots on the relatively good health record of the township of Dodworth. Each was a new, expanding miners' quarter, low-lying in comparison with the main village, and constantly cropping up in the M.O.H. reports. Eventually the board of health took steps to abate one of the most persistent complaints: the state of the streets, sewerage and guttering in Gilroyd which they had, up to the early 1890s, ignored on the grounds that the development was entirely in private hands. ⁴

When the Medical Officer of Health to the Doncaster Rural Sanitary Authority issued his annual report for 1884, Denaby Main came in for special scrutiny. ⁵ Its high overall death rate concealed the fact that over 80% of all deaths in 1884 were of children under five. Denaby Main was a community of young families it was true, and therefore more likely to register a high rate of infant mortality. But overcrowding, particularly through the taking of lodgers and the cohabiting

² Barnsley Chronicle, 25 July 1881.
⁴ Dodworth B.H., minutes 26 Feb. 1894.
⁵ Barnsley Chronicle, 24 Jan. 1885.
of complete families, was blamed in the report. The poor physical state of the buildings and the lack of washing facilities were also mentioned. That same year, an outbreak of smallpox in the neighbourhood prompted the M.O.H. to the Mexborough Board to suggest that Denaby Main should be taken under their jurisdiction in order to improve conditions there and to reduce the threat to Mexborough posed by Denaby's insanitary state.¹ Mexborough, however, seems already to have been adversely affected by the housing provided for the miners of Denaby colliery and to have done little or nothing to alleviate the poor conditions associated with it. In 1872, John Normansell visited the 'low end' of Mexborough during another outbreak of smallpox and described the miners' houses there as 'fearful to be in' with inadequate drainage and insanitary location of privvies.²

A familiar pattern emerges from these examples. Where miners and other working class groups (notably glassworkers and iron and steel workers) required new housing on a mass scale in the years of industrial expansion, much of the need was met by the creation of these adjunctive hamlets. In many respects they formed part of existing communities, unlike the isolated pit rows of parts of West Durham, for example. But they tended to be neglected, pushed to the back of the queue for amenities and services until either they became a health hazard to the community at large or a self-help effort from within emerged to alleviate the situation.³ Miners and other workers in the worst of these new neighbourhoods may have developed an awareness of relative deprivation similar to that

¹ Ibid, 7 Feb. 1885.
² S.Y.M.A. minutes (Normansell's notes), 3 June 1872.
³ See, for example, Edward Rymor's activities at Sharlston and Monk Bretton, E.A.Rymer, op.cit., pp. 18-19, 26-7. The miners of Low Valley in Darfield decided in 1875 to implement their own feast day parallel to that of the mother parish, Barnsley Chronicle, 17 July 1875.
of the Barnsley linenweavers in the appallingly neglected quarter of Wilson's Piece in the first half of the century. \(^1\)

By the 1870s, however, expectations were higher and this experience may have helped to develop a more identifiable working class consciousness amongst the miners of Denaby Main, Gilroyd, Hoyland Common and other notoriously under-serviced communities. \(^2\)

Taking a wider perspective, it is easy to see that these forces, in general, did not operate on the scale they did in some other coalfields. In 1845, a visitor to the area recognised the value of the spatial pattern of the pre-railway days.

Not living, usually, in long rows of cottages inhabited exclusively by colliers, but being mixed up with the rest of the population, (Yorkshire miners) partake of the general habits of the labouring classes in Yorkshire, which are those of attention to domestic propriety and cleanliness. \(^3\)

Contrast this impression with the reputation of Kilnhurst in mid-century as an out of the way neighbourhood where the inhabitants (miners and ironworkers) were said to be 'addicted to barbarous, ignorant and savage customs'. \(^4\)

In 1861, however, Kilnhurst instituted one of the most successful independent co-operative retailing societies in Yorkshire: a sign of the awareness of the need to establish its own identity through self help. Even Barnsley had developed


\(^2\) Compare the insanitary housing of 'low Mexborough' with one of the first examples of speculation in villa residences in the district: that of Adwick Road, Mexborough, advertised as 'a suburban retreat for our aristocracy', *Mexborough and Swinton Times*, 1 Oct. 1880.

\(^3\) Report of the Commissioner under the Act 5 and 6 Vict. c.99 (1845), p.20.

"miners' strongholds" by 1871, unlike in earlier decades when they were sprinkled fairly evenly and sparsely over a town dominated by linen weavers.¹ But in towns as large as Barnsley, they lacked the geographical isolation necessary to create a full sense of belonging to a disadvantaged community, unlike the weavers in an earlier period.

Suggestions that community design, location and amenity provision had an important influence on miners' collective attitudes can only be tentative at best. But they may have added weight to the variables in the industrial field. There were, however, several countervailing forces to the militancy of deprivation in the district under study. One was the lack of identification between colliery and house ownership; another may have been a relatively high level of homeownership, the reputed extent of which surprised the Select Committee on Coal in 1873.² There were also the channels provided by institutions in the townships for selected working class community leaders to use as roads out of the cultural isolation imposed on them. These will be examined in later chapters.

² S.C. on Coal (1873), QQ 7382-3.
Employment status of women in both mining and non-mining families in Swinton (with Kilnhurst), Dodworth and Silkstone, 1871.

N.B. Only women over the age of thirteen have been considered (excluding those referred to as scholars). Wives of lodgers have been included in the totals for wives of household heads.

H.o.H. = Head of Household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Swinton (with Kilnhurst)</th>
<th>Dodworth</th>
<th>Silkstone</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.o.H. (Women)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons not employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Women</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.o.H. (Women)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Women</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employed women as a percentage of all women over thirteen (but not scholars) 20% 19% 20% 20%

Source: Census enumerators' returns, 1871.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darton</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barugh</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk Bretton</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawthorne</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainborough</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankersley</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsborough</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombwell</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwick upon Dearne</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath upon Dearne</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton upon Dearne</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexborough</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denaby</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conisborough</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study area***  
5.0  5.2

*Plus the rest of Ecclesfield township.

Source: Census Abstracts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of plans</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>166 Houses erected &amp; certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Jan. 1887, 28 Dec. 1889, 7 Jan. 1893.
**TABLE 19**

Mortality rates, infant mortality and deaths from infectious diseases in Swinton Board of Health area, 1876-94.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mortality per 1000 inhabitants</th>
<th>Deaths of children aged under five and as % of all deaths</th>
<th>All deaths from infectious diseases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>84 - 61%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>82 - 56%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>94 - 59%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>93 - 57%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>108 - 64%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>74 - 51%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>120 - 66%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>78 - 48%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>78 - 51%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>110 - 59%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>98 - 64%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>80 - 48%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>71 - 50%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>102 - 56%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>88 - 46%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>20.1*</td>
<td>108 - 55%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>120 - 58%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>107 - 55%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>91 - 60%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Registrar General had over-estimated the actual increase in population in Swinton between 1881 and 1891 by about 2,000, hence the mortality rates for the late 1880s in particular were underestimated.*

*Source: Reports of the Medical Officer of Health for Swinton Board of Health area.*
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Occupational Structure of the Communities and Inter-Occupational Association.
The bulk of the miners lived in small pit villages and hamlets where there was far less occupational diversity than in the kind of built-up area that merited the status of an Urban District. ¹

This conclusion by Gregory about mining communities in the early twentieth century lends support to the 'isolated mass' explanation of the comparative militancy of miners. ² 'Intensely close-knit societies which tended to be cut off from the rest of the world' were, in Gregory's opinion, the result of this perceived isolation; and a unique type of camaraderie developed, based on the peculiarity of the miners' work. This view is supported by Neville, writing generally about the Yorkshire coalfield in the forty years around the turn of the century.

A large proportion of the Yorkshire mining population lived in straggling villages like Featherstone, Altofts, South Elmsall and Wombwell, which were distinctly separate from the main centres of population. This remoteness promoted strong occupation-centred communities and prevented other sections of society from understanding the miner and his problems. ³

Statistics from the 1911 Census Abstracts are used by Gregory to suggest that South Yorkshire, though more densely populated than his stereotype above, was no different from elsewhere in terms of occupational homogeneity. Bolton, Darfield and Wombwell were examples of Urban Districts with over 70% of all occupied males in mining in 1911.

Several qualifications must be made before we can accept this evidence. First, the examples given from the 1911 census

¹ R. Gregory, op.cit., p.2.
were extreme, though not isolated ones. Several of the smaller townships had equally high percentages of miners among their adult working males and other large U.D.s had over 60% of their adult males in mining - Hoyland and Worsborough - in 1911. Others had considerably less: Swinton with 52.8%, Mexborough with 41.5% and Barnsley with 34.9%, yet each was surrounded by large collieries in 1911.

A second point to note in this context is that the mining population in most South Yorkshire townships had increased at the expense of other extractive and manufacturing industries, though not usually in relation to employment in the service sector. A third point is that the growth of many of the communities in our district at least, had progressed beyond the stage when they could be described as 'small villages and hamlets'. Fourth, the proximity of both mines and settlements, one to another, and the ease of daily and residential mobility severely reduced the extent to which most of the communities in the district could be described as 'cut off'. The first three examples of pit villages given by Neville were, in fact, rather isolated and relatively new communities, more typical of the later phase of expansion into the Doncaster area. Wombwell and most others in our district were not (nor, for example, were the homes of many of the miners in the pits within a wide arc of Leeds).

This lack of isolation, it must be emphasised, was a distinctive feature of the district under study and even here, there were examples of relatively homogeneous and discrete mining communities like Silkstone (described in 1844 as

1 Census Abstracts 1911.

2 Several of the miners killed in the Oaks explosion in 1866 lived between four and six miles away, Barnsley Chronicle, 22 Dec. 1866.

3 See Manchester Guardian, 23 May 1873.
'perhaps one of the most purely collier populations in the kingdom'), Wharncliffe Silkstone, Woolley, the Westwood Rows and Denaby Main. There were also, as the last chapter suggested, neighbourhoods in the large townships which were more exclusively collier-dominated and which developed a strong sense of their own identity as working class communities. But in general, as has been emphasised, the typical living environment of the South Yorkshire miners in the period 1855-94 was one of co-existence with other occupational groups in or on the edge of overgrown villages with plenty of contact with neighbouring communities, if only through the regular district demonstrations or even more regular sub-district mass meetings. (Miners also tended to do the rounds of the district's village feasts in summer and autumn.2) The development of social and other types of contacts with other groups, moreover, seems to have been reciprocal and the South Yorkshire community at large soon became sensitive both to the value and the drawbacks of a large mining population in their midst.

Chapter One illustrated the wide variety of industry carried on in the various townships of the district, none, however, eclipsing mining as the largest employer by 1874. Barhsley, obviously was an example of an occupationally mixed community, but townships such as Mexborough, Worsborough, Hoyland, Swinton, Rawmarsh and Ardsley contained a significant number of other occupations to dilute the mining presence. To illustrate this phenomenon, the Census returns for Silkstone, Dodworth and Swinton (with Kilnhurst) in 1871 are broken down in terms of groupings of declared occupations (Tables 20 and 21).


2 Miners prosecuted for drunkenness at these feasts often lived many miles away.
Use of such data suffers from the normal weaknesses of early census enumeration.¹ But in broad outline, the statistics reveal the differences in occupational structure that existed in a district containing, at one extreme, one or two small, solidly mining communities like Silkstone;² several communities, especially around Barnsley, where large-scale mining was a newer phenomenon but had nevertheless almost superseded an important early industrial base (in Dodworth's case, handloom weaving); and occupationally mixed communities like Swinton, typical of those nearer the major iron and steel centres of Rotherham and Sheffield.

Apart from the obvious variation in the proportion of miners to the total male working population, a number of other observations must be made about the differing occupational environments of these three townships. One, which has been mentioned above, is the proportion of women defined in the Census as being employed. Expressed as a percentage of the total employed population in each community, the figures are: Silkstone - 10.5%; Dodworth - 9.6%; Swinton - 14.5%. The Dodworth figure probably underestimates the number of economically active women more than the others because it fails to take into account the many women who worked at handlooms with their husbands and fathers, but were not mentioned in the census as such. Nevertheless, the difference between Swinton and the more predominantly mining communities is significant. This becomes even more obvious if we exclude the domestic servants who made up a smaller proportion of working women in Swinton and Kilnhurst than in the others. The dominance of mining in Silkstone and to a lesser extent in Dodworth, while eclipsing other industries, also excluded work for women.

¹ See M. Drake, 'The Census 1801-1891', in E. A. Wrigley, Nineteenth Century Society (Cambridge University Press, 1972), especially pp. 29-30. The problem of distinguishing small masters from journeymen need not trouble us in this case as we are concerned principally with occupational not socio-economic groups.

² Some of these had an earlier rural industrial base; others, like Danaby Main, were entirely new communities.
A second feature is the evidence of a more advanced stage of urbanisation in Swinton, when compared with Silkstone and to a lesser extent Dodworth. Both Silkstone and Dodworth had a larger number of men working in farming than Swinton, although the townships were similar in size. The encroachments made by industry, housing, urban amenities and marginal blight was already making an important topographical impact on Swinton, pushing farming to the fringe, economically and even geographically. Another indication of Swinton's greater advance towards an urban threshold was the vastly superior range of services offered and the proportionately higher number of workers in the service sector (including clerks and a significant proportion of 'labourers' who were employed in the maintenance of parish amenities\(^1\)). These services included a toyshop, a bookshop, two full-time barbers, a chimney sweep, two doctors, an auctioneer and an attorney. Silkstone, with about half the population of Dodworth, lagged far behind the latter even in the provision of basic village services like provisions dealers, shoemakers and building workers. Silkstone, in 1871, showed no signs of expanding, industrially or demographically, unlike Dodworth and, even more, Swinton. Tradesmen were in some cases as mobile in this respect as other sectors of the population.\(^2\) Trade directories of the area indicate that other townships of a similar size to Swinton - Wombwell, Mexborough, Rawmarsh, etc. - had a well-developed service sector by 1871, while Dodworth and others of its size tended to stagnate in this respect when the collapse of the bocm signalled a temporary end to population growth.

\(^1\) See Swinton B.H., Vestry Minute Books.

\(^2\) The Bower family, for example, were, for several generations masons in Silkstone and Stainborough until, around 1870, one or more economically active members seem to have moved to Swinton to exploit the demand for housing there. Compare White's Directories of Sheffield.
The experience of living in busy, occupationally heterogeneous and often prosperous communities like Swinton must have been vastly different from that in the stereotyped isolated mining community. Even the smaller settlements away from the main population axis in the district - Cawthorne, Bolton, etc., - had access to these urban facilities, involving perhaps a two-hour round trip on foot to the regular retail markets in the larger townships. The number of Dodworth, Ardsley, Darton and Monk Bretton miners convicted of drunkenness in Barnsley on Saturday nights shows that this length of trip was no barrier to other activities. Miners in one or two of the outermost communities - Silkstone, Westwood and Woolley - may have had rather a different experience. The only evidence of colliery 'tommy' shops in this district is found at Silkstone and at the Newton Chambers' works in the 1840s.\(^1\) The fact that all three of these communities developed passive industrial responses to overbearing paternalistic regimes may have been partly a function of their relative peripheralness in a coalfield geared to mobility and mixing.

**Occupational mixing.**

Evidence of the co-existence in a township of miners and other industrial and service groups does not, of course, imply that there was necessarily a high degree of social mixing. Residential segregation within a township may have been just one factor that could have precluded this and may have set up antagonisms and distances greater than those existing between a homogeneous mining community and groups outside. Evidence of a certain degree of occupational clustering comes from a perusal of the Census enumerators' returns for the district in 1872. Concentrations of bleachers in the Greenfoot

\(^1\) S.C.L., CR 49, Workmen's Ledger; for information about the 'tommy shop' at Newton Chambers', I am grateful to Trevor Lodge, local historian and former employee of that firm.
neighbourhood in the north ward of Barnsley, for example, adds a third dimension to the residential differentiation between miners and linen weavers noted by Kaijage in some parts of Barnsley. Weavers, apart from occupying the old central areas of the town around the High Street, also were predominant in the south-west ward around Shaw Street, Longcar Street, Lancaster Street and at Kingstone Place. Miners congregated in the Old Town (in the north-west of the borough), on the Gawber Road, at Pogmoor and Slackhills in the west, and on Honeywell Street in the north-east. Many of these miners would have worked at collieries outside the borough boundaries, like Church Lane, East Gawber and Monk Bretton.

Most of the old linen weaving out-townships revealed the survival of small scale handloom 'ghettoes': the western edge of Monk Bretton, the Common area of Worsborough and some central courts in Dodworth, for example. Workers at the Milton and Elsecar ironworks complex showed some tendency to cluster in Hoyland and, to a lesser extent, in Wombwell. High Elsecar, central areas of Hoyland like Netherfield and Prospect Terrace and Jump and Kit Royd in Wombwell were largely settled by ironworkers (and especially puddlers), while Hoyland Common, Platts Common and Blacker Hill (outlying neighbourhoods in Hoyland) and the bulk of Wombwell were more mixed with miners predominating. In a similar way, there were parts of the parish of Ecclesfield with heavy concentrations of ironworkers (with some grades, such as puddlers, furnacemen and moulders predominating in different quarters) while others were evenly balanced by miners.

Glassworkers, while tending to be encouraged to live as near to their works as possible because of the irregular nature of the work stint, were rarely homogeneously clustered.

The industry in South Yorkshire tended to grow up side by side with mining and this mix is reflected in the workers' residential pattern. Only in Mexborough, where the major influx of miners did not begin until the late 1860s - ten years after the glass industry was established there - do we find any clustering (near the River Don on Dolcliffe Road and Common Side). There were also a few minor examples of this tendency from lesser trades, such as potters in Kilnhurst and engine fitters near the South Yorkshire Railway plant at Swinton Bridge.

Clearly several factors were at work in developing this pattern. One was the fossilisation of early forms of occupancy in which the early, occupationally homogeneous inhabitants of a street or neighbourhood passed their homes on to workers in the same industry (whether they rented or owned them) through family or work-based contacts. This in itself implies a degree of segregation in social mixing and a lack of inter-generational occupational mobility that may not have existed on a significant scale. If this practice had been at work, however, the incoming miners would have largely been excluded from the central neighbourhoods of the townships and created a demand for larger and larger adjuncts like Hoyland Common and Gilroyd. This appears to have been the case only on a limited scale.

A second factor must have been the impact of the journey to work on residential choice. A large township like Hoyland does present the distance factor in some relief, with miners at Hoyland Silkstone tending to live at Platts Common, near the pit, and those at Wharncliffe Silkstone finding homes in Hoyland Common. The effort of carting the yarn and the finished linen to and from the Barnsley warehouses imposed even stricter limitations on residence for the handloom weavers. The existence of tied housing, a third factor, was allied to this and, on the limited scale on which it operated, it was clearly the most potent agent of segregation. Not all
such housing was near the works (in the case of some handloom weavers' cottages, it bore no relationship to the employers' centres of operations), but in the case of some glassworkers' cottages for example, it clearly was. Many of the quarters where occupational segregation was at its highest (among those mentioned above) bore the name of the employer concerned with the local industry, suggesting the presence of tied cottages. Dawes Buildings in Hoyland (ironworkers), Young's Cottages in Wombwell (ironworkers), Wilkinson's Houses in Worsborough (handloom weavers), Jackson's Square in Dodworth (handloom weavers) and Blunn's Yard in Kilnhurst (glassworkers) were the dominant examples, as were the few tied pit communities mentioned earlier. Earl Fitzwilliam's ironstone miners were clustered in tied cottages in rural hamlets around Wentworth.

A fourth possibility is that of the more general operation of segregational forces within the community through the housing market and possibly social ostracism. Clustering based on major class differentials obviously existed in the urban environment of Barnsley. The villa residences of Cockerham and other suburban retreats and the large town houses of Regent Street and other central frontages, abounded with linen manufacturers, a few coalowners and professional men. But in the out-townships, except for the preference of the big bourgeoisie and the landowners for living in large houses in the rural and usually elevated parts of the parishes, there is no evidence that middle class quarters had developed by 1871, even if there was some speculation in villa 'estates' by the 1880s. Only Wath proved the exception. An old market town and centre of a wealthy ecclesiastical parish, pleasantly sited and laid out, Wath resisted the worst environmental encroachments of the coal industry and kept miners away from the old part of the village until late in the nineteenth century. Quarters such as Burlington Street and Fitzwilliam

1 Ibid.
Street were favoured locations for retired professional men and annuitants as well as economically active entrepreneurs and managers from surrounding townships. In the 1874 Register of Electors, one in 16.6 of Wath's population was represented, compared with one in only 36.8 of the more proletarian Wombwell's.

If this type of purposeful clustering existed amongst working class groups - the more advantaged in the housing market, presumably being the active element - we could not isolate it from other factors. But whatever the cause of intra-class segregation, it has been seen to have existed only on a small scale in most communities and in distinctive and identifiable ways in one or two others. Overall, the impression a survey of the district in 1871 leaves us with is one of an interdependent series of occupationally-integrated towns and villages rather than a number of small discrete occupational communities. One important feature of the pattern in most enumerators' districts in 1871, was that miners were the predominant occupational group if not in the majority of all occupied males. This, and their overtly strong trade union ties, tended to stamp their mark on the townships in the district, orienting services and some of the formal institutions to meet their special needs even if those institutions were rarely controlled by the miners themselves in this period. This dominance, however, should not have prevented the miners from receiving feedback from other working class groups and their labour traditions. Before examining this relationship, we should attempt to assess two other indicators of the degree of social mixing: inter-occupational mobility in individual careers and within families.

We have seen examples of the upwardly mobile collier and colliery book-keeper becoming viewers and managers in the coalfield of the 1870s. There are also isolated examples of colliers becoming entrepreneurs, such as Henry Lodge who
progressed from collier to checkweighman to colliery agent and finally to pit owner (Darton, Stanhope Silkstone and Ryhill Main - to the north of the district). As Hobsbawm suggests, however, the prospects of a certain type of skilled worker 'setting up independently or joining the employing classes' became less feasible late in the nineteenth century; and it was probably never an important feature of the developed coalfields like South Yorkshire after 1874. Nevertheless, there was an important group of self-made men who, through their enthusiasm, played an amplified role in Barnsley's and the district's institutional life. There were men like George Senior, the son of a Barnsley handloom weaver, who trained as a teacher and ran a private commercial academy and an architect's business in the town, eventually buying collieries in Dodworth and Derbyshire as speculative ventures; and F.C.W. Boocock, a coke-oven setter at Craik's collieries, who acquired some capital and became an important house builder. Teaching was also a feasible path out of their class for miners and other workers; and pupil teachers in mining areas often came from mining families. Others, like Isaac Haigh and David Moulson became newsagents, publicans, grocers or even newspaper proprietors. These methods of

1 See his obituary in Barnsley Chronicle, 19 Jan. 1889.
2 E.J. Hobsbawm, Labouring Men, p. 296.
3 See his obituary in Barnsley Chronicle, 21 Aug. 1897.
5 For example, George Armitage and John Ford, two former miners from Silkstone. See Children's Employment Commission (1845 xvi), p. 260; G.H. Teasdale, op. cit., p. 19.
6 See E.J. Hobsbawm, Labouring Men, p. 274.
7 During the 1875 strike at Stubbin, two of the miners acquired small businesses. See S.Y.M.A. minutes, 1 July 1875.
8 The proprietor of the Mexborough and Swinton Times when it began publication in 1877 was John Turner, a former railway worker, who with his children won £200 damages from the Donaby Main Colliery Company after his wife had received fatal injuries from one of their pony-carts in 1868. I am grateful to James MacFarlane for this information.
breaking the class bond were obviously only for a few and were publicised accordingly. What we have less information about is the degree of horizontal movement within the working class and of inter-generational occupational mobility which must have indicated the extent to which these different groups did mix.

Williams claimed to have identified a high degree of inter-occupational mobility in Derbyshire before the major expansion (unlike, as he put it, 'the non-competing groups' of the north and Scotland).¹ There is also evidence that vestiges of the old two-way mobility lingered on in South Yorkshire, especially in the older, less urbanised colliery communities. Thus Silkstone claimed twenty miners with dual occupations in 1871; Dodworth (double its size) had twenty one and Swinton (with Kilnhurst) only fourteen. Several of Silkstone's miners had smallholdings as well. There is also evidence that many of the traditionally-minded Fitzwilliam miners enjoyed a mix of agricultural, construction or general labouring when the collieries were under-worked or closed.²

There must have been considerable one-way movement into coal mining, especially in the years of greatest expansion and those of overmanning in other industries. Kaijage dates the drift from linen to coal in Barnsley from the late 1830s,³ but because of the great difference in working environments and routines, it was largely a second generation movement. (37% of Barnsley's miners in 1861 were from a family headed by a weaver, or with two or more weavers in it.) At a meeting of handloom weavers in Barnsley in the early 1870s, an observer noticed that they were almost all old men, the young ones

¹ J.E.Williams, op.cit., p.54.
² G.Mee, op.cit., p.139; Rotherham Advertiser, 29 May 1875.
having 'been induced almost generally to take to a collier's life'.\(^1\) Brundage claims that mining began to attract bottle makers' sons in Yorkshire especially during and after the depression.\(^2\) The *Barnsley Chronicle* commented in 1876 on the shortage of masons, explained in their view by the flow of young men into the pits over the last years.\(^3\) The observer from the *Manchester Guardian* did, however, endorse the view that the flow of adults into mining was a limited one: 'In Yorkshire, as in Lancashire, the high rate of wages is attracting men from other industries to the mine; but they do not find the process of conversion into colliers an easy one'.\(^4\) Any newcomers were first put on as surfaceworkers or trammers and only a small percentage of outsiders would have been able to enter the more lucrative hewing trade. The *Guardian*'s correspondent concluded that 'the number of (hewers) is not very largely increased from outside sources' - and this at a period of peak demand.

A hint that horizontal mobility in the 1860s at least was largely one way into mining, if it occurred at all, is given by tracing in the 1871 Census the miners appearing in the 1861 Census for Silkstone, Dodworth and Swinton. Unfortunately it was only possible to identify those who remained in the same township, thus ignoring those who moved to find or begin alternative work in other places (almost essential in the case of the Silkstone miner), but of those who remained (392 in all), only thirteen had changed their occupations. All but two of these men were under thirty in 1861 and all but four had become self-employed as proprietors of shops, beerhouses, pubs or smallholdings. Three others were reported to be simply labourers and one was a glassworker. Eight of these ex-miners were from Swinton (with Kilnhurst) where more alternatives were available within its boundaries.

\(^1\) *Manchester Guardian*, 30 May 1873.
\(^2\) D. Brundage, *op.cit.*, p.54.
\(^3\) *Barnsley Chronicle*, 3 June 1876.
\(^4\) *Manchester Guardian*, 30 May 1873.
This suggestion that miners rarely changed their occupation must not be taken too far. We cannot know how many of the 522 miners in the 1861 Census for those townships, who were no longer alive and/or resident, had changed their occupations. However, a survey of the occupations of co-habiting fathers and sons in the mixed communities of Swinton and Kilnhurst in 1871 does suggest that occupational boundaries among stable or expanding trades were fairly rigid. 125 economically active men in Swinton (with Kilnhurst) were sons of miners with whom they lived; 114 of these were also miners, 7 were ironworkers, 2 were glassworkers and 2 had other occupations. Of the ironworkers' sons, 42 were also ironworkers, 2 were miners and 5 were in other trades (none in glass). Of the glassworkers' sons, 21 were in the same trade, 3 were ironworkers, one was a miner and there were 2 others. This tendency for sons to follow fathers into the same occupations (at least those who still lived with them) was amplified by the fact that lodgers tended to follow the same trade as the head of the household with whom they lodged.

All three of these trades in 1871 were relatively well paid at all levels of skill, and were at least stable if not expanding. There was, therefore, probably considerable incentive for young men in Swinton to enter one or other of them; and the easiest to enter would have been the one plied by their fathers. There were skills in all three industries that could best be acquired with help from within the family. Also, the fact that the vast majority of heads of household working in all three of these industries were recent newcomers to the township as were most of the lodgers, partly explains the occupational nature of that type of co-habiting. Many of the potential lodgers must have travelled to the district with the head of the family, have come after on his recommendation or have acquired the lodgings through the prime source of contact: the workplace.

Superficial impressions of the family mix of minority
unskilled trades, such as general labourers and railway porters, many of whom, as Hobsbawm suggests, were probably recruited from a reservoir of the irregularly employed (outworkers, agricultural labourers, paupers, etc.)\(^1\) indicate that there could be less rigid boundaries at that level. The opposite was true of craftsmen like masons and blacksmiths and their sons. The small size of this population of course precludes firm conclusions, but the findings were not unexpected. They would have been very different in a community such as Barnsley with one major declining industry and an even larger expanding one.

However rigid the occupational exclusiveness of households might have been, it did not preclude social mixing outside. A survey of marriages in Swinton (Table 22) indicates that occupational barriers were less rigid in this direction. There were 754 marriages consecrated in Swinton church\(^2\) between 1855 and 1894 (619 of which were between two residents of Swinton or Kilnhurst); those where the occupations of either both the partners' fathers or the bride's father and the groom could be identified have been analysed (720 in all). 407 of these 1440 fathers (or grooms) were miners; 290 were labourers; 42 were glassworkers; 69 were ironworkers; 49 were pottery workers; and 587 had other occupations. In the case of the miners, glass, iron and pottery workers and labourers, less than half of each occupational group was involved in marriages within that group, considerably less in the case of the glass, iron and pottery workers. The pairing of couples with miners as fathers and of couples with labourers as


\(^2\) The parish registers rather than the civil registers were chosen because of difficulties of access to the latter. The possibility of bias therefore exists, but only the broadest conclusions are to be drawn from these figures. See J.Foster, *op.cit.*, pp.126-7, 260-9, for a more exacting treatment of marriage register data in the measurement of "social distance".
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fathers was, it is true, higher than seems statistically probable, all things being equal. But it does not point to such a high degree of occupational segregation as the co-habiting patterns discussed above. Clearly the decision-makers in the process were different, but even taking the unreliability of this index into consideration, this brief survey does suggest that considerations of occupational background were a relatively minor factor in the choice of spouses in Swinton. One noticeable detail which emerged in the gathering of this data, was the high intermixing of shopkeepers' children on the one hand and miners' and labourers' on the other in the marriage process. In fact, almost a half of all marriages involving shopkeepers' children (57 out of 126) also involved an offspring of a miner or labourer. This has important repercussions for the support that miners and other working class groups might have expected from this important group during strikes and other times of hardship. It also points to shopkeepers' and other tradesmen's ambiguous location between the working class and the lower middle class.
TABLE 20

Occupational groupings of males in Silkstone, Dodworth and Swinton (with Kilnhurst) in 1871.

N.B. Underviewers and deputies are treated as mineworkers; colliery clerks and clerks in other industries are treated separately; managers and viewers are grouped with proprietors and professional men (only proprietors of concerns employing about 25 people or more are treated as such). Pottery workers include finishing outworkers. Farmers include market gardeners. Where two occupations were given, the first-mentioned is used. Occupations representing over 5% of all male workers also given in percentage terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineworkers</th>
<th>Workers in iron, steel and engineering</th>
<th>Glassworkers</th>
<th>Pottery workers</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Labourers</th>
<th>Probably Blacksmiths</th>
<th>allied to these Engine tenters</th>
<th>industries but Firemen</th>
<th>unspecified Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>329 (71.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>658 (65.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td>464 (26.2%)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Engine drivers</th>
<th>Railway workers</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>27 (5.9%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60 (5.9%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total       | 459                  | 1009                                | 1768                       |

Source: Census enumerators' returns 1871.
N.B. As the enumerators' treatment of women working in their husbands' home-based trade (weaving, shopkeeping, etc.,) is clearly inconsistent, all such women have been treated as not employed for the purpose of this table. All women mentioned as housekeepers are treated as domestic servants, although some clearly kept house for relatives or on their own account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Silkstone</th>
<th>Dodworth</th>
<th>Swinton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic servants</td>
<td>37 (56%)</td>
<td>76 (56%)</td>
<td>143 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmakers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers (heads of household only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (including pupil teachers)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwomen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundrywomen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census enumerators' returns 1871.
TABLE 22

Numbers of marriages between couples in Swinton church, 1855-94, classified according to the occupation of the fathers.

N.B. Thirty four marriages have not been included either because the father of the bride was dead or his occupation was not identified. Where the groom's father was similarly unidentifiable, the groom's occupation has been used.

'Coalminers' include deputies, but not ambiguous workers like 'labourers', 'enginemen', 'engine tenders', 'blacksmiths' and 'firemen' who were more likely to have been colliery workers than in any other industry. There were 73 marriages between miners and one or other of these workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Coal-miners</th>
<th>Labourers</th>
<th>Glass-workers</th>
<th>Iron-workers</th>
<th>Pottery workers</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal-miners</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass-workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron-workers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery workers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Swinton marriage registers.
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

Labour Activity in Other Industries.
The received history of the S.Y.M.A. and Y.M.A. gives little consideration to the miners' links with other industrial groups apart from mention of occasional formal contact with representatives particularly of the Sheffield trades. Although unionism in other major industries in this period was sporadic and usually ineffective in the district outside Sheffield (with the exception of the glass makers), this is not to say that the miners' unions grew up in a near organisational vaccuum. The patchy evidence does suggest that, at lodge level at least, the miners and other groups learnt from each others' experiences. These experiences are examined below.

Weavers.

The period under study saw a dramatic decline in organisational activity among the Barnsley area linen handloom weavers, parallel to the overall decline of the industry itself. 1853 effectively saw a break with a tradition of militant labour activity (which had itself undergone a transition after 1829 to more peaceful forms of protest, as explained above) so abrupt that mere economic factors at first sight seem unlikely fully to explain the change. A chronicle of what vestiges of labour activity remained will help to put the transformation into relief.

1853 witnessed a last, though important, hiccup of prosperity in the Barnsley linen industry, sufficient for the handloom weavers to claw back some concessions on their embattled price lists through industrial action. From then on, the industry went into an even steeper decline, the number of firms shrinking from 36 in 1852 to 22 in 1862, and the employees from 3,111 to 1,988. In 1855, the weavers

1 See pp. 61-2.
3 Ibid, p.94.
4 References to 'weavers' will mean handloom weavers unless powerloom weavers are specifically mentioned.
resumed their characteristic defensive stance when they met to discuss striking against a threatened reduction. Frank Mirfield and Richard Taylor, two of their principal spokesmen, canvassed support from the Sheffield trades, but although the tick weavers at Pigott’s, one of the largest firms, struck a month later, mass action was ruled out. Six years later, the weavers did resist a threatened reduction, but suffered a two month lockout with adverse results. Slight trade improvements in the 1860s brought them two small advances (reputedly the only ones in our period) in 1866 after some agitation, but wages were reduced again in 1869 after a brief flurry of strike activity.

Perhaps the greatest indicator of the weavers' relative economic and organisational weakness was their failure to cash in on the general improvement in trade (in most major industries) in the early 1870s. They were said to belong to the only trade not regularly treated with works outings and other expressions of shared prosperity; and the Barnsley weavers generally were said to have been the lowest paid workers in the country 'not excepting agricultural workers'. Their industrial position was so weak that there was little or no attempt at agitation. The spokesmen for the 300-odd handloom weavers left in 1876 could only blame structural changes for their plight: the replacement of handloom by power and the flow of young men into the pits.

1 Barnsley Times, 7 April 1855.
2 Ibid, 12 May 1855.
3 Barnsley Historical Almanac and Yearbook, 1863, p.18.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 20 Aug. 1892.
5 Ibid, 23 June 1866.
6 Ibid, 9 May 1869.
7 Ibid, 19 Aug. 1871.
8 Ibid, 8 June 1872.
9 Ibid, 8 June 1876.
Weavers' prices were further reduced in 1880\(^1\) and, by the early 1890s, they were such an anachronism that a special relief fund was set up by a group of miners active in the local Trades and Labour Council,\(^2\) a final charitable gesture to a dead tradition of labour activity. The economic decline of the industry was inexorable and the death of the labour traditions of the early part of the century was perhaps inevitable. Handloom weavers were an ageing group (the average age of male weavers in Dodworth in 1871 was 46 compared with 31 for miners) and no new generation of activists had grown up to replace or question the old leaders of the 1830s and 1840s like Vallance and Mirfield. So dependent were they on these men that, it was reported, there was no record of any handloom weavers' union meeting or organised action on wages after Mirfield's death in 1869.\(^3\) Moreover, the generation of leaders of the 1830s and 1840s were not the militants that they used to be. Kaijage warns us not to overemphasise the transformation that occurred among the Barnsley Chartist leadership after 1842; they had always pursued 'not the "dictatorship of the proletariat" but power sharing' as he put it.\(^4\) The bourgeoisie proved far less intransigent after the mid 1840s and several of the Chartists' demands were met halfway. But their failure to rescue the handloom weavers from the poverty into which they slid must be examined against the background of some of the leaders' later careers if we are to make complete sense out of it.

One of the most prominent agitators in the 1829 rent strike and again in 1839 (suffering imprisonment and transportation) was William Ashton. He broke off relations with the Chartist movement over O'Connor's handling of the Newport uprising, left for America in 1843,\(^5\) but returned the following year,

\(^1\) Ibid, 2 Oct. 1880.
\(^2\) Ibid, 30 April 1892.
\(^3\) Ibid, 20 Aug. 1892.
\(^5\) Ibid, p.531.
contributing little to the movement except disruption. ¹
He eventually left for Australia in the 1850s.

J.H. Burland was a Chartist weaver who successfully evaded arrest after the Chartist demonstration of August 1839. He returned a year later, helped to found the working men's educational Franklin Club and was active as a Sunday School teacher.² He then went to York Diocesan Training School, returned to the district in 1859 as master of Hood Green School in Stainborough where he remained until 1868. He was later warden of Hoyland Board Schools, after operating grocers' businesses for eight years, until shortly before his death in 1886. Burland was, throughout his later years, a freelance journalist for the Barnsley Chronicle and other local papers, and the most prominent local historian of his day.

Joseph Crabtree, gaol ed in 1840 along with Ashton and Hoey, became a schoolmaster at Heckmondwike in West Yorkshire. In 1841, he had expressed a desire to leave politics and 'get into the police' amid rumours that he had turned informer.³

Another prominent Chartist weaver, Ben Hague, became a successful general dealer and newsagent in Barnsley. A member of the Franklin Club and Flour Society, he later became president of the Barnsley British Co-operative Society, and manager of the Barnsley Permanent Building Society.⁴ He also was a member of the Barnsley Board of Health and Town Council regularly up to 1874. Although professing himself to be a Liberal most of his life, he stood on Tory platforms in 1886.

¹ Northern Star, 8 June 1844.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 6 June 1886.
⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 13 Dec. 1890.
Peter Hoey was one of the most active weavers for many years and was closely involved in the Chartist agitation of 1839, which won him a gaol sentence. He returned to Barnsley as a provisions dealer, but in 1853 moved to Sheffield where he also took a shop and died in 1875 in an almshouse. ¹

Frank Mirfield was transported in 1830 for his part in the fent strike disturbances, but returned to an active involvement in the Chartist movement. ² He was also principal spokesman for the handloom weavers up to his death in 1869. ³ He remained a weaver up to the age of about 63 when he took the tenancy of an inn. Unlike several of his contemporaries, Mirfield's political involvement did not wain with the passing of the initial Chartist thrust, but his energies were transferred to supporting local Liberal candidates. ⁴

George Uttley was arrested during the August 1839 Chartist demonstration. He remained a weaver until late in life, but his attitude to industrial action changed radically. In 1871, he was publically extolling the virtues of Henry Richardson, his employer, ⁵ at the latter's golden wedding festivities and in 1872 was highly critical of the powerloom weavers' strike, which he claimed had been 'hatched by outsiders'. ⁶

John Vallance was probably the best known of the weavers' spokesmen both during his period as an agitator and after, partly as a result of his longevity (he was 88 when he died in 1882). ⁷ From 1853, his energies were largely confined to

¹ Ibid, 24 April 1875.
² Northern Star, 28 Jan. 1843.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 21 Oct. 1869 (obituary).
⁴ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 7 May 1859.
⁵ Ibid, 15 July 1871.
local institutional politics. He agitated for a local board in 1852, competed for the post of Inspector of Nuisances the following year, was active in the incorporation movement in 1867-8 and supported Liberal candidates in subsequent local elections. In the run-up to parliamentary elections, he found himself on the same platforms as Earl Fitzwilliam and other members of the powerful Liberal leadership.\(^1\) Vallance was also a founder and one of the most involved members of the Barnsley Flour and Provisions Society, a milling and retail co-operative, founded in 1848.\(^2\) He was also an active Wesleyan.

**John Widdop** was a warehouseman but was closely involved with his weaving contemporaries in the Chartist movement. He was an early member of the Franklin Club where, along with several other ex-Chartists, he saw its early independence lost to middle class patronage. Widdop became involved in the temperance movement, was converted to Catholicism and even took a non-platform interest in Tory politics.\(^3\) He once said of H.B. Cooke, the Barnsley magistrate who refused support to the movement to reduce the sentence imposed on the Barnsley Chartists in 1840: 'his kindness and manner in conversation were such that they have ever been to me a sunny memory'.\(^4\)

Finally we should consider **Thomas Lingard** who, though a master shoemaker at the time, was also closely involved with the weavers and was arrested in 1839. He was also secretary of the local shoemakers' union and operated a newsagency.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid, 7 May 1859 and 27 March 1880.


\(^3\) Barnsley Chronicle, 21 April 1888 (obituary).

\(^4\) Ibid, 8 March 1879.

\(^5\) Ibid, 29 June 1878 (obituary).
After a period of victimisation following a shoemakers’ strike in 1850, Lingard returned to Barnsley and helped to set up the Barnsley Chronicle newspaper which he soon took sole charge of, eventually handing the business over to his sons in 1874. He was an active Liberal, several times standing and once gaining a seat on the Town Council.

It can be seen that almost all these men, in taking their divergent paths, either severed their connection with their past (and especially with the industry whose special problems had motivated their involvement in radical activity) or followed the logic of the lessons learnt in the 1840s when a combination of well-timed repression and accommodation took the fire out of the weavers’ radicalism (or at least that of their leaders). In 1848, many of them were signed up as special constables in anticipation of a disturbance that never happened.¹ Many laid themselves open to charges of class collaboration, while others simply left the area. But even Mirfield, who remained committed to the weavers' cause until his death, bowed eventually to the overpowering stringency of the economic climate in the local industry.

The exception to the general docility in the weaving industry in the period was a burst of activity by the power-loom weavers in the early 1870s. This branch of the industry, dominated by women and children,² had not been, as we have seen, involved on a mass scale in the various labour and radical movements before the mid 1840s, and in the 1870s, its spokesmen were not public figures. In 1871 and 1872, they took part in the general agitation for the nine-hour day³ and for midday closing on Saturdays (in line with their colleagues at Leeds).⁴ On July 24th 1872, the 300-odd employees of

¹ Ibid.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 6 Jan. 1872.
⁴ Ibid, 23 Sept. 1871.
Richardson, Tee and Co., one of the largest firms, struck for an advance of 15%, creating what was effectively a test case, following more general, though ad hoc, agitation. A union had been formed about two months before, but had apparently not acquired a proper financial base. In November, lockout notices were served on all powerloom weavers (about 1,500) involved in the agitation, representing all the large firms except, at first, T. E. Taylor's whose men enjoyed paternalistic treatment.

The powerloom weavers' case was clearly based on comparisons with recent advances for local miners, iron and glass workers - a case that some manufacturers tried to destroy by pointing to the increased production costs in linen caused by coal price rises. Nevertheless, the weavers had high hopes of success when, in February 1873, they rejected a proposal for arbitration put forward by John Normansell and the S.Y.M.A. Executive Committee. Normansell was anxious to end a strike which he described as 'too hasty'; he had in the previous November been elected to Barnsley Town Council, partly as a result of a rapprochement with one or two local Liberal linen manufacturers. The weavers stayed out until November 1873, eventually accepting arbitration. The verdict of the board (composed of Philip Casey, Ben Hague - the ex-Chartist - and two linen manufacturers) was for no advance and a recommendation that women should replace men on jacquard looms as was the practice in Scotland, as there was said to be a high demand for men in other local industries. The board

1 Ibid, 8 June, 17 Aug. and 5 Oct. 1872.
2 Ibid, 22 Feb. 1873.
3 Ibid, 23 Nov. 1873.
4 Ibid, 8 Feb. 1873.
5 Ibid; S.Y.M.A. minutes, 4 Feb. 1873.
6 Barnsley Chronicle, 22 Feb. 1873.
7 Ibid, 8 Nov. 1873.
expressed the fear that trade might leave the town if the economic position of the Barnsley manufacturers did not improve. It was not long before the powerloom weavers were having to resist, apparently unsuccessfully, further wage reductions.¹

There is no evidence of anything but brief ad hoc unionism among hand or power loom weavers in the period, rendering them even more vulnerable to the effects of decline in their industry. Many were thrown on to the formal relief agencies time and time again. The eclipse of their organisational tradition coincided with the beginnings of permanent unionism and a new type of independence among the miners and the two industrial groups, significantly distant in the 1840s, had few points of contact in the second half of the century. Only a brief spell from about 1857 to 1860, when Vallance, Mirfield and Uttley spoke on miners' platforms, witnessed any joint activity of this nature.²

Ironworkers.

The economic position of the iron industry (and the small steelmaking operation outside Rotherham and Sheffield) was far less gloomy. Although the state of the industry in the district did not always reflect the overall expansion in the larger centres on its southern edge (which itself was badly hit by foreign competition in the depression years),³ the Parkgate and Chapeltown complexes buoyed up employment in the industry which began to decline in the Swinton and Hoyland districts towards the end of our period.⁴ and the proximity of the larger centres to the south undoubtedly kept wages from sliding excessively.

¹ Ibid, 13 Jan. 1877 and 24 May 1879.
² See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Sept. 1860.
³ K. Laybourn, op.cit., p.20.
⁴ See pp. 19-20.
In the early part of the period, at least, the district seems to have been an importer of labour, mainly from the low-wage areas of the Midlands. This was a familiar process as Birch demonstrates: 'complaints of ironmasters about men being enticed away from them were numerous'. These were probably mostly older, skilled men; the unskilled could be found more locally. In Swinton, 81 of the 240 self confessed workers in the iron, steel and engineering trades in 1871 had been born in the Midlands, the majority being over 35 and claiming a particular craft (moulding, puddling, refining, fitting, etc.) whereas most of the younger and general workers in those industries were born in Yorkshire, but outside the traditional ironworking areas. Of course the latter number would have been swelled if we had been able to identify as ironworkers some of the men classed in the Census simply as 'labourers'. In communities like Swinton and Rawmarsh (Parkgate), and to a lesser extent Hoyland and Ecclesfield, the mix of origins and age of the workforce was very similar to that of the miners they lived alongside. Even the same prejudice against the incoming Midlanders noted above in the case of the miners - skilled or not - was evident from the testimony of a local company historian; most of the men coming to work at the Parkgate Iron and Steelworks were said to have come from Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire and Wales; many of these were cynically described by the local residents as having brought their wardrobe with them under their arms or as having lost it entirely on their way across the moors.

The distinction between the skilled and the other employees in these industries was more evident than any found in the coal industry. This was true both of foundry and iron and steel workers. Differentials between labourers and puddlers

1 A. Birch, op. cit., p. 246.

2 This was the situation in the Sheffield steel industry up to the 1880s. See S. Pollard, op. cit., p. 170.

3 See p. 337.

in the industry were wide (at least 100% at Low Moor, Bradford, in 1864)\(^1\) and experienced moulders, founders, refiners and stovegrate fitters could earn even more, under some conditions.\(^2\) These differentials were reflected, to a certain extent in the differing degrees of organisation of the various trades within the industries. Unlike Sheffield, there were not many representatives of the old light metal trades, except in Ecclesfield, so the sectional trade societies had no effective base in this district. The sporadic violence in those trades in the 1850s and 1860s had little impact on the district; the only two publicised incidents involving outworker nailmakers at Thorpe Hesley in 1861.\(^3\) The restrictive closed shop practices of these trades were practised relatively successfully by the Friendly Society of Ironfounders in Sheffield after 1866, according to Pollard.\(^4\) The Society, which maintained steady organisation and membership through the depression years to 1894 after early fluctuations,\(^5\) excluded the stovegrate workers who abounded in Swinton and Parkgate. Unified industrial action among this group was, moreover, very limited: the only two important instances being in 1869 and 1890 (when the stovegrate workers successfully canvasses the support of miners in the Wombwell district).\(^6\) Union-backed strikes in the ironfounding industry were extremely rare during the depression, limited both by the policies of the national executive and the lack of local funds.\(^7\) The union's energy

\(^1\) A. Birch, op. cit., p. 265.

\(^2\) Ibid, p. 264; S. Pollard, op. cit., p. 49.

\(^3\) R.C. on Trades Unions, Sheffield Outrages Inquiry (1867 xxxii), p. xv.

\(^4\) S. Pollard, op. cit., p. 171.


\(^6\) S.Y.M.A. minutes, 11 Nov. 1869; Mexborough and Swinton Times, 30 May 1890; Barnsley Chronicle, 10 May 1890.

\(^7\) S. and B. Webb, op. cit., pp. 182 and 369.
was concentrated on maintaining wages by preserving the exclusiveness of the skilled grades. Yet evidence that all was not well among local foundry workers in 1876 is given by reports of 'rattening' at Kilnhurst.¹

Attempts to exploit shortages of labour through closed shops were made in the iron industry by another craft: John Kane's Associated Ironworkers, which was consolidated into a national movement in the late 1860s largely as a result of agitation by puddlers.² A branch union was set up in the Sheffield area in 1861³ and attempts were made to do the same at Parkgate in 1868.⁴ But it wasn't until the mass recruiting campaigns of 1872 and 1873 that formal and large-scale affiliation to the union made headway in the district with branches being established at Elsecar, Parkgate and Swinton.⁵ As Birch suggests, the apparent effect of trade unionism on colliers' wages was demonstrable to the ironworkers who lived alongside them⁶ and raised the hopes especially of those with skills in demand. It also raised the hostility of the employers.

Conflict in the local iron and steel industry was a familiar phenomenon throughout the period. Either as part of national or regional action, or as local disputes, ironworkers (and especially puddlers) were involved in industrial action in the following years at least: 1858 - at Hoyland; 1864/5 - Hoyland, Kilnhurst, Parkgate and Ecclesfield (part of a series of nationwide lockouts which attempted but failed to smash the growing union);

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 8 April 1876.
³ S. Pollard, op.cit., p.171.
⁴ Rotherham Advertiser, 15 Feb. 1868.
⁵ Barnsley Chronicle, 7 Dec. 1872, 1 Feb. and 18 Oct. 1873.
⁶ A. Birch, op.cit., p.269.
1866 - Hoyland; 1867 - Hoyland and Kilnhurst; 1867-8 - Hoyland and Parkgate; 1869 - Hoyland; 1873 - Hoyland; 1875 - Parkgate; 1879 - Hoyland; 1884 - Hoyland.¹ All of these strikes were over wages in one form or another and followed the familiar pattern of many miners' strikes with evictions and the recruitment of blacklegs.² Wages tended to rise and fall with those in the coal industry, the most determined attacks coming from the employers in 1867-8 and after April 1873. There were occasions when reductions were forced on the ironworkers without a struggle, as in 1876.³ But on the whole, the puddlers especially were prepared for conflict in defence of their standard of living. The notable exceptions were the men of the Thorncliffe and Chapeltown ironworks of Newton, Chambers and Co., who were reported to have been involved in the national lockouts of 1864/5, but little else in the way of industrial action. Even more than the miners there, the ironworkers seem to have been influenced by the steady employment and the paternalistic gestures of the Newton Chambers operations.

The local ironworkers' progress and defence must be seen in terms relative both to other districts (the 1875 dispute at Parkgate was over the severance of a parity agreement with South Staffordshire)⁴ and to the lower grade unskilled workers in the industry. The Associated Ironworkers maintained an

¹ Rotherham Advertiser, 13 Feb. 1858; S.Y.M.A. minutes, 7 Dec. 1864; Rotherham Advertiser, 28 Jan. 1865; Barnsley Chronicle, 14 July 1866; Barnsley Chronicle, 19 Jan. and 23 Feb. 1867; Rotherham Advertiser, 4 Jan. 1868; Barnsley Chronicle, 8 May 1869; Barnsley Chronicle, 26 April 1873; Rotherham Advertiser, 25 Oct. 1875; Barnsley Chronicle, 1 March 1879; Barnsley Chronicle, 28 June 1884. 'Hoyland' means either the Milton or the Elsecar ironworks or both.

² At Parkgate, for example, in 1875; see Rotherham Advertiser, 13 and 27 Nov. 1875.

³ Barnsley Chronicle, 26 Aug. 1876.

⁴ Rotherham Advertiser, 25 Sept. 1875.
exclusiveness even in decline when, for example, in 1875 those not connected with the union were obliged to collect on their own account and not to share in the benefits from the union's strike appeal fund. Unskilled workers in iron and steel had to wait at least until the 1890s for representation. In this respect, trade unionism among ironworkers differed from that among the miners. It was perhaps this lack of a broad base which hastened the decline of the Associated Ironworkers by the early 1880s at the latest in Sheffield and other parts of Yorkshire. With a decline in demand for puddlers and the displacement of the iron industry by steel, the disintegration of the union in our district must have been all the more swift.

It is not possible without detailed comparative analysis to define to what extent an identifiable labour aristocracy developed among iron and steel workers (and among the small but growing group of engineering workers in Barnsley, Swinton, Ecclesfield and Rawmarsh), but it was probably less likely to have flourished in less refined communities like Swinton and Hoyland than in Sheffield. Where it did occur, it was probably confined to the workplace and did not unduly hinder social mixing with other occupational groups, skilled or unskilled. There were, for example, instances of ironworkers and other metal craftsmen taking active involvement in miners' industrial action (at Thorncliff in 1870, for example). There were, of course, times when any labour solidarity that existed may have been strained by the repercussions of strikes in the coal mining industry on the ironworks they supplied and the employment of the ironworkers there. Several times, works

1 Ibid, 16 Oct. 1875.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 29 Jan. 1870 and 20 April 1872.
were closed even in anticipation of a miners' strike or lockout;\(^1\) the boycotting of the Parkgate works by the new S.Y.M.A. in the strike of 1858 evoked a particularly bitter response from the ironworkers.\(^2\)

Nevertheless, at top level, Kane and Normansell frequently met on union platforms and elsewhere, and their attitudes converged on many issues. In 1874, when Normansell was coming under attack from his rank and file for his concession to the employers, Kane offered his advice:

```
expel the roughs from your society. See that it is conducted with respectability, so that the men of noise and chaff - the mere 'paper men' - who are the worst payers, and the parties who generally make the most noise, have no voice in the matter. \(^3\)
```

Normansell may well have liked to have followed his advice, but the constitution of the S.Y.M.A. gave him little scope.

A reformed union, the Ironworkers Association (the Associated Iron and Steel Workers from 1887) recruited in Yorkshire in the late 1880s and onwards,\(^4\) but its activity in our district did not achieve much public notice. Like the Yorkshire miners, the iron and steel workers, as well as the cutlers, forgers and grinders of South Yorkshire,\(^5\) or at least their official spokesmen, opposed the early independent labour movement in the area, depriving it of its only effective mass base.

\(^1\) Thorncliffe in 1885, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 21 March 1885.

\(^2\) Rotherham Advertiser, 27 Nov. 1858.

\(^3\) Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Aug. 1874.


\(^5\) Ibid, p.452.
Glassworkers.

Apart from a few specialist factories like Beatson's of Masborough (established in 1751), 1 the glassbottle industry in the southern part of the West Riding dates from 1829, with its origins at Castleford. 2 But the real growth in the industry occurred after the repeal of the Glass Excise Duty in 1845 and the establishment of a near-monopoly for the Yorkshire industry in the manufacture of the type of pale green glass bottles favoured especially by the soda water industry. 3

This monopoly was broken in the 1870s, and although foreign competition did not become acute in this sector until after our period, 4 the industry suffered from high unemployment levels from about 1876 5 (up to 30% in the 1890s). 6 The worst effects of the depression, however, were alleviated by the growth of a powerful labour organisation rivalling the miners' unions in its breadth and stability. In our district, there were glassbottle houses at Ardsley, Barnsley, Kilnhurst, Conisborough, Swinton and Mexborough; and a flint glass making firm at Worsborough which branched into the medical bottle trade in the mid 1870s because of the declining profitability of table glass. 7

Unlike in other locations, Brundage assures us, the glassbottle makers of Yorkshire had, by 1855, 'long possessed

1 See Beatson, Clarke and Co. Ltd., The Glassworks Rotherham 1751-1951 (Rotherham, 1951?)
3 Ibid, pp. 4-5.
4 K. Laybourn, op. cit., p. 23.
5 D. Brundage, op. cit., p. 45.
6 K. Laybourn, op. cit., p. 258.
active friendly societies which served to formalise the "network of kinship and mutual contacts" existing among them.¹ There was a strong sense of occupational solidarity which had developed at places like Castleford and Thornhill Lees in the early years and which was carried with migrant workers to the new locations, mainly in the south of the county. Here in the 1850s and the 1860s was an expanding industry. Out of 117 glassworkers in Swinton and Kilnhurst in 1871, only 43 were born inside the study area as a whole (most of them young men), while most of the others ostensibly came from the older centres of glass manufacture, like Thornhill Lees, Castleford, Catcliffe (on the edge of Sheffield) Masborough and St. Helens. One of these local friendly societies moved outwards from Castleford about 1853 with these migrants and in 1860, a formalised union - the Glass Bottle Makers' United Trade Protection Society of Yorkshire - was established in 1860, after an abortive attempt had been made from 1858 to 1861 to establish a union on a national basis.²

In 1865, the Yorkshire union was reorganised on a more centralised basis with an Executive Council meeting regularly and quarterly delegate meetings.³ The depression that hit the industry in 1876, coupled with a strengthened manufacturers' association, did take its toll on membership;⁴ but the organisation survived and in 1894, there were 2,482 members⁵ at a time when the Webbs claimed that non-unionism in the Yorkshire branch of the industry was 'practically unknown'.⁶

¹ D. Brundage, op. cit., p. 33.
² Ibid, pp. 34-6.
There seems to have been a local friendly society in the Barnsley area as early as 1856, because the Barnsley Times referred to a union-backed strike at the Old Mill glassworks in that year. In 1860, the glassbottle makers of Swinton, Kilnhurst and Mexborough struck, unsuccessfully, for an advance; and in 1870, the Mexborough men gained some concessions on work arrangements after a threat of industrial action. The depression in 1876 ushered in four years of stormy relations. The South Yorkshire Glass Bottle Co., at Swinton precipitated a strike threat in 1876 when they demanded a reduction of only three pence a week off the pay of all grades (the dispute was eventually arbitrated); and in 1877 and 1879, there were two county lockouts each of which secured three shilling reductions after a struggle. Despite the growing unemployment in the industry, the union continued to resist all reductions. The employers replied at the end of 1879 by importing blacklegs and there were violent scenes reminiscent of several of the miners' confrontations. There was also plenty of pressure put by glassworkers on individual non-unionists.

A new round of attacks came in 1886 and 1887, starting at the Hope works of Dan Rylands (reputedly the biggest of its kind in the U.K.) at Ardsley on the edge of Barnsley. Here

1 Barnsley Times, 3 Jan. 1857.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 28 July 1860.
3 Rotherham Advertiser, 29 Jan. 1870.
4 Beatson, Clark and Co., op.cit., p.22.
8 Barnsley Chronicle, 7 Aug. 1886.
the employer successfully introduced a three shift system which was opposed by the workmen; and, backed by the union, they plunged into a lockout which lasted several months provoking bitter exchanges. ¹ Rylands' success meant that the firm operated on a non-union basis with the three-shift system until 1890, when both anomalies were rectified. ²

The following year, overtime rates were cut across the board at a time when trade and the union were at a low ebb. ³ In the 1880s, however, the Yorkshire union was able to implement schemes of work sharing to alleviate the worst of the unemployment. ⁴ This enhanced the credibility of the union enormously and, together with other aspects of job control it was able to negotiate or defend for their members, ensured its survival throughout the employers' offensives. One of these offensives struck directly at these wide ranging power of the union. By means of a lockout in 1893, which lasted from January to May, the employers sought to end work sharing, remove some of the restrictions imposed on entry into the trade (apprenticeship, etc.) and to reduce wages. ⁵ The employers lost the battle, the glassworkers having refused to go to arbitration in March. ⁶ This defeat contributed to a loss of £27,000 sustained by Rylands' glass enterprise in that year. ⁷

There was differentiation based on skill in the glassbottle trade. The skilled men concentrated on the middle process:

¹ Ibid, 25 Sept. and 27 Nov. 1886.
² D. Brundage, op. cit., p. 62.
³ Ibid, p. 27.
⁴ Ibid, p. 49.
⁵ Ibid, p. 59.
⁶ Barnsley Chronicle, 1 and 22 April 1893.
⁷ Ibid, 30 Dec. 1893.
the forming of bottles out of molten glass. In each work

| work | group (or 'chair') | there would be three men, each with
different skills, and two young helpers. | } | There would also

| founders, furnace tenders, sorters, packers and general labourers. Differentials could be as
great as in the iron industry: wages for journeymen

| finishers were quoted as 30/-d in 1866; for blowers, 28/0d; and for the semi-skilled gatherers, 23/-d. | } | In 1880, the

| absolute differentials were the same, three shillings having been lopped off each weekly wage. | } | Ten years later, the

| figures were: 45/-d for finishers; 43/-d for blowers; 29/8d for gatherers; and 22/-d for founders and furnacemen. | } | Nevertheless, despite the wide range of earnings and the long

| apprenticeships in the trade, the skilled glassbottlemakers

| seem to have exhibited less of an attitude of craft

| exclusiveness with regard to membership of their union and
towards other industrial groups than, for example, the

| ironfounders or the flint glass makers. Why this is so is

| not entirely clear, but the working environment may have had

| something to do with it. Glassbottle makers worked in hot,

| overcrowded and often dangerous conditions. The work was hard,

| the hours extremely irregular and regular employment by no

| means secure (the demand for soda-water bottles in particular

| was highly seasonal). Also, unskilled labour was probably

| less of a threat to the skilled glassworker because he did

| not work alongside them, unlike in engineering, for example. | } | A third factor may have been that the bottlemakers were

| reacting, consciously or subconsciously, against the

| aristocratic attitudes and behaviour of the flint glassmakers

| with whom they were often in contention.


2 Rotherham Advertiser, 24 Jan. 1866.

3 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 16 Jan. 1880.

4 D. Brundage, op. cit., p. 28.

5 Ibid, pp. 40-1.
The experience of these working conditions may have had a democratising effect on the workforce of the glasshouse. It may also have had the effect of creating an industrial militancy not found in many other trades. The structure and 'track record' of the union reflected both these tendencies. Brundage suggests that the Yorkshire bottle-makers union had a 'tendency towards industrial militancy' which put it out of step with the moderate, centralised New Model Unions. 1 A quarterly delegate meeting in 1874, in typically democratic fashion, threw out the proposal of the union secretary (Alfred Greenwood) for a new, centralised constitution similar to the A.S.E.'s. 2 The rank and file also resisted central directives to implement conciliation and arbitration, on a number of occasions.

The glassbottlemakers' ability to maintain a militant stance on issues like work sharing in the depression years was enhanced by its long history of establishing contacts, not just with other glassbottlemakers outside Yorkshire, but also with other industrial groups. A good example is their role in supporting the Denaby lockouts in 1869. 3 Liversidge, the treasurer of the Mexborough branch of the bottlemakers union, appeared on miners' platforms throughout the lockout, was the prime mover in raising funds in Mexborough (almost £300 had been collected by the end of the lockout), 4 in organising bread distributions and supplying pickets. Liversidge claimed that 'the people of Mexborough did not wish the men to look upon the gift of bread as charity but merely as a fulfillment of duty which the working men felt it incumbent upon them to perform'. 5 This duty was

2 Ibid, p.38.
3 See p. 333.
5 Ibid, 10 April 1869.
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reciprocated in 1879 and 1887 when the bottlemakers received financial support from the local miners in their disputes. At their union demonstration in the latter year, they were joined on the platform by most of the Y.M.A. executive. Similar support was received during the bottlemakers' lockout in 1893, much being prompted, in Brundage's opinion by the 'independent (political) strategy' the union had pursued since 1889. Greenwood himself became active in independent labour politics in Castleford. One is left wondering what other links existed between glassbottlemakers and miners (and other groups) at organisational level and beneath.

A final word must be said about the few representatives of the flint glass making industry in the district. In 1885, there were fifteen flint glass makers working in the district, all at the Wood Brothers factory at Worsborough. There were a larger number at Beatson and Clark's in Rotherham and in 1891, there was said to be 111 members of the Flint Glass Makers' Friendly Society in South Yorkshire. Matsumura has portrayed the flint glass makers as archetypal labour aristocrats in much of the period we are dealing with. The craft exclusiveness they defended operated in particular at the level of the work group (or 'chair') and the factory.

1 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 21 Nov. 1879; Barnsley Chronicle, 25 June 1887.
2 D. Brundage, op. cit., p. 67.
3 Ibid, p. 53.
Wood Brothers moved their factory to Barnsley in the 1870s.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 10 Jan. 1891.
'The statification of flint glass makers in the chair was
the first and vital process involved in the formation of a
labour aristocracy'; 1 wage differentials were great and the
glass makers ruled the auxiliary workers with a despotic
hand. But the glass makers also maintained a distance from
the bottle makers, reinforced in Yorkshire, it seems, because
of the former's decline relative to the latter; 2 'certainly
flint glass makers looked down upon mere bottle makers',
despite their deteriorating economic position. 3 The
F.G.M.F.S. even authorised its members to act as blacklegs
during the glassbottle makers dispute in 1877. 4

The employees of Wood Brothers certainly seem to have
adopted a very different approach to industrial relations to
their neighbours in the bottle industry. No strike was
reported at the factory throughout the period and the
industrial harmony that existed was paraded at the local
branch of the union's annual dinners, often in the company
of notable guests, like Kenny, the Barnsley Liberal M.P. 5
Not surprisingly, they were out of tune with the initial
efforts of the local Trades Council to establish broad-based
working class support in the Barnsley area. In 1891, when
the Council's candidate, a miner, stood against a Liberal in
the south-east ward where most of the Wood Brothers' employees
lived, their opposition was strongly censured by the Council,
one spokesman branding them as 'these smooth-coated men, who
could do no wrong'. 6 Despite their shared opposition to
independent labour, the miners' union probably had little to
learn from or to do with the flint glass makers.

1 T.Matsumura, op.cit., p.358.
2 Ibid, p.22.
3 Ibid, p.131.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 14 Jan. 1888.
6 Ibid, 14 Nov. 1891.
Other industrial groups.

Pottery manufacture in the South Yorkshire of the second half of the nineteenth century was a static or declining industry. In the 1830s and 1840s, the industry had witnessed a fair degree of union activity (there was a branch of the 1830s-established Potters' Union at Swinton\(^1\)), but by the end of our period, membership was proportionately low.\(^2\) Maximum piece earnings in the flat-pressing trade (the dominant mode in the district), before an important advance in 1872, were said to be only about 24/6d after the potter had paid his underhand.\(^3\) The 1872 wage advance was gained after real or threatened industrial action at several potteries in the district;\(^4\) and similar action in 1890 restored the 1872 level that had been reduced by 10% in 1885.\(^5\) Both in 1872 and 1890, the potters looked to the miners for support, example, or (in 1872 only) arbitration.\(^6\) In 1890, their struggle was closely supported by Charles Hobson of the Sheffield Trades Council who advised them to follow the miners' example in attempting to create a national union federation.\(^7\) Financial support came from local miners' lodges in 1890, and branch officials appeared on platforms at the potters' meetings.\(^8\)

---

3 *Barnsley Chronicle*, 2 March 1872.
5 Ibid, 25 April 1885; *Mexborough and Swinton Times*, 10 March 1890.
6 *Barnsley Chronicle*, 16 March 1872. Normansell and William Brown of the W.Y.M.A. were offered as arbitrators by the Swinton potters, but a third party was chosen by the employers.
7 *Mexborough and Swinton Times*, 17 Feb. and 11 April 1890.
8 Ibid, 10 March and 11 April 1890.
Bleachers, dyers, quarrymen, brickmakers, bobbin makers and tailors were small industrial groups involved in industrial action over wages during the period, but significantly less so during the worst depression years, 1874-89.\(^1\) If workers in these industries were members of local trade societies\(^2\) or larger amalgamated unions, in general they saw their collective power and financial strength dwindle during those years, making industrial action impractical.

There were strikes of the masons and bricklayers in Barnsley in 1865, 1867, 1889 and 1890 (along with the joiners).\(^3\) The success of the action in 1890 was said to have boosted membership of the local branch of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners from 66 at the end of 1890 to 107 at the end of 1892.\(^4\) The builders' strike of 1890, though it successively sought to maintain differentials in the industry, had more of the characteristics of a mass movement than any of the isolated efforts of the previous 30-odd years. The possible exception was the Nine Hours movement which, in 1871-2, involved a wide range of local trades including engineers, ironworkers, colliery craftsmen, bleachers, powerloom weavers and building workers, with some support from individual miners' representatives.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Barnsley Chronicle, 10 June 1865, 12 May 1866, 8 March 1890, 11 July 1891 and 23 Oct. 1893; S.Y.M.A. minutes, 23 Oct. 1871.

\(^2\) See, for example, K. Laybourn, _op. cit._, p. 143. He refers to the activity of the dyers' union in Barnsley in the early 1870s.

\(^3\) Barnsley Chronicle, 8 April 1865, 4 May 1867, 10 May and 12 July 1890.


\(^5\) Ibid, 6 Jan., 3 Feb. and 9 March 1872.
The 1890s saw the beginnings of new types of labour activity based on the one hand on the organisation of the unskilled, notably the gasworkers in the Gasworkers and General Labourers Union whose growth ran into employer opposition in Barnsley in 1890, resulting in a strike over alleged victimisation.¹ The N.U.G.G.L. at first flourished in the Barnsley area more than its rival general union, the N.A.U.L. which concentrated its activities in Sheffield.² The latter was beginning to recruit colliery surfaceworkers, but its major development in our district belongs to a later period. On the other hand, there was the more general organisation and support given to trade unionists by the Barnsley and Rotherham Trades and Labour Councils, both formed in 1891. These Councils brought together such diverse trades as engineering and mining; but, as we shall see in Chapter Twenty Four, the union representatives of these industries were often divided in their support of the Barnsley Council because of its opposition to traditional Lib-Lab politics.³

In this survey, we have seen that a fair proportion of labour organisations in a diverse range of industries had much in common with the miners in terms of industrial experience if not of union structure and policy. Many more links were forged at branch level than official reports suggested. Nevertheless, a high degree of sectionalism persisted and was fostered by the official policy of the union executives which hindered the progress of efforts like those of the Barnsley Trades Council for so long. The

¹ Ibid, 17 and 30 May and 26 July 1890.
³ See K.Laybourn, op.cit., p.156. The A.S.E. in Sheffield were hostile towards the I.L.P.; engineers in Sheffield earned higher wages, in general, than elsewhere.
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mutual support of unions in disputes with block donations to each others' funds, or the exchanging of personnel on official union platforms\(^1\) were the accepted forms of joint action, but did not convince the ordinary miner, potter or filesmith that he was fighting the same struggle as his contemporary in another industry. More convincing would have been the real gestures of committed support, glimpses of which we occasionally get through reports of the members of one industry getting actively involved in the disputes of another: the best example of which was the events at Denaby in 1869.

\(^1\) George Potter, Robert Applegarth and William Dronfield regularly appeared on platforms at S.Y.M.A. and W.Y.M.A. demonstrations and mass meetings in the 1870s.
CHAPTER NINETEEN

The Landed and Middle Classes: their Status in the District.
The remainder of Part Three will examine the structure and overall class and ideological orientation of the major urban and rural institutions in the study area - local government, the church and chapels, the schools and other 'improvement' agencies - and, above all, the type of people who controlled or influenced them. This analysis, which concludes with a study of party politics itself, will help to emphasise one of the central arguments of the thesis: that the district we are dealing with was a politically fluid and liberal one, free from the domination of any one powerful landed or manufacturing interest through most of the period under study. It will also emphasise that the bourgeois oligarchy that attempted to establish itself after the decline of the linen interest was to a certain extent circumscribed in its activities by the intervention of working class interests in local and national politics in the 1880s and 1890s.

These final chapters will begin with a survey of the resident landowners, the farming interest and the resident coalowning, manufacturing and other non-working class groups. The analysis will then pass on to a consideration of the institutions in the district in order to gain insights into the impact these economic groups had on the local power structure and its implications for social control.

The landowners.

J. T. Ward argues:

In many nineteenth century estate accounts, sums received from mining operations held a significant place. Some examples are well known: the Marquis of Londonderry, the Earls of Durham, Lonsdale and Crawford, J. Bowes and Lord Ravensworth owned famous and lucrative mineral properties. Many West Riding landowners also shared to some extent in the prosperity created by mining developments. 1

The operative phrase with respect to the West Riding

1 J. T. Ward, 'West Riding landowners...', p. 45.
landowners was 'to some extent', especially in South Yorkshire. With two notable exceptions, the established landowning class in our district - substantial owners with local lineage back to 1800 or before - played virtually no direct role in mining operations and merely profited from the royalties accruing to them from their ownership of the mineral rights (a total annual income of about £20,000 in South Yorkshire as a whole in 1890).\(^1\) This severance of ownership from operation did not, however, as suggested above,\(^2\) pose a great problem for the industry as a whole, but led to a commercially competitive, yet relatively democratic entrepreneurial environment.

In 1873, there were seven landowners resident in or just outside (with estates that encroached significantly on) the district, who owned over 3,000 acres in the West Riding. There were only ten more who owned between 300 and 2,999 acres (Table 23). There were, in addition, three large landowners, F.J.S. Foljambe of Nottinghamshire, the Duke of Leeds and the Duke of Norfolk, who lived outside South Yorkshire but who owned large estates in the county (including some land in our district) and a few smaller absentee owners like the Earl of Mexborough (from Methley, West Yorkshire), Earl Manvers of Nottinghamshire, the Otter family (partly of Lincolnshire and partly of Wath and Swinton) and the Charlesworth family of Lofthouse, near Wakefield, who owned 373 acres in the West Riding, mostly in Dodworth (as well as land in North Yorkshire).

Two important aspects of the landowning structure of the district need emphasising. One is the dearth of owners in

---

1. R.C. on Mining Royalties (1890), Q 1496
2. See above, p. 257. R.C. on Mining Royalties (1890), Q 1437.
in the 300-2,999 acres range, suggesting the lack of a wealthy owner-farmer class which, with the royalty income it would have received in addition, would have been a powerful factor in local politics. The concentration of land in the hands of the seven big owners in Table 23 was the product of intricate series of negotiations and the machinations of inheritance which, in the case of the three most important figures, will be examined below. These processes, which were also evident in the acquisition of estates by the Clarke and the Taylor families (two families who had an importance beyond the size of their land holding), were intricately wound up with industrial success. Only in two cases - the Clarkes' and the Fitzwilliams' - did this involve them directly in the coal industry.

Another striking feature of Table 23 is the great disparity in rent value per acre that existed between some owners. Those with predominantly urban and industrial land (including land that was exploited for minerals), like W.H. Martin-Edmunds, the Fullertons, Francis Taylor and the Fitzwilliams, used the strategic location of their land to great financial advantage. T.W. Spencer Stanhope and Lord Wharncliffe were not so well placed with a considerable acreage of hill and moorland, good for sheep and shooting excursions, but not for high rental and mineral royalties. Probably the best example of a landowner with a high return on his acreage was William Day, coalowner of Monk Bretton, whose 16 acres (which included land in Barnsley) was given a rent value of £6,353.

One aspect of the top-heavy structure of ownership in the district was an absence, in several townships in the district, of a squirearchial figure: a locally resident landowner of substance. Swinton, Mexborough, Hoyland, Rawmarsh, Wombwell, Conisborough, Darton, Bolton and the northern part of Ecclesfield all lacked resident owners of more than 300 acres,

1 Return of Owners of Land, 1873 (P.P. 1874 lxii).
resulting in a power vacuum in one form or another. It seems that, in almost every case - except Conisborough and north Ecclesfield - competing industrial interests tended to limit the ability of one particular interest to fill the vacuum. In all those townships except Conisborough, Ecclesfield and Bolton, local boards of health were formed, each providing some opportunity, albeit of a narrow kind, for small trading and even working class interests to gain expression. This process was eased by the fact that the few large landowners, on the occasions that they did become actively involved in local affairs, did it either relatively unobtrusively, or, in Fitzwilliam's case, with a relatively liberal approach (except in his attitude to industrial relations at his own collieries).

The Fitzwilliams.

The Fitzwilliams' imprint on life in South Yorkshire was large and important enough to merit closer scrutiny than that already attempted piecemeal in earlier chapters. The sixth Earl Fitzwilliam - William Thomas Spencer Wentworth Fitzwilliam - held the title through almost the whole length of the period under study, and beyond. He became an earl in 1857 and died in 1902, at the age of eighty six. He was the second son of Charles William Wentworth Fitzwilliam (1786-1857), the fifth Earl, and grandson of William Wentworth Fitzwilliam (1748-1833), the fourth Earl. The latter was nephew and heir of Charles Watson-Wentworth (1730-82), second Marquis Rockingham and one-time Prime Minister, who was also a direct descendant of Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford.

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 22 Feb. 1902 (obituary).

The sixth Earl inherited the material remnants of an Irish earldom dating back to 1620 and a current English earldom dating from 1746. He owned at his date of death about 116,000 acres, including about 80,000 in County Wicklow and the rest in his Wentworth and Malton estates in Yorkshire and at Milton, near Peterborough. The bulk of the Yorkshire estates were acquired through purchases made by Thomas Watson Wentworth and his son, the first Marquis Rockingham, between 1712 and 1749 (at a time when the land market in South Yorkshire was extremely fluid). The Milton estate accrued to the family through the marriage of the second Marquis Rockingham's sister Anne to William Fitzwilliam of Milton.¹

The sixth Earl not only inherited the land, industrial undertakings and Wentworth Woodhouse, an imposing family seat, built largely by the first Marquis Rockingham, but also a tradition of active involvement in Whig politics. The fourth Earl had followed his uncle into government under Pitt as President of Council. Rockingham had lent his support to the idea of American independence while in opposition in the 1760s and 1770s; and the fourth Earl developed this critical posture as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, from which post he was removed for his expressed sympathy for Irish independence. He was also removed from his Lord Lieutenancy of the West Riding in 1819 for his public criticism of the Liverpool administration's handling of the Peterloo massacre.²

The fifth Earl had been a Member of Parliament for the County of York, originally as Wilberforce's partner in 1807, through to the former's retirement in 1830. He had previously been Member for Northamptonshire.³ Like his father, he was a free

¹ Who was Who 1897-1915, p.248; S.C.L., Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments catalogue, family tree appendix.
² The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, p.443; Barnsley Chronicle, 10 Sept. 1892.
³ G.Mee, op.cit., pp. 4, 9, 11-12; Barnsley Chronicle, 21 June 1884 and 15 Sept. 1888.
trader and was almost puritanically critical of the aristocracy's role in Ireland. He marginally gave his support to the 1832 Reform Bill; but, as Mee argues:

The Fitzwilliams (fourth and fifth Earls) . . . had no taste for social levelling. They were born to position and wealth and enjoyed the privileges which rank and landownership conferred. However, they felt the responsibility of their high station and consequently spent much of their lives involved in the determination of the great political issues of their time, speaking out courageously against injustice and the abuse of privilege. ¹

Their political record, locally and nationally, was, in general, only marred by their attitude to grass-roots social movements at their doorstep.

The sixth Earl himself had been an M.P. - for Malton between 1837 and 1841; and from 1846 to 1847 and 1847 to 1857 for Wicklow. He failed in the West Riding election of 1842. He was Lord Lieutenant for the West Riding between 1857 and 1892 and A.D.C. to the Queen from 1884 to 1894. The sixth Earl's eldest son, Charles Viscount Milton, was Liberal M.P. for the South-West Riding from 1865 to 1872, dying in 1877; while the second son, Henry, was M.P. for the South-West Riding, 1880-5 and for Doncaster as a Unionist from 1888-92.² The sixth Earl was also, for forty years, commanding officer of the First West Yorkshire Yeomanry.

The Fitzwilliams, by far the largest landowners in the district - the twelfth largest landowners in the U.K. in 1873, and the sixth wealthiest in terms of the rent value of their land³ - were also local political magnates of the first order. If the sixth Earl did not, like some of his ancestors, have a major national political role to play, he was certainly at the

¹ G.Mee, op.cit., p.15.
pinnacle of county government. Despite his periodic absences in Ireland and at his Grosvenor Square, London, residence, he loomed very large as a local political and economic figure.

The fifth Earl, as Mee points out, responded amply, with a mixture of unselfish philanthropy and pragmatic utilitarianism, to local charity and encouraged a brand of self help through such bodies as the Mechanics Institutes. ¹ He was an active and relatively liberal member of the Rotherham Poor Law Board, supported local schools and chapels, but always stopped short of delegating his jealously guarded political power. ² The sixth Earl made no attempt to veer from his predecessors' tradition of paternalism towards both his miners and the community at large. He donated substantial sums to the building and upkeep of churches and chapels of several denominations; and he took a lively interest in colliery accident relief in the coalfield at large. He was president of the West Riding Miners' Permanent Relief Fund to his death and of the Oaks Disaster Relief Fund, contributing £500 to the fund himself. ³ Wentworth Woodhouse was frequently host to groups of working people from the district in some guise or other; in 1890, for example, the old people from the Rotherham workhouse were invited to dine there. ⁴

Fitzwilliam inevitably was landlord to a large number of tenant farmers. And the fact that he took a close interest in the running of this as well as the mineral side of his estate, despite the declining important of agricultural rents in his total income, was verified by the Barnsley Chronicle, a paper not renowned for an uncritical assessment of the sixth Earl.

² Ibid., p.22.
⁴ Ibid, 26 July 1890.
'His lordship's efficient administration as a landowner is found in the excellent condition of the farms on his estates and the contentment of his tenantry'. About 300 tenants feasted at Wentworth Woodhouse every half yearly rent day. He presented silver cups to the tenants of the best cultivated farms and, in 1881, when the agricultural depression had begun to bite, he remitted a half-year's rent on his farms, which was ceremoniously acknowledged by the beneficiaries a couple of months later.

Perhaps Fitzwilliam's aristocratic but paternalistic view of class is best summed up by his replies during an interview he gave on the values of one of his lifelong passions - hunting. He claimed that it 'formed a bond embracing all ranks in society, from the humblest to the very highest.' Hunting's value was found in the opportunities it created for the different classes to meet. Inevitably it was on the landlord's terms: Fitzwilliam prosecuted poachers as avidly as anyone.

Mee reminds us that the Fitzwilliams have been cited as an example of mineral landlords who withdrew 'into the more secure position of rentiers' as the century progressed. This view, he claims, was based on a wrong impression of the size of his colliery operations. (Fitzwilliam worked several

1 Ibid, 22 Feb. 1902.
2 Ibid, 26 Nov. 1864.
3 Ibid, 5 Nov. 1881.
5 The sixth Earl instituted his own hunt in 1860.
6 Barnsley Chronicle, 23 March 1872.
7 This was the assertion of F.M.L.Thompson, see G.Mee, op.cit., ix.
pits in the second half of the century, but they tended to be grouped under the collective titles of the Stubbin and Elsecar collieries, even though more men were employed than in the first half of the century; setting a trap for the unwary historian.) Nevertheless, income from mineral rents always outweighed income from the Earl’s collieries themselves in our period: in 1901 the figures were £74,041 and £13,701 respectively¹ (the latter being less than the profits from his industrial operations in 1870,² suggesting some degree of absolute as well as relative decline). As the century advanced, mineral rents also became far more important than agricultural ones. At half yearly audits in 1855, 1874 and 1894, the proportion of mineral rents in total rents could be seen to have grown dramatically, especially in the first twenty years:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mineral rents</th>
<th>Total rents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>£5,172</td>
<td>£18,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>£21,039</td>
<td>£35,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>£26,022</td>
<td>£43,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In very few townships (notably in the semi-urbanised Kimberworth) on the Earl’s estates did non-mineral rents fail to fall between 1855 and 1894;⁴ while in 1894, he was receiving royalties from seventeen South Yorkshire colliery companies.⁵ With a marginally expanding colliery undertaking (and even a declining one in the later years) a declining agricultural sector, but a rapidly growing royalty income, especially in the first twenty to twenty five years of our period and the last decade of the century, there is some truth in Thompson’s original statement which was questioned by Mee.

² S.C.L., WWM T 29 (b).
³ S.C.L., WWM A 651, 670, 690.
⁴ S.C.L., WWM A 651.
⁵ S.C.L., WWM A 690.
The Fitzwilliams, despite their devotion to the coal industry (perhaps flagging somewhat towards the end of the century) were not adverse to conspicuous spending in the manner of many of their contemporary landed magnates. The hunt, the upkeep of the Milton, Coolattin, Grosvenor Square and Wentworth households, the constant travelling and many other items of expenditure ensured that the sixth Earl found himself in debt in 1871.\(^1\) But it was the mineral royalty and not the collieries' profits which bolstered his finances and counteracted the stagnation and fall in agricultural rents after the late 1870s. In the 1890s, in fact, the Earl undertook large scale conversion of his capital into stocks and bonds.\(^2\) There is ample evidence to suggest that, with the relative decline in his mining undertaking, reinforced by waning local political influence,\(^3\) the Fitzwilliam 'empire' contracted, retreating behind an increasingly out-of-date approach to politics and labour relations. As Evison suggests: "The Earl could not appreciate the social changes that were going on around him and he tried to ignore them; but in the end they overwhelmed him as they did everyone else".\(^4\) He was not exactly overwhelmed by these changes before 1894, but his influence had withered without a doubt, leaving even more room for those social forces who were motivated and sufficiently strong enough to fill the vacuum.

\(^1\) The Milton estate was permanently in debt throughout the nineteenth century. See D. Spring, 'English landowners and nineteenth century industrialism' in J.T. Ward and R.G. Wilson, \textit{op.cit.}, p.51.


\(^3\) See pp. 576-7.

Other landowners.

The Stuart-Wortley family had been resident landowners at Wortley for longer than Earl Fitzwilliam's ancestors had been influential in the district, but their elevation to the peerage was of more recent descent. James Archibald Stuart-Wortley (1776-1845), M.P., Lord Privy Seal, was created the first Lord Wharncliffe in 1826. He was the grandson of the Earl of Bute, one time Prime Minister, and of Mary, daughter of Edward Wortley Montagu of Wortley. One of the first Lord Wharncliffe's sons and the former's brother had been Tory M.P.s in Yorkshire, but a political life was not for Edward, Lord Wharncliffe (1827-99), the first Lord Wharncliffe's grandson and the holder of the title throughout our period. He was, nevertheless granted an earldom in 1876. He inherited not only the 9,000-odd acres West Riding estate but land in other parts of Yorkshire which totalled over 13,000 acres in 1873.

The Wortley family had been involved in the early eighteenth century exploitation of iron around their estates and, up to 1852, were involved in partnerships in the Durham coal trade. The first Earl's father, however, sold out what remained of these interests with debts of about £110,000. The first Earl, though retaining an active interest in railway development in South Yorkshire and further afield, took no further economic part in any industrial undertaking.

---

1 Who was Who 1897-1915, pp. 754-5; C. Grosvenor and C. Beilby, The First Lady Wharncliffe and her Family 1779-1856 (Heinemann, 1927), ii, family tree appendix.

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 1 March 1873.

3 Who was Who 1897-1915, p. 754.


5 J. T. Ward, 'The Earls Fitzwilliam and the Wentworth Woodhouse estate', p. 21; Who was Who 1897-1915, pp. 754-5.
even though he was patron of the North of England Institute of Mining Engineers. His attitude to the early S.Y.M.A. can be assessed from his threat, in 1859, to evict a tenant if he allowed his field to be used for a miners' meeting. In 1869, however, with Walter Spencer Stanhope, he intervened in the Thorncliffe lockout in an attempt to get an arbitrated settlement. He was Honorary Colonel of the Second West Yorkshire Volunteers, a magistrate and was benevolent in his support of local charities and disaster funds. But he was a far less obtrusive and less important presence in the district than Earl Fitzwilliam.

The Spencer family who first came to the West Riding in the mid seventeenth century, settling in Cawthorne, were, for several decades in the early and mid eighteenth century, pivotal figures in the West Riding iron mining and smelting industries. Walter Spencer Stanhope (1749-1821) inherited both the Cannon Hall (Cawthorne) estate and the Horsforth (near Bradford) estate of the Stanhope family, into which his mother had married. Walter, through the patronage of the Lowthers (the large Cumbrian coal and land owners and relatives of the Stanhopes), became M.P. for Carlisle and later for Hull. He did, however, sever the Spencer family's link with industry after refusing the offer of purchase of the Low Moor estate, near Bradford, with valuable coal and

1 J.T. Ward, 'West Riding landowners...', p.52.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 13 Aug. 1859.
3 Cusworth Hall, Newton Chambers MSS, Trades Disputes File.
4 See p. 35.
5 A.N.W. Stirling, op. cit., i, pp. 60-324; ibid, ii, p.4.
6 Ibid, i, p.144; ibid, ii, p.150.
iron seams, which were subsequently worked by his former
estate steward, William Hardy, in partnership with others.¹
Walter's son, John (1787-1873), apart from acting as a
magistrate through the disturbed years 1820-40, shrank
further from the public eye.²

His son, Walter (1827-1911), was a more active political
figure: Tory M.P. for the South-West Riding in 1872-80,
Deputy Lord Lieutenant of the West Riding and deputy chairman
of Quarter Sessions; and after 1885, president of the
Holmfirth Division Conservative Association.³ He was one
time officer in the West Yorkshire Yeomanry, a director of
the Aire and Calder Navigation and patron of three livings.⁴
Cannon Hall was frequently host to Sunday scholars and every
year staged a ball for the tenantry and servants.⁵ An Oxford
scholar, one might have expected Walter Spencer Stanhope to
have pursued an active political career on the national stage,
but he chose to devote his energies to local matters. He did
not, however, emulate his great-grandfather's activities in
industry, the Cannon Hall estate's coal and iron having
largely been worked out by the time he inherited it in 1873.
This was reflected in the low rent value of his estate in
that year. He left £118,979 in his will in 1911.⁶

The most retiring of all the four big 'internal'
landowning families in our district were the Vernon-Wentworths:
Frederick (1795-1885) and his son and heir, Thomas (1831-1902).

¹ Ibid, ii, pp.75-81.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 25 Nov. 1911.
⁴ Ibid; Barnsley Times, 1 Feb. 1873.
⁵ Barnsley Times, 5 Jan. 1856.
⁶ Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley
and District 1229-1922, entry for 17 Nov. 1911.
Their Stainborough, Worsborough and Barnsley estates were accumulated in the early eighteenth century by the first Earl of Strafford, who held title to a recreation of the peerage after the Restoration, for the benefit of the great nephew of the former Lord Strafford. The earldom became extinct in 1799 and the estates passed through a number of distant branches of the family, eventually to Frederick William Thomas Vernon, the seven-year-old son of a Staffordshire landowner, in 1802. When Frederick Vernon-Wentworth (as he subsequently styled himself) came of age, he devoted his energies almost entirely to his estate; his one major public office having been that of High Sheriff of the West Riding in 1841. He led what the Barnsley Chronicle called a 'singularly quiet and uneventful career', spending his winters in London and rarely appearing on public platforms. He was honorary head of various local charities and welfare institutions, subscribed to them generously and supported churches and chapels of all denominations. He had formerly thrown his estate open to the general public, but withdrew this facility later in his life. Unlike Fitzwilliam and the Stanhopes, he was not a sportsman. He took a keen interest in the mining operations of the eight major colliery companies who leased minerals from him, from the point of view of how they might affect his land. His leases were relatively stringent and detailed and companies planning to change their commercial status had to look to his interests. The Vernon-Wentworths' estate income dropped from £2,880 for the first half of 1885, to £1,522 for the first half of 1894 (and a low of £1,142 in the first half of 1900). Their coal incomes, however, must have seen them comfortably through the long depression.

1 Burlands 'Annals of Barnsley' in Barnsley Chronicle, 22 March to 15 July 1882; Barnsley Times, 29 March and 12 April 1873.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 19 Sept. 1885.
3 Barnsley Times, 12 April 1873.
4 See, for example, Lincolnshire C.R.O., Strafford Main MSS, Proposed Scheme for Conversion to Limited Liability.
5 S.C.L., V-W M 164.
Frederick's son, Thomas, although a J.P. for the forty years 1862-1902, sat only once on the bench in that time. He was a parliamentary candidate for Aylesbury in 1865, but was defeated. He too was seldom seen in public. His eldest son, Bruce, born in 1862, did enter political life with some enthusiasm. He twice contested the Barnsley parliamentary seat and eventually won the Tory representation of Brighton.

The Beaumonts of Bretton Hall (about three miles north-west of Darton village) included in their estate a large portion of the coal-rich township of Darton. They had originally been resident in Darton, but through a lucrative marriage in the 1780s, acquired the Bretton Hall seat. They also accumulated land in Northumberland which included leadmines, and Thomas Wentworth Beaumont, the grandfather of Wentworth Blackett Beaumont (the head of the family throughout most of the period), had fought the Northumberland parliamentary seat for the Liberals several times in the early decades of the century. Several members of the family took an interest in coalmining (they were, like Lord Wharncliffe, patrons of the North of England Institute of Mining Engineers), but did not operate mines themselves. Moreover, their royalty income declined dramatically from a peak of £9,280 in 1874 to £3,215 in 1890. They suffered especially from the liquidation of the Thorpe colliery enterprise in 1882. In 1885, a large portion of the Bretton Hall estate was put up for sale. The family maintained some political influence in the district in the earlier years of the period through the acquisition of the South-West Riding seat from

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 4 Jan. 1902.
2 Ibid, 8 Jan. 1881.
3 Ibid.
4 J.T. Ward, 'West Riding landowners...', p. 52.
5 Ibid.
6 Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Sept. 1885.
1865 to 1874 by a cousin, II. P. Beauront. But Wentworth Beaumont, though M.P. for South Northumberland for many years, ¹ did not extend his interests into the study area to any great extent (other than fulfilling the duties of a magistrate from time to time).

The Fullertons of Thrybergh (just south-east of Swinton) were an old Scottish family who acquired the ownership of the Thrybergh Park estate (with land mainly in Denaby, Kilnhurst, Thrybergh itself and Brinsworth on the edge of Rotherham) through marriage in the late eighteenth century. ² John Fullerton (1778-1847) rebuilt Thrybergh Hall and set the model of life for his heirs: his son John (died in 1871), John's son Thomas (died in 1881), Thomas's brother the Rev. Charles (died in 1890) and Charles' son John who eventually married into the Clarke family of Silkstone in 1893, moving soon after to Noblethorpe Hall. ³ The model was that of the Tory squire in a rural parish, despite the proximity of the Thrybergh Hall, Denaby and Cadeby mining operations from which the family accumulated massive mining royalties from 1858 onwards. They had no other ostensible industrial interests, confining their roles to those of the magistracy, hunting and local benefaction. ⁴

The Clarkes of Noblethorpe Hall in Silkstone were descended from a Barnsley family who made their money in the local wiredrawing industry. Jonas Clarke (1758-1822), formerly a lawyer, bought the Noblethorpe estate in 1792. ⁵

¹ Ibid, 12 July 1884.
³ Ibid, pp.219, 226.
⁴ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 7 Feb. 1890.
⁵ S.C.L., CR 315.
Whether or not it had been his intention from the start, Jonas Clarke soon began to test for coal on his and adjoining estates after the opening of the Barnsley Canal had proved its marketable value. Jonas, his son and grandson (both named Robert Couldwell Clarke) and the first Robert's wife, Sarah (daughter of a North Yorkshire industrialist), set about systematically buying up vacant farms, messuages and parcels of land, a process made easier by the fact that much of Silkstone was owned by absentees with little interest in the township's development. In 1846, Sarah Clarke also acquired an interest in some Dodworth property, under which the family was soon to mine. The benefits of land ownership, both for their own major colliery enterprise and for the royalties that came in from two or three smaller proprietors, were obvious.

Up to the mid 1880s, the family lived securely if not flamboyantly. Noblethorpe Hall was rebuilt in 1838 into a sizeable mansion; and by the early 1880s, there was also a London home in Brook Street, near Grosvenor Square. There were twelve servants resident at Noblethorpe in 1871. With the closure of the New Sovereign pit (their largest) in 1885, however, coupled with the general decline of Silkstone's coal reserves and of agricultural rents, the family's fortunes must have been squeezed. The marriage into the Fullerton family in 1893 stemmed the slide, although the colliery enterprise was all but wound up in 1900.

2 S.C.L., CR 231, 314-5, 501-2, 506-543. Jonas Clarke conducted seventeen major transactions; Sarah Clarke fourteen; Robert Clarke snr. seven; and Robert jnr. five.
3 S.C.L., CR 163.
4 S.C.L., CR 110.
5 Census enumerators' returns, 1871.
6 S.C.L., CR 121.
The two Robert Clarkes died young and never had a great impact on life outside Silkstone. The younger (who died in 1874) had been a magistrate since 1862 and had an active interest in the Volunteer movement. He had been a promoter of the thirty seventh West Yorkshire Volunteer Rifle Corps, taking over the captaincy from Walter Spencer Stanhope in 1863. He lent some support to the Tories in the parliamentary campaigns of 1865 and 1868.\(^1\) The Clarkes, including the widows who twice had to shoulder the responsibilities of the estate and the mining operations (although Emily, the widow of the younger Robert Clarke, delegated more and more to her managers), did take a great interest in parish affairs, supporting the local church and schools and dominating the vestry.

Thomas Edward Taylor (1813-90), was the model of a type of active landowner-industrialist of his day. The descendant of Edward Taylor, one of the pioneer linen manufacturers in Barnsley, Thomas Taylor inherited not only the largest linen business in the district, but also landed estates in Dodworth and elsewhere, purchased and acquired through marriage in the early nineteenth century.\(^2\)

Taylor remained active in the linen industry all his life, diversifying into wool weaving to maintain the size of his enterprise.\(^3\) He married the daughter of another large linen manufacturer and left over £110,000 on his death in 1890.\(^4\) Taylor, like so many of the other important Barnsley industrialists, was very active in local government.

\(^1\) Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Dec. 1874 (obituary).
\(^2\) Ibid, 18 Oct. 1890 (obituary);
J.T. Ward, 'West Riding Landowners...', p.53.
\(^3\) Barnsley Chronicle, 18 Oct. 1890.
\(^4\) Ibid, 17 Jan. 1891.
He was one of the Town Commissioners, was involved in Barnsley's incorporation movement and was chairman of Dodworth Board of Health for twenty five years. He was an active magistrate for nearly thirty years, an enthusiastic promoter of the Barnsley and Dodworth Mechanics Institutes and a supporter of numerous local charities. He was a Tory in politics and played an active role during parliamentary elections.

Taylor combined characteristics of the urban industrialist and of the rural Tory squire, an unusual mix for this district. His son, the Rev. Thomas Thornley Taylor, was not so ambitious and devoted himself far more to parish affairs after his return to Dodworth in 1882. Thomas Edward also differed in important ways from his brother Francis of Middlewood Hall, Darfield who, although having a financial interest in the family weaving business, rarely broke the bounds of his role as 'a model country squire'. The latter's only major public involvement was as a magistrate.

Three smaller landowning families to the south and east of Barnsley - the Martin-Edmunds of Worsborough, the Micklethwaites of Ardsley and the Vizards of Hoyland (owners of 200 West Riding acres in 1873) - were active in promoting mining on their estates in the 1840s and 1850s. When, however, the major collieries they were concerned with - notably Oaks and Hoyland and Elsecar (later, Hoyland Silkstone) - were leased first to outside partnerships and then to limited companies, these landowners took on rentier's roles. The Micklethwaites were rather inactive Tories and

1 Ibid, 28 June 1884.
2 Ibid, 19 Nov. 1898.
magistrates and were involved in the Volunteers. The Martin-Edmunds family - closely related by marriage to the Stuart-Wortleys - became non-resident in the late 1860s and the family seat of Worsborough Hall was rented to local colliery managers. They all continued to benefit from mining royalties, but on a scale that left Richard Micklethwaite, for example, with a fortune of a little under £35,000 on his death in 1888 (compared with £961,000 left by Frederick Vernon-Wentworth, a much larger landowner but one with interests largely confined to the district in a non-industrial capacity) in 1886.

None of the other resident landowners in Table 23, nor the three major absentee owners, played important roles in district affairs or became directly involved in mining. Godfrey Wentworth of Woolley was a J.P., but not an active one. The family estates had been substantially reduced through the failure of their banking business earlier in the century. F. J. S. Foljambe, a relation of the Fitzwilliams, was also a J.P. with responsibility for part of the district (Rotherham Petty Sessional Division). He contested (unsuccessfully) the Rotherham parliamentary seat in 1886 and 1892 as a Unionist. Despite these interests in the area and the lordships of three local manors, he was said by the Barnsley Chronicle to have had 'no local claims'.

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 11 April 1908 and 14 July 1888.
2 Except for a brief period in 1886 and 1887 when William Martin-Edmunds returned to the district and supported Kenny, the Liberal candidate for Barnsley, having already shocked his family by standing as a Home Rule Liberal at Barrow in Furness in 1886. Barnsley Chronicle, 10 April 1886.
3 Barnsley Times, 1 Sept. 1855.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 14 Oct. 1899.
5 Ibid, 6 Oct. 1888.
6 Ibid, 20 Feb. 1886.
7 J. T. Ward, 'West Riding Landowners... ', p. 54.
8 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 July 1892.
Thomas Owsworth, the largest farmer in Dodworth, would probably have played a more important role in local affairs but for the domination of the Taylor family. He remained, however, the virtually undisputed Guardian for the township for about twenty years and was a member of the local board from 1865 until shortly before his death in 1874.1 Owsworth seems to have been one of the very few large owner-farmers in the district and the family, as a result, probably maintained a more secure position through the depression than many of the smaller mortgagees and tenants.2

The largest farmer from each township in the study area in 1871 was reported to have had a holding in the range of 180 to 520 acres,3 with a medium range of 200 to 300 acres. The vast majority of these men were clearly tenant farmers. Usually there were two or three (or more in the larger townships like Wombwell and Conisborough) men of this stature in each township, employing between one and five farm labourers and/or farm servants, but often with no, or at the most, three domestic servants. Turnover amongst this relatively modest class of farmers seems to have been quite high and where one acquired some permanency, he tended to snap up the job of Guardian (the one sphere of local government still dominated, unchallenged, by the farmers in the out-townships) and retain it for years. Raywood of Wombwell, for example, though not the farmer of the largest holding in the township (his was 148 acres in 1871), exploited the advantages of relative permanency.

1 Ibid, 25 April and 18 July 1874.
2 See P. J. Perry, British Farming in the Great Depression 1870-1914 (David and Charles, Newton Abbot, 1974), pp. 102-3. About 85% of farmers in England in 1894 were tenants (ibid, pp. 92, 162).
3 Census enumerators' returns. This only dealt with men who were described in the census as farmers.
Without going too deeply into a study of the institutions of the district (to be found in Chapters Twenty to Twenty Two), it is possible to say that the farming interest was on the decline several years before the depression set in, in the central industrialised townships of the district and was only able to assert itself in the more rural townships on the fringe (and here only if they were not dominated by an assertive local coalowner as in Silkstone). In Stainborough, for example, the resident landowner - the Vernon-Wentworth family - clearly took a back seat role and farming and other interests were able to emerge.\(^1\) Marriage between farming families and industrial and trading families could have been one compromise in the less rural parishes. In Swinton, only one of the nine children of the larger farmers (holding over 150 acres in 1871) who were married at Swinton church between 1855 and 1894, married into another farming family.\(^2\)

Growing local urban markets must have helped the farmers stave off the worst effects of the depression just as they, and the royalties from mining, benefited the landowners. The market garden industry, at least, seems to have grown substantially over the period, judging from the major increase in this occupation in the local trade directories. A certain amount of subsidisation by the wealthier mineral-owning landlords must also have taken place. Nevertheless, by the early 1890s, representatives, especially of the upland sheep farmers, were talking about crisis and calling for tariffs and for rent and rate reductions.\(^3\) It was claimed, in 1893, that tenant farmers had been paying rents out of their capital for several years.\(^4\) Recognition of their diminished

\(^1\) The farmer who was guardian of Stainborough for many years, E. Grove, even voted Liberal, unlike his landlord; see West Riding Poll Book, 1865.

\(^2\) Swinton parish marriage registers.

\(^3\) Barnsley Chronicle, 26 Nov. and 10 Dec. 1892.

\(^4\) Ibid, 7 Jan. 1893.
status in national and local politics was given at a meeting of the Barnsley Agricultural and Horticultural Society in 1892: a new corn tax was an unrealistic hope because the controlling power in the country was said to lie with 'the masses of the working men'. Recognition of their community interest with the landowners, however, was expressed by an assertion that rent reductions would only deprive the landowners of capital needed for investment in improvements. The one major assault that the farmers intended to make was on the rating levels for school boards and boards of health: the traditional field on which farmers in the district had been fighting a largely unsuccessful rearguard action (except in small, rural townships where early local boards were not resisted by the farmers who then packed them with their representatives, pre-empting high expenditure and rating policies).

We have seen, therefore, how the dominance of the large landowner in the district and other processes (including the high turnover of farmers) which happened to equalise the size of tenanted farms, effectively prevented the establishment and maintenance of a powerful farming lobby. The relative lack of involvement of several of the larger landowners in local government and other public affairs, moreover, left a power vacuum to be filled, from the mid 1850s, by other interests.

Other middle class groups.

There were few important coalowners permanently resident in the study area in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was especially true of the years after 1870.

1 Ibid, 26 Nov. 1892.

2 This was especially true of several townships to the west of the district, like Hoylandswaine.
The few that remained - Earl Fitzwilliam, the Clarkes and the Day family in particular - continued to make their presence felt in the area, but inevitably this influence became increasingly confined to their neighbourhood of residence as both the new and some older institutions fell into the hands of less traditional elements. A list has been compiled of sixty-nine members of the manufacturing, commercial, trading and professional middle class in the district (not including those dealt with above as landowners) sufficiently important to merit persistent mention (and, in most cases, earn obituaries) in the local press, mainly, but not always, because of their involvement in public affairs. Only eight of these men - the Fountains (North Gawber, Woolley Beamshaw, Darton Main and Haigh in West Yorkshire), William Day (Mount Osborne, Old Mill, Rosa and Agnes), Ben Sellars (Wath Main and Roundwood), William Batty (Darley Main and Pindar Oaks), Samuel Cooper (Wentworth Silkstone, Worsborough Park and Rockley), George Burnley (as with Joseph and Henry Fountain) John Haynes (Hallroyd) and Howard Allport (Wharncliffe Woodmoor) - could legitimately be described as colliery proprietors in the sense that this was virtually their only active economic interest. There were several others - Joseph Mitchell (Edmunds and Mitchell Main and iron manufacture), Robert Craik (East Gawber and bleaching), the Newtons and the Chambers's (the Thorncliffe collieries and iron manufacture), Dan Rylands (Rylands Main and glass manufacture), Thomas Marsden (Winter colliery and paper manufacturing) and John Tyas (Wombwell Main, Edmunds and Swaithe Main and law practice), in particular - who had controlling interests in mining while being involved in another industry or profession.

There were, in addition, a few important omissions from the list by virtue of the fact that they were resident just outside the study area - Horace Walker of Wharncliffe Silkstone, John Brown and Co., of Aldwarke Main, Charles Cammell of Oaks,

1 See Appendix 5.
J. Davy of Manvers Main, J. B. Pope of Denaby Main and the Charlesworths of Thrybergh Hall and Warren Vale - yet who exerted a more important influence on the area than more distantly and permanently absent proprietors of similar stature. Pope, the Charlesworths and Horace Walker, in particular, were frequently to be found at or around their collieries, enforcing their own particular brand of work and community discipline.

Most of the locally resident coalowners made their presence felt in local affairs in one way or another, but mostly in the out-townships where all but one or two lived and where their pits were sunk. There were a few small coalowners, such as William Lawton (co-owner of Hallroyd), Thomas Harrison (co-owner of West Silkstone) and Joseph Sutcliffe (owner of the small Victoria pit), who were living in Barnsley at the time of the 1871 census, but they had insufficient means or motivation to make an impact on public life in the town. Proprietors of larger pits who were important voices in local government in Barnsley around 1850 - Twibell (Day's partner), the Thorpe family (of North Gawber and other smaller pits) and Hopwood (co-owner of two or three early Barnsley pits), in particular - were either dead or no longer economically and politically active by the mid 1860s.1 And even Robert and Thomas Craik, important industrialists on two accounts, who lived in the town throughout our period,2 took little or no part in Barnsley's public affairs. Only John Tyas, Dan Rylands and Thomas Marsden, amongst the full or part time coalowners, made an important impact on politics and local government in the town itself.

1 See Barnsley Chronicle Almanack 1862, p. 57.
2 Census enumerators' returns 1871; E. G. Tasker, Barnsley Streets (Chesterfield, 1974), pp. 49, 56.
Even if men like the Fountains at Darton, the Days at Monk Bretton, the Newton and Chambers families in the Chapeltown area and, of course, the Clarkes and the Fitzwilliams, made an important impact on some of the out-townships (particularly on the fringe of the district) it is still difficult to talk of a cohesive coal interest, other than in an economic sense, in this period as a whole. Perhaps one of the most likely rallying points for such a grouping might have been Samuel Cooper: the longest established and almost certainly the wealthiest industrialist in the district with an exclusive interest in coal (Earl Fitzwilliam was too much of a maverick in the industry to fulfill this role). Cooper was a retiring figure, living modestly (he had only three servants in 1871), albeit in a substantial house, at Mount Vernon in Worsborough.

His only public roles, despite his father's involvement as chairman of the Yorkshire Association in 1841, were a trusteeship of the Permanent Relief Fund up to 1893 and large scale public benefaction (he had no children to leave his wealth to). The proprietors who did, more than any, attempt to give a lead to the colliery interest in the area were the Newton and Chambers families. We have noted their involvement in the coalowners' associations and suggested that their hold on Chapeltown and the scattered hamlets around it was more than merely an economic one. Unlike another longstanding family-based firm with a well-established power base in the Yorkshire coalfield - the Charlesworths - the members of the partnership continually

1 Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922, entry for 11 July 1913. Cooper left £751,446 in his will, having already donated large sums to charitable foundations.

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 27 June 1885. Cooper bought a fifty six acre estate at Pindar Oaks in 1885, but did not choose to live there.

3 S.C.L., CR 139 A.

4 Barnsley Chronicle, 19 July 1913 (obituary).
ploughed back their profits into the business, and personally led unostentatious lives. George Chambers' modest villa residence in Mortomley, for example, contrasted vividly with John and Joseph Charlesworth's Stanley, Chapelthorpe and Kettlethorpe estates. Thomas Newton left only £90,000 on his death in 1868. Yet both groups of proprietors enjoyed a considerable degree of involvement in local institutions and politics.

One aspect of the increasing importance of coal in the South Yorkshire economy was the presence of a growing number of colliery managers and other senior staff, resident in the area. In many ways, these men tended to take over the community roles that were not filled by colliery proprietors. Lockwood points out that a top cashier, for example, in industry could earn as much as some small employers, with all the implications that that held for their status in the community and ability to perform roles in local institutions. A glance at the structure of salaries in the Newton Chambers' colliery enterprise reveals the presence of several employees in this category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary p.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.C. Newton</td>
<td>Managing Director, Newton, Chambers and Co. Ltd. (1881 onwards)</td>
<td>£1,250 + bonus based on dividends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M. Chambers</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dawson</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Allott</td>
<td>General Manager (1899)</td>
<td>£900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Wardell</td>
<td>Viewer (1871)</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Watson</td>
<td>Certified Colliery Manager (1875)</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Cowlishaw</td>
<td>Surveyor (1875)</td>
<td>£350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Barraclough</td>
<td>Cashier (1872)</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Stanley Hall was put on the market in 1853. It had fifteen bedrooms. See Wakefield Express, 9 July 1853. Chapelthorpe Hall was on the market in 1902. It had 20 bedrooms and over 300 acres of land. Kettlethorpe Hall was on the market in 1908. It had 10 bedrooms and over 400 acres. See Cusworth Hall, Charlesworth MSS, sale brochures.

2 Cusworth Hall, Newton Chambers MSS, George Dawson's diary, May 1868.


4 Cusworth Hall, Newton Chambers MSS, Partnership Memoranda and 'Notes for a history of...'.

485
In Dodworth, Keresforth House, one of the largest residences in the township, was occupied in 1871 by Seward, the manager at Strafford Main. Several of the largest town houses in Barnsley were occupied by colliery managers and viewers who often had a servant or two. The most important group were the general managers of the larger (mostly limited liability) companies - men like Fincken of Hoyland Silkstone, Thompson of Manvers, W.H. Chambers of Denaby and Cheatter of Monk Bretton (who left £29,624 in his will) who enjoyed high salaries, a varying degree of unhindered control over their enterprises and often a long period of residence in the district which enabled them to establish a power base. It is also likely that, as a group, they earned more respect from both the working and middle classes on account of their active involvement in the industry than would a group of non-participant capitalist colliery proprietors. Many had shares in their enterprises and some became managing directors. Once they established their credentials with some of the older-established groups in the district, they became an important force, more cohesive than the colliery owners whose interests still conflicted and whose backgrounds were extremely diverse.

Alongside the fourteen colliery proprietors (including the ones with interests in other economic ventures) there were twenty six other manufacturers in our list - nine in linen, seven in iron and steel manufacture or founding, five in glass, and the rest in paper, bleaching and beer making. A few more linen manufacturers might have been added to the list, but because they died or retired in the first decade of the period, their presence in the district was limited in time and information on their backgrounds was lacking.

1 Census enumerators' returns 1871.
2 Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922, entry for 25 Aug. 1912.
3 See Barnsley Chronicle, Nov. 1883 to Jan. 1884.
The linen interest in Barnsley nevertheless continued to be important long after the industry had begun its steep decline. Some of the manufacturers - like the Taylors and the McClintocks - diversified into other textiles, some retired and invested their savings and most continued to live in or near Barnsley until they died, playing prominent roles in local government and politics, some conspicuously displaying the considerable wealth which the industry had brought them.¹

Iron and glass manufacture too were almost entirely in the hands of local men. The Mitchell family, George Dawes (said to have been 'the most prominent person' in the important township of Hoyland),² the Wood brothers, Richard Inns and Dan Rylands - all wealthy manufacturers - loomed large in local politics, as did Tune and Senior, the two largest brewers in Barnsley. The main difference between the colliery proprietors and the other major manufacturers is that the latter were, on the whole, well established in the district when the principle modern institutions of the second half of the nineteenth century were developing. In 1855, for example, the town's Celebration Committee, formed to mark the fall of Sebastopol, was almost entirely composed of linen and iron manufacturers.³ They were, and remained, local men and formed a distinct and memorable group who dominated politics in Barnsley, at least, until midway through the 1880s.

Finally we must consider the remaining names in the list of notables. These twenty nine individuals belonged to the professions (law, accountancy, teaching, the churches and

¹ Charles Harvey, for example, left £219,451 in his will. See Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922, entry for 12 Nov. 1898.
³ Barnsley Times, 22 Sept. 1855.
medicine); or to services (publishing, estate agency, drapery, tailoring, quarrying, building, milling and managerial services). Inevitably these men, whose strength lay mostly in Barnsley itself, were not a homogeneous group on their own, but they were more likely to have in common the drive to become involved in local institutions that was not always incumbent on their economic position. In this group we find most of the Radicals who emerged as a powerful force in 1885. But there were also Tories. A few of these men, such as Thomas Wilkinson, a grain merchant and property speculator, and Charles Lingard (who bought the imposing Cockerham Hall in 1882) became wealthy men. Others, such as John Hanlon the schoolmaster, may have lived on incomes not much higher than the skilled labour aristocrats. Few of these men, however, ran the risk of antagonising large sections of the local working class through their ostensible position on the opposite side of the fence during industrial disputes. They turned this ambiguity to their advantage in the liberal political and social climate of South Yorkshire in our period.

One last group that did not figure in our list was the lesser clergymen and Nonconformist ministers who, though they did not attempt to win places on local boards and on Barnsley Council, were important public figures in their townships (albeit, in the case of the Nonconformists, for only short periods) especially after the establishment of a school board. The Nonconformists in particular often made a big impact during their temporary periods of residence in townships.

1 Wilkinson left about £134,000 in his will. Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922, entry for 3 March 1908.

2 See Barnsley Chronicle, 8 April 1882.
It cost him £2,355.

3 Headmasters in Barnsley received about £200 p.a. after 1873. Barnsley Chronicle, 29 Nov. 1873.
Several — such as Rev. Leslie (Congregationalist) of Swinton, Rev. Horne (Primitive Methodist), Rev. Blazeby (Wesleyan) and Rev. Compston (Baptist) of Barnsley — became closely involved with working class groups, especially the miners, during difficult times like lockouts.¹

¹ See, for example, S.Y.M.A. minutes, 11 June 1877; Barnsley Chronicle, 15 Aug. 1885 and 17 Feb. 1894.
### TABLE 23

**Principal owners of land in the study area who were also resident in or just outside the district in 1873.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Township</th>
<th>Acreage*</th>
<th>Rent Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Fitzwilliam and Hon. C.H. Fitzwilliam</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>75,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W. Spencer-Stanhope</td>
<td>Cawthorne</td>
<td>11,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Wharncliffe</td>
<td>Wortley</td>
<td>9,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.B. Beaumont</td>
<td>West Bretton</td>
<td>9,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Wentworth</td>
<td>Woolley</td>
<td>5,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W.T. Vernon-Wentworth</td>
<td>Stainborough</td>
<td>5,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. A. Fullerton and J. Fullerton (Execs.)</td>
<td>Thrybergh</td>
<td>3,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.E. Taylor</td>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>2,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Clarke (Execs.)</td>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cadman</td>
<td>Wath</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.H. Martin-Edmunds</td>
<td>Worsborough</td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. R. Micklethwaite</td>
<td>Ardsley</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H. Taylor</td>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B. Greaves</td>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Elmhirst</td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ownsworth</td>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. Elmhirst</td>
<td>Worsborough</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Land owned in the West Riding only.

Source: *Return of Owners of Land 1873* (P.P. 1874 lxii).
CHAPTER TWENTY

Politics and Interest Groups in Local Government.
In June 1853, the Barnsley ratepayers elected eighteen men to their new Board of Health after a fairly heated campaign between the more reactionary elements among the old town commissioners and the new 'Liberals'. The political boundaries between the two groups were not, however, easily definable. A high proportion of the commissioners who had pressed for a new Private Act in 1852, rather than the implementation of the Public Health Act, had been industrialists with Whig inclinations, yet two of the most ardent promoters of the new Board of Health - Richardson and Harvey - were both linen manufacturers who had sat on the Town Commission. As it happened, twelve of the old commissioners were elected to the Board, including four who had opposed its implementation. Nine of the first Board were linen manufacturers (most of them Liberals), two were ironfounders, one (John Twibell) was a colliery owner and the rest were professional men or suppliers of other services. The chairman, Edward Newman, was a solicitor.

This mix continued relatively undisturbed until incorporation in 1869, as Appendix 6 suggests. Barnsley coalowners increased their representation only marginally when William Day and John Hopwood sat together in the late 1850s after Twibell retired. Day, however, was a victim of the Ingbirchworth water scheme controversy in 1861. Most of

1 Wakefield Express, 25 June 1853.
3 Ibid, p.296.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 9 Jan. 1875 (Burland's 'Annals'). Twibell originally made his money in drapery.
5 Wakefield Express, 25 June 1853.
6 See Barnsley Chronicle, 4 May 1861.
the large linen manufacturers backed the ambitious scheme, fell foul of reactionary interests in 1861 (when T.E.Taylor resigned from the Board), but after a long campaign, pushed the scheme through after the 1862 election at which most of the opponents of the scheme lost their seats, despite support from the vestry.

The question of incorporation for Barnsley had been raised early on in the 1860s and the local press contributed as much to the controversy as members of the Board of Health and other outside interests. The Tory Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record made its position clear in 1865, on hearing speculation about an imminent move to secure a Council by the Liberals:

If this turns out to be correct; and a very large addition is made to the present electoral list, the representation of the place will be placed in the hands of those who are at present, and who have been at intervals for years, paralysing the trade of the town by strikes, or provoking lockouts.

The paper's fears were groundless. The issue was first raised at a Board of Health meeting in May 1866, by Ben Hague (the former handloom weaver), but found no seconder. The Barnsley Chronicle, in February 1868, explained the opposition to incorporation as a fear among some classes (Liberal and Tory) of an extension of voting rights:

It is here that the 'shoe pinches' with many of our large ratepayers. They do not like to forfeit their privilege of practically saying who shall and who shall not be members of the Local Board of Health. While declining to do the work of the public themselves, they prize the favour of being able to say who shall do it.

1 Ibid, 11 May 1861.
2 Ibid, 3 May 1862.
3 See Barnsley Chronicle Almanack 1862, p. 105.
4 Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record, 16 Dec. 1865.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Nov. 1873.
6 Ibid, 1 Feb. 1868.
This may have been an allusion to several coalowners, absentee or resident, who retained some control over the Board even though they did not sit on it. Several of them signed a petition counter to the one in favour of incorporation, which would have brought them into the rating net by extending the area to be administered. The collieries' rate contribution would have, according to the Barnsley Chronicle, exceeded that of all the other 'public works' put together. 1 Henry Richardson, the Liberal chairman of the Board of Health, led the proponents of incorporation during the inquiry of early 1869. He testified:

I find amongst my workmen, cleverer men than myself. I am surrounded by these men, I have to live by hundreds of them, I trust them with my property, and their skill enables me to make it a little more than it was. Many of these men are distinguished for their temperance, industry and goodness, and knowing the character of these men, I think, sir, a charter would be a great comfort and advantage to the town of Barnsley. 2

Appendix 6 sets out the result of the first Council election in September 1869. Not a great deal had changed since the later years of the Board of Health. The linen manufacturers had decreased in numbers, but where they stood as candidates (in four seats), they were successful. The colliery owners failed not only to prevent incorporation but to obtain the one seat a member of that group (Edwin Booth, a partner in the Silkstone Fall colliery in Dodworth) contested. Two prominent features of the new Council was the consolidation of the brewing interest in the south-east ward and the increase in the proportion of professional men over previous years. The growth of the miscellaneous tradesmen group was merely a continuation of a trend that began with the decline of the linen manufacturers in the early 1860s.

The most obvious defeat was of the seven who styled themselves 'gentlemen', mostly non-active property owners.

Twelve years later, in 1881, there were still four linen manufacturers on the enlarged Council, three proprietors of bleachworks and two representatives of another trade, subsidiary to linen: drapery.¹ There were no other manufacturers except for Eugene Wood (flint glass). No less than eleven out of the twenty four councillors and aldermen could be described as tradesmen; and there were five professionals. Another twelve years on, and the decline of the industrial interests on the Council was almost complete.² Henry Pigott was the only linen manufacturer on the Council in 1893 (and he had just retired from the industry). No other major manufacturer or coalowner shared office with him. There were two innkeepers; two drapers and an outfitter; two builders; a grain merchant; six shopkeeper/tradesmen; two merchants' agents, a colliery deputy and a mechanic; and five professionals (including three doctors).

The precedent for working class representation had been set in 1872 when John Normansell won a seat against John Lowrance, an ironmonger, after the S.Y.M.A. had deposited the qualifying sum of £1,000 in Normansell's bank account.³ Normansell's support from outside his union came from a mixture of industrial and small trading interests, by no means consistently Liberal; although, in 1872, he did have the vital backing of Thomas Lingard, a Liberal councillor and owner of the Barnsley Chronicle.⁴ The year before, Normansell had stood against an ironfounder, John Shaw, who was backed not only by the mass Liberal linen interest, but also by Butcher, the president of the Barnsley Working Men's

¹ See Appendix 6.
³ *Barnsley Chronicle*; 2 Nov. 1872.
⁴ Ibid, 30 Nov. 1872.
Liberal Association. The Barnsley Chronicle on this occasion was equivocal. Normansell's candidature was criticised by the linen manufacturers for being 'a holy alliance' between Catholics, Tories and the S.Y.M.A. and there was no more telling evidence of the power that the big manufacturers had over the important institutions in the town as late as 1871, than their ability to trounce Normansell in the south ward election. Here was 'where the power of capital has more expression than it has perhaps in any other ward in Barnsley', according to Normansell; and allegations were made that the big employers had successfully 'put the screw' on their men. Normansell's victory in 1872 proved to be an empty victory. His attendance of council meetings in the year 1874/5 was by far the lowest of any councillor and nothing from what was reported of his performance at those meetings he did attend, gives us to believe that things would have been different in the council if he had been more regular.

If overt political allegiances were somewhat confused or suppressed in the early years of the Barnsley Town Council, the economic and social issues which divided them were not. The most obvious was that of temperance versus the brewing/licensed victualling trades, which took open party lines from the early 1870s. The success of the latter put an end to the council career of Ben Hague, the leading temperance Liberal, although other identifiable Liberals did maintain a near two to one majority over the Tories in the council from 1869/70 to 1882/3. From 1883/4 to 1888/9, however, the Liberals

1 Ibid, 28 Oct. and 4 Nov. 1871, and 18 May 1872.
3 Ibid, 25 Nov. 1871.
5 Ibid, 31 Oct. and 7 Nov. 1874.
6 Ibid, 9 Nov. 1889.
suffered a reversal of fortunes through aggressive attacks on Liberal seats by Tories who often resurrected as an issue the defence of the drink trade which they claimed had been harmed by the many pro-temperance Liberal councillors. In 1885, the Liberals found themselves in a nine to fifteen minority.

In response to this development and in collaboration with the organised miners, who had just entered the political forum on a mass scale for the first time in this district, the Barnsley Radical Association was formed. Its main aims were to concern itself with the formal election of the local Liberal Hundreds in preparation for the general election and to bring about change in local political tradition. James Birtles, the Association's first president, insisted on bringing party politics into local government elections in opposition to the Barnsley Chronicle and other more traditional interests - Tory and Liberal. The Radicals' active campaigning was, no doubt, partly responsible for the return of Liberal/Radical majority in the Council in 1891/2 with nineteen seats to the Tories' five. Ten new members between 1886 and 1894 - Haigh, Wheelhouse, Tinker, Stott, Grason, Marshall, Waddington, Halton, Raley, and Webster - won their seats on an overtly Radical ticket. Apart from the three professional men amongst them, they were all of the shopkeeper/small tradesmen class. Two miners' agents - Frith and Parrott - also won seats in these years on a Lib-Lab platform. Not only were the Radicals responsible for contesting the seats of 'sitting' Tories like William Tune and William Jackson, who tended to remain unchallenged by their more traditional Liberal colleagues, but also for

1 Ibid, 6 Nov. 1886.
2 Ibid, 9 Nov. 1889.
4 Ibid, 5 Nov. 1892.
edging into retirement one or two of the less progressive Liberal councillors, like Charles Lingard.

By the late 1880s, however, Liberal industrialists were thin on the ground in Barnsley and there was no large resident coalowning group at hand to take their place. The Radical tradesmen/professional group were keen to take over their mantle, even if it could be seen by the mid 1890s, only to be a caretaker's cloak for the benefit of working class candidates who slowly began to assert themselves in local government elections. The major complication in this slow transition was the emergence of a semi-independent labour group in the form of the Barnsley Trades and Labour Council. Formed in 1891, the Trades Council at first shared platforms and personnel with the Radical Association and the executive of the Y.M.A. The Trades Council's decision to put up an independent labour candidate (Thomas Taylor, a miner at Church Lane) against the sitting Liberal, J.H. Bailey in 1891, naturally provoked a split. Bailey, though selected by his ward committee which was said to have been composed of sixty trade unionists out of a total of eighty members, was accused of anti-union sympathies and behaviour in his outfitting business. Several members of the Trades Council resigned from the local Liberal committees because of the latters' refusal to drop their support for Bailey and there were accusations and counter accusations of treachery flying between the Radical Association and the Trades Council. Pattison, the Council's secretary, pointed in justification of its independent stance to the opposition from some traditional Liberals to Frith's resolution in the Town Council for higher wages for municipal workers. Pickard, however, urged his members to vote for Bailey, and Frith

---

1 See especially, Barnsley Chronicle, 7 March 1891. For a full discussion of the political implications of the Trades Council, see Chapter Twenty Four.

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 26 Sept. 1891.

3 Ibid, 10 Oct. 1891.

appeared on platforms in his support. Bailey's candidature was unanimously endorsed by his Liberal ward committee and in the election, won by 870 votes to 530 in a straight fight with Taylor.

At by-elections in two wards in December 1891, R. Holden, a pit deputy and general dealer was returned unopposed on a labour platform, but another labour candidate, originally put up against the Liberal, was withdrawn. One of the Trades Council's reasons for securing a foothold in the Town Council was to get the implementation of 'fair contracts' (contracts involving wages at union rates of pay) in municipal work. In April 1892, the Council passed a modified fair contracts motion by ten votes to nine; and by August 1892, when another labour candidate (James Taylor, a mechanic) won a seat at a by-election without Liberal opposition, some accommodation between the two groups had taken place. In the annual elections of October 1893 and 1894, the Trades Council fielded no new candidates, but put their support behind two miners' Lib-Lab candidates: Parrott and Edward Thorne, a checkweighman from Church Lane (who failed to beat the sitting Tory).

Local boards in the out-townships.

By 1894, there were local boards in eleven of the out-townships in our district, ranging in size from Dodworth, with 3,106 inhabitants in 1891 (yet acquiring a local board as early as 1865) to Hoyland, with 11,006 in 1891 (which did not get urban powers until 1891, although it had had a Highway Board for some years). Like the tiny township of

1 Ibid, 17 Oct. 1891.
3 Ibid, 12, 19 and 26 Dec. 1891.
4 Ibid, 30 April 1892.
5 Ibid, 6 Aug. 1892.
Hoylandswaine (with a population of 648 in 1891) on the western edge of Silkstone, which acquired a local board in 1869, Dodworth's collective decision to adopt urban power at an early stage may have been as much to pre-empt a possible take-over of control by the growing mining interests, as to ensure the overall health of the township. It was generally agreed at one of the first meetings of the Dodworth Board of Health that collieries 'brought great distress to the township' despite the obvious rate advantages that accrued from them. It needed a relative outsider in John Spencer, proprietor of the bleachworks on the south-eastern edge of the township, to defend the colliery interest. 1

At Wombwell, by contrast, not only was the Local Government Act adopted with no opposition in 1865, but the first local board, composed entirely of non-industrial interests, set about its allotted duties in this rapidly urbanising township, with some dedication. 2 In other examples, there was not such a harmony of interest either for or against active improvements. In several townships, the campaign to establish a board became a battle between progressive and reactionary forces that sometimes persisted for years. Ardsley publicly discussed the formation of a local board as early as 1865, 3 but lack of support rather than positive opposition delayed it until 1892. 4 Mexborough adopted the Act after a unanimous vote by ratepayers and, although the older farming and trading interests, who dominated the vestry, fought hard to get their candidates elected, it was the new manufacturing interests - glass, iron and pottery - who carried away half the seats. 5

1 Ibid, 3 June 1865. The big mining operators had no representatives on the Board in the first seven years.
2 See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 8 July 1865.
3 Ibid, 8 April 1868.
5 Ibid, 18 Aug. 1866.
Rawmarsh perhaps presents us with the best picture of resistance by an entrenched farming/landed group to the formation of a board of health. In June 1868, the township was said to have been in 'a most unhealthy condition' to the extent that compulsory action by the Local Government Board seemed likely.1 Yet the large tenant farming interest continued to resist and as a last resort, attempted to have the rural areas of the township excluded from the local board's scope.2 In the ensuing election, the first six in the poll were all connected with the coal, iron and steel and pottery industries, while just two of the eight farming candidates won seats.3 At neighbouring Swinton, early ratepayer meetings had also rejected the adoption of a Board, but an unlikely combination of churchmen and industrialists eventually removed the opposition of Earl Fitzwilliam and other interested parties. This opposition had been due to 'early misunderstandings' about the scope of the Local Government Act.4 Again, the farmers were submerged beneath a plethora of tradesmen and manufacturer candidates: only one farmer winning a seat.5

Wath also provides us with an interesting picture of the interplay of competing groups. An influential middle class group had formed an Improvement Society there in 1828; and in 1846, they secured an Improvement Act with the power to levy rates.6 Their efforts seem to have satisfied the ratepayers at least until 1878 when adoption of the Local Government Act was discussed. Earl Fitzwilliam resisted this new move, however, on the grounds that his rate burden would double

1 Rotherham Advertiser, 27 June 1868.
2 Ibid, 11 July 1868.
without him receiving any advantages from the adoption of urban powers (he had very few houses and no industrial interest in Wath).¹ In 1881, he was finally won over by the powerful industrialist lobby² who, by then, had representatives on the Commission, including J.F.Thompson, the energetic manager of Manvers Main, and the managers of Wath Main and the smaller Newhill Main collieries.³ All the members of the old Commission except one were returned in November 1881 to the first Board of Health.⁴

Dodworth also provides an interesting stage for examining in depth the conflict that sometimes existed between the new colliery interests and the other, often old-established, groups in the townships around Barnsley. Throughout the period, the two big colliery companies working Dodworth's coal - the Old Silkstone and Dodworth Coal and Iron Co., which bought Church Lane from the Charlesworths; and the Strafford Main Colliery Co., - were consortiums of outsiders, with no prior connections in the township.⁵ At first, as suggested above, the entrenched group of linen manufacturers and tradesmen on the Board of Health were wary of these intrusions, even if the rate value of the township had risen substantially as a result of the colliery operations. The company at Church Lane, in particular, received short shrift from the Board when disputes and other commercial difficulties took them into arrears with rate payments.⁶ When the Clarke family began to mine under Dodworth on a large scale in the late 1860s and their manager, Edwin Teasdale, gained a place

¹ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 8 Nov. 1878.
² Ibid, 7 Jan. 1881.
³ Ibid, 20 July 1877.
⁴ Ibid, 7 Jan. 1881.
⁵ The Charlesworths had owned land in Dodworth since the 1830s. See J.Goodchild, op.cit.
⁶ Barnsley Chronicle, 30 Nov. 1878 and 3 Sept. 1881; Dodworth B.II. minutes.
on the Board in the early 1870s (along with Miller, the manager at Strafford), the colliery interest began to have more of a voice. In the 1880s, further colliery representatives on the Board included Rilston and Stear (undermanagers at Strafford), Allport (managing director of Wharncliffe Woodmoor colliery in Carlton), Crowther (owner of a small pit in Dodworth) and George Senior, a man with substantial investment interests in mining. 1 The colliery interest in Dodworth had, by the early 1880s, totally outflanked the linen manufacturers, even if Thomas Taylor retained the chairmanship of the Board. Hartley, the local spokesman for the beleaguered Church Lane enterprise, however, never secured a place on the Board, despite several attempts.

With or without the colliery interest, the Dodworth Board of Health tended to be rather dilatory, even by the standards of the day. In 1873, all the members except one voted in favour of remaining without a paid nuisance inspector; Taylor's attitude to this and other similar issues being summed up in his public reaction to the threat of Local Government Board intervention: 'we can remain as we are until they compel us to change'. 2 When Blackburn, the Medical Officer, issued a comprehensive condemnation of the state of the township's sanitary facilities in 1877, Taylor was reported to have replied that the Board wanted Blackburn 'to do his duty, but not to give them such a sweeping rap as he did'. 3 Taylor, an active Tory, was very different from the breed of campaigning Liberal linen manufacturers like Henry Harvey and Henry Richardson. Richardson lived in Dodworth too, but devoted all his energies to the improvement of Barnsley where he had his warehouse and factory. In 1887,

1 Reports of Local Board elections in Barnsley Chronicle.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Feb. 1873.
3 Ibid, 29 Sept. 1877.
the poor state of Dodworth's drainage and roads was blamed by a correspondent in the *Barnsley Chronicle* on the fact that it had a mainly Tory Board of Health.¹ In 1865, two of the nine members could be identified as Liberals and five as Tories.²

Costs remained the one major issue in local government politics and the dominant economic interest in a particular neighbourhood would not always be able to assert itself if it was in favour of costly improvements. Attempts by members of the firm of Newton, Chambers and Co., to get a local board for the Chapeltown neighbourhood of the vast township of Ecclesfield were at least twice publicly thwarted.³ At Conisborough and Denaby Main, however, the colliery company was opposed to urban powers and any attempts to secure them in the period under study were suppressed. Conisborough, with 8,549 inhabitants in 1891, had twice the population of the next largest township without an urban district council in 1894. Reassertion of the economy-minded lobby was frequently made after the establishment of a local board. In the eastern townships in 1878, for example, rate increases triggered off a mass assault by new candidates designed to oust the profligate spenders. There were nineteen candidates for four places at Mexborough (three of the old members losing their seats as the poll), fourteen for four at Swinton (two old members being ousted) and fifteen for four at Rawmarsh.⁴ A similar reputation for generosity in the distribution of the ratepayers' money by the member-surveyor for Monk Bretton Board of Health came under attack from Muckle, another member and the manager at the local colliery.

³ *Barnsley Chronicle*, 7 Dec. 1872 and 31 July 1875.
⁴ *Mexborough and Swinton Times*, 29 March and 12 April 1878.
On this occasion, the confrontation became so heated that fighting broke out between the two members.¹

The one group that was hardly ever directly represented on the local boards in the district, falling foul of the property qualifications,² was the working class. A few colliery deputies and clerks won seats, for example at Rawmarsh in 1868,³ at Wombwell in the 1870s⁴ and at Ardsley in 1892.⁵ But at Dodworth, another deputy, Richard Pickering, persistently failed to get elected. The ambiguous class status of deputies clearly helped some but hindered others. In 1872, when Normansell and the S.Y.M.A. criticised the sanitary state of part of Mexborough,⁶ there was no public suggestion that working class candidates might be supported in the local board elections. Edward Rymer, in 1887, did extend his criticism of the behaviour of local boards to include the property qualifications imposed on prospective candidates.⁷ Acknowledging the barrier, however, he turned his attention, as other activists had obviously done, to the more democratic school boards. The only members of local boards who could claim to be rank and file miners were Albert Earnshaw, a well-known union official, checkweighman and temperance advocate who was elected at Darton in 1890 and 1893;⁸ and Jabez Law and Walter Allsop, both

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 8 Aug. 1874.
³ Rotherham Advertiser, 24 Oct. 1868.
⁴ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 29 March 1879.
⁵ Ibid, 8 Oct. 1892.
⁶ See p. 405.
⁷ Barnsley Chronicle, 5 March 1887.
⁸ Ibid, 12 April 1890 and 15 April 1893.
checkweighmen, who won seats on the first Hoyland Board of Health in 1891.¹ Nor is there evidence of any other working class group having anything but isolated success (like that of a Parkgate steel roller in the first Rawmarsh Board of Health election in 1868).²

The urban district council elections of 1894, despite their wider franchise, produced changes of an undramatic nature, as Appendix 6 suggests. The Barnsley Chronicle commented:

There is not a solitary District Council in our immediate neighbourhood which doesn't retain a very large proportion of the element which controlled the now practically defunct Local Boards - a proportion sufficiently large to shape the action of the new bodies.³

At Wath, eight labour candidates were defeated and an all but one Tory council returned, two thirds of whom were members of the old Board.⁴ At Darton, two miners and a checkweighman failed, leaving Earnshaw as the only working class member. At Mexborough, only one of the five labour candidates (John Dixon, the local miners' leader) won a seat, although most of the Tory candidates were beaten. At Monk Bretton, any campaigning by Rymer seems to have had little effect: only one out of six miner candidates was elected (Rymer's two colleagues, Duffy and Bradbury, losing in the poll) and no other working class candidates. At Worsborough, the story was a little different: five miners were beaten, but two others, Levi Dyson and James Murray, Trades Council activists and miners at Barrow colliery, were successful.

¹ Ibid, 2 May 1891.
² Rotherham Advertiser, 24 Oct. 1894.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 22 Dec. 1894.
⁴ Ibid.
At Wombwell, no rank and file miners were elected, but a foreman carpenter, a colliery clerk and a deputy were successful. Ardsley did better with three labour councillors and Swinton best of all with four miners (including two Manvers Main and one Thrybergh Hall union officials) and a railway guard. Rawmarsh returned four labour candidates, and Hoyland and Dodworth elected two miners each. From what we know of the successful labour candidates, most were either moderate union officials or active in one or other of the 'respectable' institutions of the district. The exceptions seem to be the two Trades Council miners at Worsborough who carried with them the support of the huge Barrow colliery workforce. The example of their success, however, was lost on other local union branches who continued to play the middle class at its own game in local institutional politics - and, on the whole, losing.

If any overall trend in the out-townships between 1865 and 1893 can be identified from the data on occupational structure in Appendix 6, it is probably the decline of the farming and large manufacturing interests with respect to representation on the boards. The two groups that survived the best over those years and, except in Swinton (where the tradesmen probably lost votes to the labour candidates), into the years of the urban district councils, were the senior colliery staff and the shopkeepers/small tradesmen. The professionals were, as yet, too small a group to make much of an impact on the out-townships, unlike in Barnsley.

Other local government institutions.
(a) Guardians.

Probably the most prestigious local office accessible to men of property in the out-townships (other than the largest manufacturers and landowners) and yet one that saw the least competition of all, was that of poor law guardian. The position itself was valued for its status, but it also
provided access to the local rates assessment committee, potentially useful to men of property. The Barnsley Chronicle suggested that the latter consideration was a motivating force for some colliery proprietors in the elections of 1894.1

Despite these benefits of achieving office, there were some townships where a particular guardian was incumbent, almost unchallenged, for years. This was especially true in the more rural townships like Stainborough and Silkstone where the Liberal and Radical presence was minimal. In most townships, before the mid 1870s, the job tended to go to a substantial and long-established farmer. In 1857, only five guardians in the Barnsley Union out of twenty one were neither farmers nor self styled 'gentlemen'.2 In 1863, only Barnsley and Worsborough returned guardians other than farmers or 'gentlemen' and in 1867, the Rotherham Union, which was responsible for Rawmarsh, Wath, Bolton, Wentworth and Swinton, as well as the industrialised area around Rotherham and Kimberworth, returned fifteen farmers, three clergymen, one manufacturer, two merchants, a surgeon and three 'gentlemen' in 1867. In 1874 there were still only ten representatives of industrial and trading interests in Barnsley Union to dilute the traditional type of guardian; but in 1881, there were only six farmers in all.

Even in some of the more industrialised townships, other groups abdicated their challenge to the farmers. In Wombwell, a farmer (Joseph Raywood) held the position for over twenty years in this period; in Hoyland, two farming families shared

1 Ibid.

2 Unless otherwise stated, the information in this and the next four paragraphs is from the annual reports of elections in the local press, backed up by Barnsley almanacks.
the position until 1864, after which there was a succession of tradesmen and farmers. In the more rural mining parishes, coalowners (or managers), if resident, would often take the place of farmers. This was the case on several occasions at Silkstone, Tankersley, Denaby and at Woolley (to the north of Darton). Swinton and Dodworth both abandoned the tradition of electing farmers, who up to then had virtually gone unchallenged, in the 1870s. Wombwell reacted in the later years of the period by electing, amongst others, a pit deputy, a coalowner and a small builder. Worsborough, one of the earliest industrialised townships, rarely elected farmers.

In Barnsley there were nearly always contests, but they were less frequent in the out-townships. In Dodworth, for example, Thomas Ownsworth, a substantial farmer and landowner, held the position for seven years unchallenged before having to defend it against a Liberal butcher, Randal Wilson, in 1857. In 1861, after voluntarily relinquishing the position the year before to Bower, a local builder, Ownsworth returned to defeat him in the contest, 202 votes to 107. Bower had raised the indignation of some of the larger ratepayers by setting locked out miners onto repairing roads at three shillings a day. In the following year, Bower failed even more emphatically (116 votes to 17 against him) to regain the position. The Liberals won a victory in 1879, however, when George Senior, one of the few campaigning members of the Board of Health, beat Ownsworth's son in a two-way contest. In the 1880s and 1890s, there were more contests in Dodworth, reflecting a general trend across the district as the position of guardian became accepted as fair game even for small tradesmen, as it had in Barnsley for many years. In Barnsley,

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 24 May 1884.
2 Ibid, 29 March 1862.
3 Ibid.
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the five guardians were usually a microcosm of the Board of Health and Council. Politics entered into the contests as early as 1861, a fact that was much regretted by the Barnsley Chronicle. ¹

Working class intervention in guardians' contests inevitably was a late phenomenon, following the lowering of property qualifications. Pattison (an engineering worker) and Ackroyd (an insurance agent) were the first two Trades Council candidates for guardians' positions - in Barnsley in 1893. They advocated radical policies, including the non-separation of man and wife in the workhouse and the abolition of workhouse dress, but failed to get elected² (as did Ackroyd and Sherratt - a signalman - in 1894).³ In Monk Bretton, in 1893, Edward Rymer and his associate, Duffy, organised a successful grass-roots campaign for a radical guardian. But their choice of candidate was a farmer.⁴ The nearest any township came to electing a working class guardian was probably the contest at Wombwell in 1893, where a pit deputy was returned as one of its three guardians.⁵

Kaijage claims that the inadequacy of poor relief in Barnsley in the first half of the century was a contributing factor to the militancy of the handloom weavers in the district up to the eclipse of the Chartist movement there in the mid 1840s.⁶ Indeed, the campaign against the New Poor Law in the district had been intense and bitter,⁷ and had

¹ Ibid, 9 March 1861.
² Ibid, 4 Feb. and 8 April 1893.
³ Ibid, 22 Dec. 1894. Only about 1,800 people out of a possible 7,000-odd voted in this occasion.
⁴ Ibid, 25 March 1893.
⁵ Ibid.
postponed the formation of the Barnsley Union until 1850. There is little doubt, also, that the liberalising process that was under way in other institutions in the district around the 1850s, also touched the new administrators of the poor law in the district. As early as 1852, the Barnsley Guardians were said to have petitioned the Poor Law Board over several articles in the recently drawn up General Order of Regulation. In particular, they objected to Article Four which limited their ability to offer partial relief to men temporarily out of work. Faced with massive unemployment amongst the handloom weavers, the Guardians felt obliged to give out-relief because, in Kaijage's opinion, to give workhouse orders to all of them would have been too costly.

In individual cases, in fact, the relieving officers had considerable leeway. Thus, in the district of the Barnsley Union with the highest unemployment (the West), Atkinson, the new officer in 1857, set about a liberalising of relief after the 'ruthlessly' tight policy of his predecessor. There were few public complaints about the standard of individual relief, perhaps through the poor's lack of articulate spokesmen; although on two major areas of policy, the Barnsley Guardians in the early years of the period did display their lack of representativeness and their overzealous concern for economy. In 1861, the Barnsley Chronicle condemned the 'niggardly and parsimonious' administration of poor relief and called for a 'well-informed, thoroughly active manufacturer or coal proprietor' to be more often elected. No progress seems to have been made by 1863 when,

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 13 May 1879.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 June 1866.
4 Ibid, 30 March 1861.
after a fund had been set up to support the bereaved families of the Edmunds Main miners killed in an explosion in 1862, two colliery owners were 'surprised to find that the Board of Guardians are disposed to treat this fund as a means of merely reducing the allowance from the poor rates'. In 1867, after the Oaks explosion, the story was the same. It was the largest ratepayers, though - the ex-officio members of the Board of Guardians and landowning J.P.'s - who were among the critics of the guardians' penny-pinching stance.

In 1885, the Barnsley guardians took the 'progressive' step of allowing girls from the workhouse to attend board schools. Yet in the same year, they refused to give out-relief to miners on strike. With more manufacturers on the Board than at any time, this was hardly surprising. In 1864, when a similar refusal was given, virtually none of the lockouts opted for admission to the workhouse which, apart from stone breaking at ten pence a day, was the guardians' only alternative solution at times of industrial conflict. The Rotherham guardians were certainly not renown for their love of democracy. In 1883, for example, they memorialised the Local Government Board in opposition to a proposal to free the ballot for guardians; while in 1892, they protested:

1 Ibid, 31 Jan. 1863.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid, 9 May 1885.
5 Ibid, 23 April and 2 July 1864.
6 Ibid, 1 Sept. 1883.
in the strongest terms possible against the action of the Local Government Board in reducing the rating qualification required for the office of Guardian to £5, it being their opinion that there is no necessity for so great a change, the inevitable result of which will be the increased distribution of the poor rate by reason of the election on the Boards of Guardians of persons having little responsibility and small interest in the funds they have to administer. ¹

The Rotherham guardians had also demonstrated their illiberality and unrepresentativeness in 1868 by refusing permission for anything but Anglican services to be held in the workhouse.² The Barnsley Guardians relented on this issue in 1885.³

With relatively less people dependent on poor relief in our period than in the first half of the century and very few miners coming into contact with the relieving officers for prolonged periods, the question of how the guardians interpreted their role was not such a relevant one for the shaping of collective working class attitudes as it might have been before 1855. Much of the increased interest in guardians' elections after the mid 1870s, had probably more to do with the general increase in conventional party political activity in local government than any widespread dissatisfaction with the administration of poor relief by the more traditional type of guardian.

(b)Vestries, county councils, etc.

The vestries were even slower to adapt to the processes of social change under way in the district than the boards of guardians. Four of the seven different men acting as overseers in Swinton between 1855 and 1864, for example,

¹ Rotherham Advertiser, 17 Dec. 1892.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 11 Jan. 1868.
³ Ibid, 28 Feb. 1885.
were farmers, whereas between 1880 and 1889, four out of eight were farmers.¹ For Dodworth in the same periods, the figures were four out of seven and three out of seven.² The others tended to be tradesmen, although a few of the larger manufacturers interested themselves in vestry affairs. This activity tended to be more pertinent where there was no local board, as in Silkstone. Here the dominant coal interest (represented by the Clarke family and by John Haynes, the proprietor of Hallroyd) occasionally flexed its muscles, besides securing the election of Haynes as its guardian whenever he decided to stand. In 1881, a contest for Silkstone's churchwarden was swung in the favour of one of the two candidates, Henry Goodyear, in a parish poll (resulting in 95 votes to 5) by a circular, allegedly sent by Mrs. Clarke to her voting employees in which it was said she was 'very anxious that Mr. Goodyear should be elected'.³ She intended to scrutinise the voting book after the election. A few weeks before, her manager Teasdale had written to Mrs. Clarke suggesting that Goodyear's majority was in the bag.⁴

Some new parish councils did not prove so easy for the middle classes to dominate. Stainborough avoided a contest in 1894, yet had no working men amongst its first councillors. At Silkstone, however, a poll was forced and although Emily Clarke was returned at the top of the poll, she was joined on the council of nine by five miners (including the local union branch secretary).⁵ The big farmer, James Ownsworth, who had

¹ Swinton Vestry minute books and reports of vestry appointments in Mexborough and Swinton Times and Rotherham Advertiser.
² Reports of vestry appointments in Barnsley Chronicle.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 7 May 1881.
⁴ S.C.L., CR 108, Teasdale to Clarke, 10 April 1881.
⁵ Barnsley Chronicle, 8 and 22 Dec. 1894.
land in both Silkstone and Dodworth, the vicar and two colliery managers failed to get elected. On this occasion the Silkstone miners made an independent gesture, yet in the district as a whole, the Barnsley Chronicle could only report that 'there is on the part of many, a considerable amount of apathy and indifference' to the parish council elections.¹ At Conisborough, two miners and three other workmen were elected to a council of twelve; Darfield returned three miners out of eleven; and Cawthorne, only one miner and no other working men on a council of nine, a contest being avoided. With a similar minimum of fuss, W.H. Chambers, the Denaby manager, was returned as Rural District Councillor for that township in 1894. Like their predecessors, the Rural Sanitary Authorities, the R.D.C.s were dominated by the farmers and landowners, with the occasional rural-based coalowner or industrialist like George Dawson of Newton, Chambers and Co., joining their ranks.²

The first County Council elections in 1889 were a qualified victory for a united front of traditional middle class Liberals and the organised miners against Tories and Liberal Unionists. In the West Riding as a whole, there were fifty six Liberal victories, twenty three Tory victories and eleven by Liberal Unionists and Independents.³ In the ten divisions most relevant to our district, there were eight Liberal victories (in Darton, Hoyland, Worsborough, Swinton, Rawmarsh, Ecclesfield and Barnsley where there were two seats) and two for Tories (Wombwell and Wentworth). The overall result was no surprise, nor were several of the individual ones: Cowey's victory at Darton over a coalowner and a colliery manager (one Tory, the other Independent); the

³ Barnsley Chronicle, 2 Feb. 1889.
unopposed candidature of the 'Newton Chambers' candidate George Dawson (one of the managing directors), at Ecclesfield; the substantial victories of local Liberal candidates at Rawmarsh and Swinton; and the victory of a local Tory, Spedding Whitworth (a Wath brewer), in the Wentworth constituency. The Barnsley Tories admitted defeat before the election and allowed two well-established Liberals - Charles Brady (a draper) and Henry Pigott (a linen manufacturer) - to stand unopposed.

Surprising results occurred at Wombwell, Hoyland and Worsborough. At Wombwell, Joseph Mitchell, certified colliery manager at Mitchell Main, his father's pit, was backed by the local miners, but lost to a local Tory farmer. The fact that both candidates were Tories was probably just as surprising, a fact recognised by Pickard who admonished the local Liberals for permitting this to happen in what he described as 'the most radical division in the West Riding'. In neighbouring Worsborough, the Liberals were in no mood to abdicate their challenge, even in the face of a popular local coalowner, (retired), William Batty, who, though a Tory, enjoyed the support of the Fitzwilliams. The Liberal, a small industrialist and landowner from Denby Dale, to the north-west of the district, won a good victory with the active support of the Barrow miner-radicals. Finally, in Hoyland division, the Fitzwilliam interest, in the shape of W.A. Durnford, the family's colliery manager, fought a heated battle with the Liberals whose candidate (a farmer) narrowly won. Not surprisingly, the Elsecar miners' spokesmen found themselves supporting Durnford against the rest of the activist miners in the division.

1 Ibid, 26 Jan. 1889.
3 Ibid, 26 Jan. 1889.
By-elections in 1890 put a Liberal (Stephen Seal, a Darfield quarry owner) in the Wombwell division and gave Eugene Wood, the Liberal flint glass manufacturer a seat on the Council for Barnsley. The elections of 1892 saw little change. Eight of the ten seats were unopposed, with the same party and, in all but two of the seats, the same candidate being returned as before. In Darton, Henry Fountain the Tory coalowner, beaten by Cowey in 1889, won the seat against a Liberal landowner; while in the west division of Barnsley, Parrott's challenge to Henry Pigott failed. The Barnsley Chronicle suggested that the former's platform had been too narrow a one, appealing directly to the miners on the basis of the wage advances secured by the Y.M.A. in recent years. Pigott, on the other hand, had appealed to the burgesses of Barnsley, a traditional formula for success. The first successful challenge to traditional Liberal interests by a 'labour' candidate in county council elections in the district was in 1894, in a by-election in Worsborough division when Nelson Matthews, a public works contractor from Dodworth beat the official Liberal. The surprising thing was that both men were active in the local co-operative movement, but Matthews had the support of Murray and Dyson of Barrow; a formula that seems to have become a prerequisite of success in political life in Worsborough.

(c)Magistrates.

The Barnsley (and Rotherham) benches in this period reveal just how slowly county government at this level reacted to the changing social order in places like the South Yorkshire coalfield. In 1860, the Staincross Petty Sessional bench (areally virtually the same as the Barnsley Poor Law Union) contained no coalowners among its ranks. The only magistrate

1 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 9 May 1890; Barnsley Chronicle, 27 Sept. 1890.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 5 March 1892.
3 Ibid, 8 Sept. 1894.
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with a major, direct industrial interest was Thomas Taylor, the linen manufacturer of Dodworth, and he was a substantial landowner in his own right. Rotherham bench in the early years of the period presented a similar picture, dominated by Tory landowners. This is all the more surprising in view of the fact that the Lord Lieutenant, Earl Fitzwilliam, was not only a Liberal, but also had direct interests in the local coal and iron industries. Taking the period as a whole, it can be seen from Table 24 that the picture had not changed appreciably, even by 1894. Of the forty six magistrates who can be traced as having been appointed to sit on the Staincross bench, thirty were landowners with virtually no direct interest in local industry, commerce or the professions (other than the Church). Twenty six of these were Tories, as were ten of the fifteen magistrates who were not exclusively landowners.

In mitigation, it must be said that the majority of the Tory landowner-magistrates were purely nominal appointments and they rarely sat on the Barnsley bench. Half of the forty six magistrates in fact lived outside the study area, many of them outside the area of Staincross division itself. Secondly, as Lee suggests, magistrates were usually not appointed on party lines. If, as Vincent claims, magistracies could be used as political rewards for industrialists or businessmen, the system did not extend to the county benches of South Yorkshire, not even in the latter years of heightened political involvement.

1 Barnsley Chronicle Almanack 1860, p.80.
3 J.Vincent, op.cit., p.164.
4 Only three out of the twenty nine magistrates in 1892 were Liberal, probably the lowest proportion ever, perhaps a tangible symptom of Earl Fitzwilliam's breach with the Liberal party. See Barnsley Chronicle, 17 Dec. 1892.
If the Liberal share of the magistracies did not increase through the period, the Barnsley industrialists, tradesmen and professionals did gain a foothold, largely through the borough nominations. To a lesser extent, this was true of industrialists in the Rotherham area, where, for example, two steel manufacturers and a coalowner were appointed in 1894. Nevertheless, the structure of appointments in the Barnsley area was criticised by the Barnsley Chronicle in 1892, not least because Hoyland, Wombwell, Worsborough and Dodworth were all without resident J.P.s. The Chapeltown area was better served in this respect by 1894. George Dawson and John Newton of the local iron/coal enterprise were county magistrates and Arthur Chambers sat on the Sheffield borough bench. Not surprisingly, the Sheffield borough bench was dominated by industrial and other business interests.

However indistinguishable the land and big industrial interests may have become by 1894, and however loaded against the local working class was the system that controlled the local courts and the judiciary, there was at least a marked absence of colliery owners from the Barnsley bench in the period under study. Robert Clarke and Joseph Mitchell were the exceptions, although the nomination of Durnford and Walker, colliery agents at Fitzwilliam's and Wharncliffe

---

1 County Magistrates appointed since 1893 (P.P. 1894 lxxi).
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 10 Sept. 1892.
3 Wakefield Registry of Deeds, Justices Correspondence, Wharncliffe to Fitzwilliam, 15 March 1885; Cusworth Hall, Newton Chambers MSS, Dawson's diary, 5 April 1887 and 5 Jan. 1894.
4 Return of Justices of the Peace (P.P. 1875 lxi).
6 As W.P. Roberts reminded the Rotherham bench in 1858. See p. 327.
Silkstone, respectively, in 1893, did something to restore the balance. Moreover, the occasions when a major confrontation occurred between the courts and the organised miners in the district were rare.
TABLE 24

Magistrates serving on the Staincross Petty Sessional Division bench between 1860 and 1894.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Qualification</th>
<th>Resident in or Outside Study Area</th>
<th>Political Allegiance</th>
<th>Principal Economic Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Spencer Stanhope</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. H. B. Cooke</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. B. Beaumont</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Wentworth</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Taylor</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. Wordsworth</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. E. G. Monckton</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Spencer Stanhope</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Leatham</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. B. Beaumont</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Corbett</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Wharncliffe</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Stuart-Wortley</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. F. C. Vernon-Wentworth</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut-Col. Daly</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Chapman</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. E. Taylor</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. Clarke jnr.</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. H. Taylor</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kaye</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Newman</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Micklethwaite</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Richardson</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dyson</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Milner</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Norton</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Vincent</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Norton</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/cont...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of qualification</th>
<th>Resident in or outside study area</th>
<th>Political allegiance</th>
<th>Principal economic interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Harvey</td>
<td>1880 In Liberal</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>Iron-founding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Inns</td>
<td>1880 In Tory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut-Col. Neville</td>
<td>1882 Out Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lancaster</td>
<td>1885 In ?</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hall</td>
<td>1885 Out Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Pigott</td>
<td>1887 In Liberal</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Chapman</td>
<td>1887 Out Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. Vernon-Wentworth</td>
<td>1887 In Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Marsden</td>
<td>1890 In Tory</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. G. Ormsby</td>
<td>1890 Out Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. Taylor</td>
<td>1890 In Tory</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Brady</td>
<td>1890 In Liberal</td>
<td>Drapery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Spencer-Stanhope</td>
<td>1890 In Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Hinchcliffe</td>
<td>1890 Out Liberal</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mitchell</td>
<td>1892 In Tory</td>
<td>Coal/iron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Micklethwaite</td>
<td>1892 In Tory</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Durnford</td>
<td>1893 In Tory</td>
<td>Coal (agent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Walker</td>
<td>1893 In Tory</td>
<td>Coal (Managing propr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Barnsley almanacks; Barnsley Chronicle, 1 Jan. 1876, 2 Aug. 1890, 18 March 1893, White's Directories, Poll Books, etc.
CHAPTER TWENTY ONE

Education and Religion.
School Boards.

The School boards, with their minimal qualifying requirements for candidature and for voting, were the most democratic of the major statutory institutions in the district. Although they tended to be the focus of competition between entrenched interests, this very process often resulted in vigorous election campaigns in the larger parishes and occasionally in constructive debate at board meetings.¹ Nonconformists and Catholics in areas like South Yorkshire saw in the boards, opportunities to remove the Anglican domination of the schooling system, having failed to make much use of the limited facilities available through the British Schools scheme. To some established interests, the school boards seemed positively subversive;² but in reality, the boards were usually prevented from implementing dramatic changes by the balance of power that was usually contained within them. This was certainly true of the school boards in our district, while, of course, some of the smaller townships remained without them throughout the period.

By the 1860s, there were many children in the Barnsley area who were neither working nor in schools. The various Mines Acts since 1842 had excluded more and more children from working underground and, unlike the Lancashire and West Yorkshire coalfields, for example, there was no major source of employment for these youngsters, especially after the decline of linen weaving. It is not surprising then that the various religious groups sought to exploit the school boards to bring about a major increase in school accommodation.

² J. M. Lee, op. cit., p. 50.
In Barnsley, they began to manoeuvre for position early in
1871. The election which ensued was vigorously fought, but
the battle lines were drawn more between the supporters and
opponents of compulsion and between the denominationalists
and undenominationalists, rather than between Church and
Nonconformity in a straight fight. The election produced a
victory for the undenominationalists who won the first six
places (Casey, the miners' candidate and a Catholic, four
Wesleyans and an Anglican) followed by three Anglicans. The
dominance of the Wesleyans over other nonconformist groups
(no Primitive Methodist even stood in 1871) in Barnsley
points to its deep roots in local institutional politics,
spearheaded by the linen manufacturers and small tradesmen.
Nevertheless, the election of Casey and John Butcher, an
engineering worker and the secretary of the Barnsley Working
Men's Liberal Association, also reveals the ability of the
organised working class to exploit the divisions in the ranks
of the middle classes and mobilise the newly enfranchised
electorate of the school boards. A good poll was achieved
on this first occasion - 2,170 out of a possible 3,154.

In 1874, however, less enthusiasm was shown. Both the
miners and other groups could be seen to be negotiating for
the avoidance of a contest. A contest there was, and in a
low poll, the Wesleyans (whether undenominationalist or not)
maintained a big presence, while Sadler, the Anglican who had
come fourth in 1871, lost a considerable number of votes after
he declared himself a denominationalist for the first time.

1 A.M. Davies, 'Education for working class
children in Barnsley during the nineteenth
century, with particular reference to the
Barnsley School Board', unpublished M.Ed.

2 Ibid, pp. 131-5; Barnsley Chronicle, 28 Jan.
and 4 Feb. 1871.

3 Barnsley Chronicle, 17 Jan. 1874.

Casey was defeated (his vote almost halved). He suffered, no doubt from public disillusionment with the lack of impact that the few examples of working class representatives had had on local institutions. His campaign for compulsory attendance may also have scared off some of the less zealous working class voters.

Although attempts to avoid elections were usually unsuccessful, little controversy disturbed the Barnsley School Boards until the overt introduction of party politics into their elections in the mid 1880s. In 1883, the Board was elected according to the usual formula of a mixture of a majority of Nonconformists (usually industrialists and small tradesmen) and a minority of Anglicans (usually clergy, professionals and a schoolmaster), with one Catholic on every occasion. But one of these successful candidates, Abraham Chappell (a draper), was to become in later elections the outspoken candidate of 'Labour', fighting within the Board for such things as improved teachers' salaries. In the 1886 election, the two Radicals (Isaac Haigh and John Tomlinson, a mechanic) failed, but three were returned in 1889, including Parrott who stood both as the official miner candidate and as a Primitive Methodist. In 1892, Chappell was chosen as the Trades Council candidate on an undenominational and 'fair contracts' platform.

1 Ibid, 27 Jan. 1883. The Board on this occasion was composed of a schoolmaster, a Catholic priest, a solicitor, a linen manufacturer, a draper, a shoemaker, a tallow chandler, a cabinet maker and a shopkeeper.

2 A.M. Davies, op.cit., p.151.

3 Barnsley Chronicle, 23 and 30 Jan. 1886.


5 Ibid, 9 Jan. 1892.
was elected, as was a beerhouse keeper, James Hatch, backed by several members of the Trades Council. Yet Parrott and other Liberals and Radicals failed in what was hailed as a Church and Tory victory. Parrott, it seems, had rejected Trades Council backing, and paid the price. The story was the same in 1895. Meanwhile, Chappell won his 'fair contracts' motion by six votes to two. The Barnsley School Boards were the stage for a close version of the history of the miners' 'official' intervention into Town Council politics. The ineffectual impact of the miners' candidate in the optimistic early 1870s was followed by a defeatist lull through the early depression years and a revival in the late 1880s through the mandatory Lib-Lab alliance, only to have the initiative snatched away by the Trades Council in the 1890s.

The less urbanised and more mining-dominated townships were more in a position to reflect the voice of the mining rank and file where they were well organised by the local union branches. Not surprisingly, Wombwell became the first to elect a school board in March 1871. There was, in fact, no contest, but no members of the big bourgeoisie were to be found on it. Instead, there were two ordinary miners, two deputies (including the republican Joseph Sheldon), a colliery clerk, a grocer and a small master brickmaker. In 1874, four of the five colliery members were re-elected along with two colliery managers and a farmer; a stark contrast to the 1874 Board of Health where only one colliery representative sat.

1 Ibid, 30 Jan. 1892.
2 Ibid, 5 March 1892.
3 Ibid, 26 Jan. 1895.
5 Ibid, 1 April 1871.
6 Ibid, 28 March 1874.
Whyatt, one of the deputies, sat on the School Board until 1883 and was replaced by a lampkeeper and a weighman.\textsuperscript{1} Underviewers and miners, in fact, occupied at least two places until the end of the period. The presence of miners, deputies, underviewers and colliery managers on the Wombwell School Board meant that all the parties had to adopt a common language in discussion of community problems. This must have led to a certain amount of dialogue between men and management in the industrial sphere, even to a degree of power balance of the type noticed by Rymer at Wombwell Main in the late 1870s.\textsuperscript{2}

Hoyland was the next township to adopt a school board. In the autumn of 1873, the electorate returned two miners, including Sam Woffinden, a member of the S.Y.M.A. Executive Committee.\textsuperscript{3} The others were shopkeepers and small tradesmen. The 1876, 1879 and 1882 elections produced no miners but a large majority of undenominationalist Nonconformists (in 1876, there was only one Anglican).\textsuperscript{4} In 1891 and 1894, however, after more concerted campaigns, miners were returned (three in 1894, including Joseph Wadsworth, a future secretary of the Y.M.A.).\textsuperscript{5}

Swinton elected its first Board in December 1875, avoiding a contest after nine of the original sixteen candidates withdrew. The compromise produced no miners nor independents (the miners' candidate, David Moulson - the S.Y.M.A. president - was dropped, probably in favour of the Primitive Methodist)

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid, 7 April 1883.
\textsuperscript{2} E.A.Rymer, \textit{op.cit.}, p.23.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Barnsley Chronicle}, 15 Nov. 1873.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid, 11 Nov. 1876, 8 Nov. 1879 and 4 Nov. 1882.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid, 14 Nov. 1891 and 10 Nov. 1894.
but representatives of three nonconformist sects and three churchmen.¹ At the election in 1878, Moulson received the largest vote by far, and was joined by the radical Congregationalist minister, Leslie. Two Anglicans managed to scrape in at the bottom.² In the election addresses, however, class and religious issues were avoided, most parties advocating financial prudence as their prime concern. When Goodinson, the Charlesworth's colliery manager and representative for the Kilnhurst portion of the township, was selected as chairman, it was the Rev. Leslie and not Moulson (who was a miner at the Charlesworth's Warren Vale pit) who objected.³ The perceived inequity of Goodinson's chairmanship after such a resounding victory for the miners' candidate was rectified in 1881 when Moulson not only became chairman, but was joined on the Board by two other miners. The other four members were shopkeepers.⁴ By the 1890s, almost all the members were miners, checkweighmen or junior colliery staff, including, in 1893, the two Manvers Main branch officials who also gained seats on the first Urban District Council.⁵

Swinton's economy, by 1893, was far more dominated by mining than in 1871, Wombwell became so from the earliest part of the period, whereas Hoyland, always an occupationally heterogeneous township, witnessed its main colliery, Hoyland Silkstone, languishing in the worst depression years.⁶ These developments seem to be reflected in the composition of the school boards in those townships. Nevertheless, in all these examples, working class representation, albeit by a small group of articulate, skilled colliery workers points to the ability of the miners to mobilise their voting potential

¹ Rotherham Advertiser, 27 Nov. and 4 Dec. 1875.
² Mexborough and Swinton Times, 13 Dec. 1878.
⁵ Ibid, 12 Dec. 1890 and 8 Dec. 1893.
⁶ See pp. 250-1.
around the local trade union lodge, in the absence of local trade councils. Elsewhere, this mobilisation did not begin until the mid 1880s.\(^1\)

The concentration of the efforts of the two Manvers Main lodges on the Swinton School Board, in fact, weakened the ability of the miners to get representation in Mexborough, a more occupationally-mixed township. John Dixon, the Denaby Main lodge secretary, was a member from 1884 (the School Board was first elected in 1875), but the only other 'labour' candidate in the period was Liversidge, the local glass-blowers' spokesman. A Manvers Main miner failed to get elected in 1890.\(^2\) Nevertheless, the absence of a colliery management faction on the Mexborough School Board probably was the deciding factor in enabling Dixon to make quite an impression on the Board, such as in 1885, when he got the striking Denaby miners' school fees remitted.\(^3\)

The Mexborough pattern was repeated in all the other townships with school boards. An occasional working class candidate gaining a seat by 'plumping' amid an occupational mixture similar to that on the boards of health. The only major difference was the presence of a few Nonconformist ministers on the school boards. Only from the late 1880s or early 1890s did more than one miner at a time gain a seat on the boards at Ardsley, Darton, Monk Bretton or Worsborough. But in 1893 at Worsborough, after a vigorous campaign backed by the familiar Dyson-Murray team, five miners won seats.\(^4\) Rymer's associates, Duffy and Bradbury, were elected at Monk Bretton in 1893.\(^5\)

\(^2\) Mexborough and Swinton Times, 28 March 1890. His failure was blamed on 'Factional voting'.
\(^3\) Ibid, 21 March 1890.
\(^5\) Ibid, 25 March 1893.
School accommodation and provision.

The fact that school boards were elected in these townships points to rapid demographic growth and the strength of democratic opinion among the dominant industrial, trading and organised working class groups. The experience of some of the outlying, less industrialised townships on the edge and to the north of our district was different. ¹ There was also probably some resistance from industrialists because of the anticipated effect of compulsory school attendance on their ability to employ children of school age; ² although this would have been far less of an issue than in the woollen district of the West Yorkshire coalfield for example. In Rawmarsh, where the Fitzwilliam tenantry was still a cohesive force, disproportionate to its size, a move to create a Board in 1871 was defeated; ³ while the less industrialised Monk Bretton resisted for six years. ⁴ Dodworth ratepayers circumvented the need for a Board by appointing fifteen 'substantial' residents to look after their Town School, a Church charity. ⁵ In this relatively small industrial township, the local school expanded sufficiently to meet the basic demand. But the expanding townships to the east of Barnsley had, in 1870, a basically pre-industrial school structure that was beginning to crack at the seams. The case for school boards was overwhelming. With a characteristic sensitivity to the most pressing collective needs, all but a few small and backward townships like Silkstone voted in 1891 for free education. ⁶ Yet, as Simon points out, this was by no means a universal reaction nationally. ⁷

³ Barnsley Chronicle, 18 Feb. 1871 and 22 Feb. 1873.
⁴ See Barnsley Chronicle, 30 Dec. 1876.
⁵ Ibid, 5 and 26 June 1880.
⁶ Ibid, 22 and 29 Aug. and 5 Sept. 1891.
⁷ B. Simon, Education and the Labour Movement, p. 131.
Mexborough had a National School before 1873, but in 1890 only one fifth of the children on the Mexborough registers attended it. Almost all the rest went to the three Board Schools built after 1875.\(^1\) Swinton in 1875 was forced to elect a School Board because of the failure of the ratepayers' representatives to raise enough money by voluntary subscription (for which they had voted at a Town Meeting in 1870).\(^2\) Despite Fitzwilliam's patronage, in 1875 there was accommodation for only 512 in the Kilnhurst and Swinton National Schools and an old endowed infant school, plus 52 places in dame schools,\(^3\) compared with Rawmarsh's accommodation for 1,151. The deficiency was apparent to 'any casual visitor either at Swinton or Kilnhurst, for during ordinary school hours there may be seen scores of children playing in the streets who ought to be receiving education'.\(^4\) In 1875, Swinton was served with a notice by the Department of Education to increase its school accommodation.\(^5\) Three years later, schools costing about £9,000 had been opened or were planned at Kilnhurst and Swinton Bridge and another opened at Roman Terrace in 1884. All were priority neighbourhoods.\(^6\) This points decidedly to the success of the Nonconformists over the Church lobby.

In the whole of the Barnsley Poor Law Union, there was public day school accommodation for only 2,875 children in 1851.\(^7\) Yet 1,217 children could attend private schools. Of the non-endowed schools, only two were not Anglican: a Wesleyan and a Catholic school, both in Barnsley. In

\(^1\)Mexborough and Swinton Times, 24 Jan. 1890.
\(^2\)Rotherham Advertiser, 24 Dec. 1870.
\(^4\)Rotherham Advertiser, 24 Dec. 1870.
\(^5\)Barnsley Chronicle, 24 April 1875.
\(^7\)1851 Religious Census.
In Rotherham Union, the story was similar. After an inquiry in 1839, it was revealed that well over half the children aged two to fifteen were not receiving any schooling at all. An attempt by the Nonconformists to found a British School soon after, provoked the formation of two National Schools, backed by the resources of the three local Tory landowners: Wharncliffe, Spencer Stanhope and Vernon-Wentworth. A Wesleyan school was founded in 1843 and three more National Schools by 1857. Two interdenominational Ragged Schools attracted much financial support from 1862. Secondary school accommodation, however, was inadequate. Though in 1872, 156 were attending private institutions in Barnsley, little of this teaching was above elementary level: mainly providing a means for conspicuous consumption for the lower middle classes. The ten Locke Scholarships, awarded every year from 1661, did, however, make some impression on the moribund endowed Grammar School.

Work on two Board Schools was begun in 1872, but in 1889, an acute shortage was recognised and a decision was made to build a new school for 650. The battle for the site of the Agnes Road Schools became, in Davies's opinion:

"the only episode in the history of the Board when the sectarian bitterness which coloured the proceedings of most of the School Boards in the country, was to sully the Barnsley members' reputation for tolerance and courtesy."

The Nonconformists succeeded in getting it sited in the middle

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 18 June 1887.
2 A.M. Davies, op. cit., p.37.
3 Ibid, pp. 59-63.
5 Ibid, p.386.
7 A.M. Davies, op. cit., p.167.
of the Church schools to enable non-Anglicans to avoid denominational teaching. Barnsley School Board was typical of many of the Nonconformist-dominated Boards in industrial areas. It met the demands of the situation, reducing the influence of the Anglicans to something nearer their representation in the town, yet keeping the ratepayers' purse strings fairly tightly drawn. It eventually decided to remit fees in 1886, resulting in a rise in school attendance; and voted for free schooling in 1891 with none too great a margin. It dogmatically enforced regular attendance, frequently summonsed offending parents, but was not always taken seriously by the predominantly Tory/Anglican magistrates.

Several of the more rural townships, like Silkstone, Wentworth, Stainborough and Tankersley, had schools wholly or substantially maintained by local landowners (or, in the case of Tankersley and north Ecclesfield, by members of Newton, Chambers and Co.). Not surprisingly they managed to keep the School Boards at bay. Provision and standard of teaching in these places had not satisfied the 1842 Commissioners, but it had inevitably improved by the 1860s when the patrons responded to the needs of the children no longer able to work in the mines. Tremenheere in 1845 noticed that several large

1 Ibid, pp. 198 and 209.
3 Children's Employment Commission (1842 xvi), pp.199-200. The school at Wentworth was described as adequate, although the teaching in the boys' section was said to be unimaginative. The High Green and Silkstone schools were said to be inadequate in all respects.
4 Improvement was noticed already at the Elsecar school by Tremenheere in 1845, Report of the Commissioner under the Act 5 and 6 Vict. c 99 (1845), p.25.
West Yorkshire coalowners such as the Charlesworths, Stansfield and Briggs, provided educational facilities for the children of their employees. The Charlesworths' manager adopted a utilitarian approach in suggesting to his employer that in supporting another National School, 'we should save in fences and in damages to the land and crops by trespasses . . . all the cost that the school might put us to'. 1 In our district, however, provision of day schools by colliery owners seems to have been confined to the one at Denaby Main; 2 and substantial patronage by other firms or individuals was rare outside those examples already given. The central townships in particular were too cosmopolitan and too large for one patron to reap benefits from such action and to cope with demand.

Support of Sunday schools, both by landowners and industrialists, was more common. It was also an activity in which Nonconformists were active before our period began. The Wesleyans alone claimed larger attendances at Sunday schools in 1851 than the Churches in both the Barnsley and Rotherham Unions, and even in the more rural Wortley Union. 3 The Primitive Methodists, with only one Sunday school out of fifty four in the Barnsley Union and three out of fifty eight in Rotherham Union, were poorly endowed in 1851.

By 1884, there were 7,244 children in the Barnsley Sunday School Union, well over double the figure for 1851 (although the population of the area itself had not increased at that rate). 4 As Davies argues, 'To offer visible proof that Sunday

---

1 Ibid, p.29.

2 In 1893, for example, a new school, costing between £4,000 and £5,000, was built by the company, Mexborough and Swinton Times, 27 Oct. 1893.

3 1851 Religious Census.

4 Barnsley Chronicle, 12 April 1884.
Schools were "mighty engines for good in our midst", the children were constantly kept in the public eye'. Every year, they were marched through the streets of Barnsley and feted by local landowners and industrialists in the grounds of one of the local mansions, or some further destination. At Whitsun 1859 and 1860, for example, 8,000 scholars and teachers from South Yorkshire were taken to Grimsby and Cleethorpes on special trains; and in 1864, the resources of linen, land and church combined to take the local scholars to Roche Abbey. As Davies points out, there were elements of compulsion in securing and retaining children in Sunday schools, even after secular education had been removed; but on the whole the movement lacked sectarian bitterness. The overall value of the schools' role in regimenting and controlling was too great to squander.

As J.F.C. Harrison points out, schools in the later nineteenth century, despite the democratic nature of the school boards, were not to be seen as mass institutions but as organs of middle class aspirations and values. 'The break up of the old popular culture and its supersession by formal literary "instruction" based on the 3 Rs was the conscious aim of many middle class educationalists'. The more astute members of the landed and industrial classes realised the value of schooling for social control. Even if a few Anglican Tories like Stanhope criticised the liberality of the school boards, elsewhere, coalowners in places like West Yorkshire

1 A.M. Davies, op. cit., p.31.
3 Ibid, 9 July 1864.
4 A.M. Davies, op. cit., p.25.
5 Ibid, p.32.
7 See Barnsley Chronicle, 25 Jan. 1873.
and the North-East were more co-operative.

Colliery education, as it developed in Northumberland and Durham during the 1850s, was the climax in a struggle for cultural hegemony which owners and others had waged with the pitmen for nearly thirty years. Work discipline, political passivity, social order: these had been the borders of invasion, but until the systematic pursuit of education, the fray had been more a series of disparate skirmishes. ¹

In the Barnsley area, the main impetus of this change did not come from the coalowners. But, as in Oldham, the re-assertion of religious control in schools in the 1840s and 1850s, later consolidated by the radical-working class alliance in the movement for religious reform between 1867 and 1870, helped to harden the mould within which working class leaders could express themselves in the period before independent labour politics² (and even beyond³). Education, in schools at least, with its emphasis on 'useful knowledge' and rote learning, lacking immediate relevance to the children's lives, was sold as fervently by miners' leaders as by labour aristocrats and the Nonconformist middle class elsewhere. Edward Rymer was content in seeing Casey and Sheldon on the school boards of South Yorkshire in 1873.⁴ That their tones may not have differed from middle class employer-educationalists did not seem to matter. A minimum of provision was met and the momentum maintained by the school boards. No miners' leaders were to be found objecting to the system in our period.

¹ R. Colls, "Oh happy English children": coal, class and education in the North East, Past and Present, No. 73 (Nov. 1976), p.76.
⁴ Miners' Advocate and Record, 22 March 1873.
Religion and temperance.

Religion reached more people through the Sunday schools than through any other institution. By 1851, the vast majority of working people were not regularly attending any place of worship. Indeed, church and chapel accommodation was inadequate not just in the expanding townships in the east of our district. Religion did, however, provide the controlling groups in the coalfield's society with their codes of practice and the models on which were based many of the institutions in the district which reached a wider audience.

Unlike in Sheffield and the edges of the large parishes of rural south-east Yorkshire, 'Old Dissent' had never gained much of a foothold in Barnsley and surrounding townships. But by the late eighteenth century, with the expansion of the linen industry, the district was a willing recipient of Methodist and small Quaker congregations in particular. The Barnsley Wesleyan Methodist circuit was formed in 1801 and within twenty years, there were Wesleyan or New Connexion chapels in at least ten townships in the district. These were chiefly the handloom weaving and early coal and iron working townships in the west, but the early expansion of Swinton and neighbouring townships produced four chapels in the east of the district too. Wombwell, Darfield, Worsborough and the more rural townships had to wait at least until the 1820s for this development.

1 D.G. Hey, 'The pattern of Nonconformity in South Yorkshire 1660-1851', *Northern History*, viii (1973), 111.


3 P.R.O., H.O. 129 505-510. This information relates to the foundation dates of chapels existing in 1851. Some may have replaced earlier foundations, but in most cases, such replacements were noted in White's Directories and other sources and have been noted.
Several of the 'estate' villages - Tankersley, Stainborough (and the Fullertons' home of Thrybergh) - resisted institutionalised Nonconformity altogether, while Wentworth benefited from the fifth Earl's liberality in gaining not only two Wesleyan chapels in the 1830s, but also a small Primitive Methodist chapel at Thorpe Wesley at a peppercorn rent.¹

Primitive Methodism was, on the whole, a later development, taking root in the expansion of mining and other industries after 1850, but some worshippers in Silkstone, lacking a resident Wesleyan bourgeoisie, opted for a Primitive Methodist chapel in 1824, the same year as the first chapel was founded in Barnsley among the weavers of Wilson's piece.² Tiny Primitive Methodist congregations were formed at several places in the rural counties in the 1830s and 1840s, taking root among agricultural labourers.³ This seems to have affected the eastern edge of our district, for the Scotter Circuit of the sect, based on Mexborough, had twenty two preaching places in 1845.⁴

At the time of the 1851 Religious Census, there were forty one Methodist congregations (including seven Primitive and nineteen Wesleyan) in the Barnsley Union, as opposed to seventeen Anglican centres (there were five others).⁵ In the Rotherham Union, there were forty one Methodist congregations (including six Primitive and twenty nine Wesleyan), twenty one Anglican, six Independent (this sect was strong in the

¹ Ibid; D.G. Hey, op.cit., p.111.
² Ibid.
³ D.G. Hey, op.cit., p.115.
⁴ Scotter Circuit Primitive Methodist Preachers' Plan 1845 (in the writer's possession).
⁵ 1851 Religious Census Abstracts.
Rotherham area after Samuel Walker's son Joshua founded an Independent training college there in 1795)¹ and five others. On aggregating attendances, however, we find that the relatively small number of Anglican congregations in fact returned over 35% of attendances on Census day in both Barnsley and Rotherham.² These figures obscure huge differences in attendance from township to township. In rural parishes with strong Church influence, like Darfield, over 86% of the worshippers attended the Anglican church. In the large township of Hoyland, the figure was 40%. In Rawmarsh and Mexborough, where early Methodist congregations accompanied early industrialisation, the figures were 27% and 25% respectively.³

As the industrial population expanded in previously thinly populated townships and neighbourhoods, new ecclesiastical parishes and chapelries like Denaby Main, Darugh and Kilnhurst were created and a second wave of Methodist and other Nonconformist chapels sprung up. The Primitive Methodist chapel at Swinton Bridge, for example, was built in 1869 to serve the local glass and foundry workers and to anticipate the influx of miners to Manvers Main, where sinkings had just begun.⁴ A Primitive Methodist chapel was built on Silkstone Common about 1868 to meet the demand from the expanding outpost of miners and coke workers there.⁵ Wesleyan and

¹ D.G.Hey, op.cit., p.113.
² 1851 Religious Census Abstracts. Attendance at Sunday schools is excluded. There is an acknowledged bias towards Nonconformists in these figures and those people who attended more than one service on Census day were counted twice. See M.Drake, op.cit., p.17.
³ P.R.O., H.O. 129 505-510.
⁵ Barnsley Chronicle, 29 July 1876.
Primitive Methodist chapels were built on Hoyland Common in the 1860s at a time of rapid expansion. The 1860s and 1870s were also years for rebuilding earlier foundations to accommodate more and to provide more ambitious edifices in keeping with the relatively prosperity and new 'respectability' of their congregations (especially true of the Wesleyans). Table 25 gives some indication of the relative increase in the committed members of the two main Methodist sects. Nowhere, except in Wombwell, could this growth be described as spectacular and demographic factors account for much of the change. But the actual size of the Wombwell membership and its growth from negligible proportions at the time of the sinking of the first major collieries in the township, suggest that a fairly high proportion of those committed Wesleyans were ordinary miners. Yet even in progressively expanding townships like Wombwell and Swinton, there was a falling off proportional to the rise in population, or even in absolute terms during and after the 1870s. The experiences of the Wesleyans and the Primitive Methodists did not differ appreciably in this respect.

Patronage played a role in both church and chapel building in our district, but in most cases, the majority of subscriptions were raised from among the congregations themselves. This was especially true of Nonconformists. The Wesleyans numbered among them many members of the wealthy industrial middle class who were always ready to spend on new chapels; while active Primitive Methodists, though predominantly working class, were prepared to devote much of their limited resources to new places of worship.


2 The Trustees of the Swinton Bridge in 1869 were: three engine drivers, two glassblowers, two potters, two fitters, two labourers, four other craftsmen and a schoolmaster (R.E. Lloyd, op. cit., p. 4). All five identifiable members of a foundation stone meeting for the Silkstone Common Chapel were miners (Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Sept. 1868; Census enumerators' returns).
The Barnsley area as a whole missed out on the effects of the evangelical expansion of the 1830s and 1840s and although the national religious revival of the 1850s coincided with the major expansion of the industrial population, particularly in the out-townships, it came when the Church's missionary zeal was largely spent; and we see little involvement by the Church in radical activity, either in or out of Church matters. There were one or two exceptions. The vicar of Dodworth, Rev. Hudson, in 1857 used the occasion of the Lundhill pit disaster to make some radical suggestions for the amelioration of the mining population: permanent relief and pithead baths, for example, as well as the more conventional attack on beerhouses and on the commingling of the sexes as a result of overcrowding.¹ In 1874, he was also campaigning over the poor sanitary state of Dodworth.²

The Church was not, in general, an ostentatious presence in the district. The only parish left with a large endowment was Darfield where half of the living's £3,000 p.a. (in the hands of the Cooke family) was raised in tithes.³ The rector was non-resident for long periods at a time, delegating his duties to a curate who, in 1858, was paid only £90 p.a.⁴ Neither the rector of Darfield, nor Trinity College, Cambridge, the other tithe recipient, contributed, in the words of the Barnsley Chronicle in 1859, 'one farthing towards the educational requirements of the township'.⁵ In 1862, the vicar of Darfield, W.B. Charlesworth, resigned because, with the expansion of the township after the sinking of Darfield

¹ Barnsley Times, 28 March 1857.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 3 Jan. 1874.
⁴ Ibid, 11 Dec. 1858.
⁵ Ibid, 8 Jan. 1859.
Main in 1860, 'far more work requires to be done than I have vigour of mind or body to expend upon it'.¹ Wombwell, one of Darfield parish's constituent townships, soon secured its own church, the Wombwell Main Colliery Co., having already provided a non-denominational Sunday school.²

Public hostility to the power of the Church was muted, except on the occasions when it attempted to levy a large church rate (at Rawmarsh in 1863, for example).³ Earl Fitzwilliam contributed to this phenomenon by his open hostility to pew rents⁴ and his positive support for most religious groups in the district. Most townships had small churches with small livings - the result of early dismemberment of the large parishes like Silkstone and Wath. Several vicars and curates even revived missionary work in the 1880s and won popularity with the working classes, even if some more established members of their congregations were not so enthusiastic. The Rev. Bleasdell of St. Thomas's Mission at Gilroyd was the honorary secretary of the Dodworth Mechanics Institute, a predominantly working class venture, and was a keen sportsman.⁵ Barker, the vicar of Silkstone, came into conflict with one of his churchwardens, Edwin Teasdale, when he conducted open air meetings with Nonconformists in an attempt to reach a wider audience.⁶

¹ Ibid, 14 June 1862.
² Rotherham Advertiser, 25 June 1864.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 20 June 1863. The Chronicle commented that 'a normally quiet and undemonstrative village' was indignant at the proposal to levy a five pence rate for church repairs. The proposal was turned down by a mass meeting and in a subsequent ballot.
⁴ Ibid, 2 Nov. 1867.
⁵ Ibid, 27 March 1886.
⁶ Ibid, 8 April 1882.
This liberal approach by a few of the local clergy certainly helped to reduce conflict between Church and Chapel at a time when, potentially, both could have benefited from a religious revival, an expanding population and a stratum of respectable working class leaders who might have acted as agents of this revival among their rank and file. As it happened, it was only the Nonconformists who secured the services of the latter even if, in Sheffield at least, the Anglican congregation were increasing proportionately more than the combined Methodist congregations, between 1851 and 1881.1

The structure of the Methodist Society in mining villages, with its accent on mobility, membership, elections for office and missionary fervour, bore a close resemblance to the miners' union. This was especially true of Primitive Methodists,2 but also applied to the mining community's own adaptation of the Wesleyan model. As Griffin, suggests: 'Wesleyan Societies of the mining villages were distant, both in space and outlook, from the Methodist Conference'.3 Most of the Yorkshire miners' leaders at district level - and many at branch level - espoused Methodism; and there is ample evidence that many miners were local preachers in Primitive, Wesleyan and New Connexion congregations.4 These men may have been a tiny minority, but they set standards for others through their overlapping social roles.

1 E.R.Wickham, Church and People in an Industrial City (Lutterworth, 1969), p.141.
3 A.R.Griffin, op.cit., p.46.
4 Twelve miners in the district were also described as local preachers in the 1871 Census enumerators' returns.
The involvement of Nonconformist ministers in miners' affairs was also prolific. Primitive Methodist, Congregationalist and Baptist ministers, especially, were frequently to be seen on platforms at miners' demonstrations and local mass meetings and several became involved in providing for miners' families during lockouts and even strikes. Parrish, a Primitive Methodist minister at Hoyland, and Leslie, a Congregationalist at Swinton, won great respect for their roles in disputes in 1864 and 1885 respectively. Leslie, especially, built up a special relationship with the miners of Swinton, Mexborough and Denaby Main. In the early 1880s, he had publicly signalled his divorce from co-operation with at least one member of the local establishment: the rather dilatory vicar of Mexborough, Ellershaw. In 1883, Leslie claimed that he had become a Liberationist because of Ellershaw's dogmatic refusal to compromise with him over matters of devotional procedures, such as interring bodies in the Church graveyard. Ellershaw, in the middle of the 1885 dispute at Denaby Main, cut off his support for the miners' relief fund, leaving Leslie in sole charge. Leslie's independent avowal of the Denaby miners' cause won him strong criticism from the mining company who claimed that he was responsible for fomenting trouble at the pit. (His tradition of support for the Denaby miners was revived in 1902 by the Primitive Methodist minister, Jesse Wilson.)

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 July 1864; J. MacFarlane, 'One association - the Yorkshire Miners Association'.
2 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 7 Dec. 1883.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 11 July 1885.
4 Ibid., 15 Aug. 1885.
Liberationists like Leslie were almost all Liberal in politics, many of them actively. In the early years of the period, this group nationally had been an important force in mustering support for the Liberals at elections. Locally, these men, by their acceptance into the confidence of so many ordinary miners, were in a position to exert a strong moral influence on their audiences, both in and outside the chapels. They tended to avoid the excesses of temperance advocacy that might, like Edward Rymer's uncomfortable exhortations, have jeopardised this confidence. The Rev. Hadfield, a popular Primitive Methodist minister in Wombwell, claimed, at a miners' meeting, that he 'didn't like crotcheteers; either teetotal, anti-vaccination, liberation or other crotchets', but favoured a broad, liberal approach to moral issues. Compston, the Barnsley Baptist minister and a frequent member of S.Y.N.A. platforms in the 1860s, was one of the few Nonconformist ministers who persistently preached temperance. Wesleyan ministers, especially in the latter years of the period, fought shy of alienating their congregations (potential or real) by temperance excesses, a saving grace which made up some of the ground they might have lost through their inactivity in politics and industrial spheres.

Temperance undoubtedly had little appeal for the vast majority of miners and other workmen. But it provide the most utilised point of contact between a minority of articulate working class leaders and their counterparts among the lay middle class. The Barnsley Temperance Society had existed in some form or other since 1835 and parishes as small

1 J. Vincent, *op. cit.*., p. 106.
2 *Barnsley Chronicle*, 16 Feb. 1884.
3 Ibid, 27 April 1889 (obituary).
4 See *Barnsley Chronicle*, 2 Sept. 1893.
as Kilnhurst had Bands of Hope and their own temperance societies, most dating, like many of the chapels, from the time of the 1860s mining expansion. The Barnsley Band of Hope Union, whose job was to carry on temperance work within the Sunday schools, in 1880 had 1,614 members.¹ The Dodworth Wesleyan Band had 138 members in 1877 and Wombwell had a combined membership of 390 in 1890.² Clearly the moral climate was strong enough to convince a substantial number of parents at least to pay lip service to temperance through their children's Sunday activities, even if the latter may have remained sceptical. In 1877, there were 150 members of the Silkstone Temperance Association, enough to make it a significant community institution in this township of only about 1,400 inhabitants. For those among them who wished to tone down any symptoms of class conflict, it must have been reassuring to see radical miners' leaders, like Edward Rymer,³ Abraham Tibbott, Albert Earnshaw and Edward Jones, alongside the trade and manufacturing interests of the district on temperance platforms.

A large number of the leading Barnsley industrialists, tradesmen and professionals belonged to the local Temperance Society. At least five contemporary or future members of the Town Council were members of the Society in 1894;⁴ and a similar number one-time councillors were involved in the Band of Hope movement in 1880.⁵ The largest ideological group

¹ Ibid, 28 Feb. 1880.

² Ibid, 13 Jan. 1877; Mexborough and Swinton Times, 14 Feb. 1890.

³ Jones, a 'counter-attractionist' in his role as steward of the British Workman Temperance Club, was probably one of the most effective agents for the movement in the district. See D. Harrison, op.cit., p.297.

⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 6 Jan. 1894.

⁵ Ibid, 28 Feb. 1880.
involved were the Nonconformist Liberals, but there were several Tory and Church figures, like Richard Inns, the ironfounder. As influential as the individual members of the Temperance Society might have been in Barnsley, the movement itself, like many aspects of Liberal politics in the district, seems to have lost momentum in the early 1880s. In 1885, a new mass organisation, the Barnsley Total Abstainers and Temperance Electoral Union, was founded, with Charles Brady (a draper and active Liberal) as its first chairman, \(^1\) soon followed by John Grimshaw, one of the founders of the Barnsley and District Radical Association. \(^2\) Its design was to revive the flagging movement and to launch an offensive against the 'drink ring' whose object, the temperance spokesmen claimed, was 'to have a predominate influence in all public bodies in the town, and to have a borough police under its control so that those who held licences might work the law as they liked'. \(^3\) The Licensed victuallers, backed in the 1870s and early 1880s by Tune and Senior the two big brewers, were a powerful force in local politics, gathering an increasingly aggressive group of town-based Tories around them.

It is likely, however, that rank and file working class support for temperance had passed its peak by 1885. The tendency of the alliance of diverse groups under the temperance banner to disintegrate was noticed at the time by the editor of the *Barnsley Chronicle*. He was sceptical about the ability of the new Temperance Union to unite the 'atoms ... many of which contain repellent rather than cohesive properties'. \(^4\) In the formative years of the late

\(^1\) Ibid, 25 July 1885.

\(^2\) Ibid, 5 Sept. 1885.

\(^3\) Ibid, 18 and 25 July 1885.

\(^4\) *Barnsley Chronicle*, 25 July 1885.
1860s and early 1870s, however, the alliance of working class leaders and bourgeois temperance advocates was certainly influential in shaping the consciousness of a significant minority of miners. Edward Rymer and Abraham Tibbott may not have been representative of their rank and file, but they carried with them the support of a good number of local spokesmen in South Yorkshire and elsewhere, despite the obvious excesses of Rymer's public style in particular. Moreover, in small communities like Silkstone, the influence of temperance, if espoused by a dominant interest, must have been all the more thorough (though ultimately, polarising). In Silkstone, the Temperance Association, founded in 1875, counted among its active members, Mrs. Clarke, the vicar, the schoolmaster and the wife of John Haynes, the other leading coalowner.¹ The fact that the new manager of the Clarkes' collieries in the late 1880s, George Teasdale, was prone to drink, partly accounted for his rapid departure from the neighbourhood after only a couple of years of full-time responsibility.² Here was yet another strand in the web of aggressive paternalism in Silkstone.³

For the Clarkes and others, a temperate workforce meant a steady one and this, they achieved on the whole. The

¹ Ibid, 13 Jan. 1877. The secretary of the Barnsley Sunday School Union and Temperance Society (and a Methodist Free Church local preacher), William Ashworth, had also been a resident of Silkstone for some years. (Barnsley Chronicle, 17 March 1883).

² Court Transcript, Old Silkstone and Dodworth Coal and Iron Co. Ltd., versus Clarke, 4-8 Nov. 1893, para 11.

³ Brian Harrison stresses that the temperance movement propagated the 'self-made man' against 'a corrupt and antiquated paternalism', op. cit., p. 150. The Clarkes' paternalism, though centred on the Church and Tory politics, tended to be comparatively lively and progressive and as employers, they did not differ fundamentally from many of the Barnsley Nonconformist: Liberal industrialists.
efforts of one or two of the management staff of Church Lane colliery were less successful. In 1892, before the Royal Commission on Labour, the company spokesman stressed how difficult the drink problem was at the colliery.¹

As Brian Harrison suggests, the temperance movement imbued the wealthy with a sense of social responsibility and the need to co-operate with members of the working class;² just as the committed working class temperance propagandist, like Rymer and Jones, was always willing to accept their open hand to further the cause. Yet this tendency may have been, as Harrison claims, simply a stage in the growth of working class consciousness, a desire for independence from an upper class that was often hostile to it: 'it flourished on the genuine desire for respectability and self-reliance'.³ There had been many in the Chartist movement and were to be many in the independent labour movement who stressed the value of temperance. The Labour Leader said in 1894 that 'temperance reform is worth fighting for';⁴ but it went on to stress that there were dangers in the alliance with the bourgeois and labour aristocratic advocates: 'the impotent hands to whose keeping it is presently entrusted, know nothing of fighting when their party is in power'.⁵

Amongst active Nonconformists in general, in Robert Moore's words, 'ethical issues were more important than economic and political issues',⁶ and they cut across social classes.

³ Ibid.
⁴ Labour Leader, 4 Aug. 1894.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ R. Moore, op.cit., p.27.
'For the Methodist, the worker-boss division may not have been the most relevant social division'. Moore goes on to suggest that Methodism acquiesced in or even propagated submission to the market economy, if not to the bosses. There is no evidence from the history of this district in the period under study to dispute this. Men like the Rev. Leslie encouraged working class resistance only when employers were not rewarding their men with what the market would, in the former's opinion, allow. In this sense, the Nonconformist leaders of the second half of the century had no concept of a 'moral wage': a basic minimum standard of living to which all working men should be entitled. There are suggestions that this may, however, have been part of the consciousness of the Primitive Methodist leaders of the Chartist period.

What we have to decide is how far the influence that the Nonconformist/temperance conscience of the period had on a certain stratum of miners' and other working class leaders, rubbed off on the rank and file and eventually brought them within their own web of influence; or whether this ideological presence had a polarising effect among the miners and others, creating deep divisions which eventually surfaced when an alternative leadership emerged. It has already been suggested that Keir Hardie and other independent labour leaders were not radically different from many of their predecessors in their attitude towards temperance and similar moral issues. This would tend to suggest that the really deep divisions, which Hardie and others exposed, lay elsewhere.

1 Ibid, p.156. See also pp.286-7 for parallels with the attitudes of even the most radical of miners' activists.

2 He does not distinguish between Wesleyans, Primitive Methodists or any other Methodist sect in this context.


4 See, for example, R.Colls, op.cit., pp.84-5.
To amplify this point, we must look at a few remaining institutions in the district, some of which undoubtedly complemented the indirect influence that Nonconformist-type morals had over large numbers of the working class.
TABLE 25

Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist society membership in selected townships in the Wath and Mexborough Circuits, for selected years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wesleyan Swinton (and Kilnhurst)</th>
<th>Mexborough</th>
<th>Wath</th>
<th>Wombwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primitive Methodist Swinton</th>
<th>Mexborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1864 None</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 54</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877 72</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882 103</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892 100</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Circuit Schedules, Wath Manse.
CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

Adult Education,
Co-operative and Friendly Societies.
Adult education.

In 1851, there were mechanics institutes in Wentworth, Hoyland and Barnsley (where there were also two similar facilities in the Franklin Club and a Church literary institute), with a total membership of 695,570 of whom belonged to the Barnsley institutes. Wath and one or two other townships had been hosts to smaller literary societies dating back as far as the 1830s.

The Barnsley Mechanics Institute had been founded in 1834 in the upper room of the Wesleyan School by a combination of weavers and small tradesmen, some of whom were to become involved in Chartist activity in 1839. In 1837, however, the Institute was taken over by the middle class: in particular by Thomas Wilson, a coalowner of Cawthorne; Richard Inns, the ironfounder; and Edward Parker, a bleacher and yarn agent. Six years later, several members of the Barnsley working class, including ex-Chartists like Burland and John Garlick, replied by opening the Franklin Club; but by 1856, it too had been infiltrated by local trade and manufacturing interests with Parker as president. Though it never attracted the mass middle class patronage that characterised the Mechanics Institute, the Franklin Club soon lost its objective of promoting 'educational Chartism' and, in Kaijage's words, became a hot-bed of 'class collaboration' where many of the former Chartists 'imbibed the Liberal Creed'. It was closed in 1873.

1 1851 Census of Education.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 8 July 1876 and 29 Aug, 1897.
3 Ibid, 15 July 1876.
4 Barnsley Times, 10 May 1856.
6 Barnsley Chronicle, 7 April 1883.
Meanwhile, in 1848, the Barnsley Mechanics Institute was put on a formal footing. Its president in the 1850s was William Harvey; and, for most of the 1870s, it was Thomas Taylor, like Harvey a large linen manufacturer.\(^1\) Other officials and committee members in these years were mostly manufacturers, tradesmen and professionals.\(^2\) In the classic tradition, the Barnsley Mechanics Institute, with a high proportion of temperance advocates among its organisers, set out to instill an ideology of self-improvement among its members, especially the acquisition of 'useful knowledge', tightly constrained by the tenets of orthodox political economy, through formal study. The adult education movement of the 1830s and 1840s had grown up as a check to the influence of the manufacturing class, but the flagging energies and reduced confidence of the movement in the late 1840s opened the door to middle class reformers who, though enlightened and liberal compared with many of their class, nevertheless used the movement to establish controls over the people who fell into the movement's web of influence.\(^3\)

The over-emphasis on formal educational techniques and standards in the Institute, saw working class support fall off by the late 1860s.\(^4\) It did not close down, however, there being no effective alternative in the town, unlike Sheffield where opportunities for formal technical instruction hastened the demise of the Mechanics Institute.\(^5\) In 1886, it was said that the Barnsley Institute had 'never had the working class support that it ought to have had in a town of the size and importance of Barnsley'.\(^6\) There were few members of the

---

1 Barnsley Times, 5 Jan. 1856; Barnsley Chronicle, 15 July 1876.  
2 See, for example, Barnsley Times, 5 Jan. and 9 Feb. 1856.  
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 7 March 1868.  
working class on the committee even at this stage and there were few who showed any desire to be nominated for the annual vacancies. In 1885, Birtles, the chairman of the Barnsley Radical Association claimed that it was merely a 'snob club' and the 'there was nothing there that was attractive to mechanics'.

Formal classes were abandoned in the 1870s and replaced by ad hoc series of lectures. Yet this brought no improvement in membership. By 1886, it was under threat both in terms of membership and patronage, from the political clubs as both the active middle class and working class in the town grouped themselves around the institutions of one party or another. The Mechanics Institute, nevertheless, survived into the twentieth century, a reminder of a period when middle class patronage had been more blatant yet not altogether unsuccessful.

Attempts in out-townships to support mechanics institutes were almost entirely dependent on the support of one or two wealthy patrons. Wentworth was well-disposed in this respect due to the Fitzwilliams' benevolence and the Institute, opened in 1825, was still functioning in 1890 with sixty members. The Institute at Wath was also said to be thriving in 1890, unlike its less well-endowed neighbour (and relative newcomer to the movement) in Mexborough. At Dodworth, a mechanics institute was formed as late as 1893 through the munificence of the Rev. Taylor (of the linen family), but out of a pre-existing mutual improvement society with a history of working class involvement.

2 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 14 Feb. 1890.
3 Report of the Yorkshire Union of Mechanics Institutes 1876.
4 Ibid.
5 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 3 Jan. 1890.
From the middle decades of the century mutual improvement societies of one sort or another had grown up, in the country as a whole, alongside the more formal mechanics institutes. Here, formal, non-political and non-sectarian instruction was dispensed with in favour of more lively and relevant discussion. The small weekly subscription paid for their independence. In the early 1860s, however, there appeared a third party in the field. Henry Solly's initiative in starting the Working Men's Club movement made its mark on South Yorkshire soon afterwards. Clubs opened in both Rotherham and Barnsley in 1864; Dodworth put its club on a formal basis in 1868; and one was opened near the Thorncliffe iron complex in 1875, dominated, not surprisingly, by representatives of the firm. Several of the other out-townships did not have clubs until after the Club and Institute Union had replaced dependence on patronage with formalised central subscription canvassing. Monk Bretton in 1890 and Ardsley in 1892, were examples. The clubs may have had a distinct recreational and social base from the very start and especially after the introduction of beer, but they were intended to have a counter-attractionist role and as such, attracted the constant attention of temperance buffs and middle class educationalists, not always with much success.

1 J.F.C. Harrison, op.cit., p.52.
2 Rotherham Advertiser, 16 April 1864; Barnsley Chronicle, 4 July 1868 and 16 Jan. 1875.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 22 March 1890 and 5 Nov. 1893.
5 A magistrate in 1878 voiced criticism that the Mexborough club was used predominantly for drinking and gambling (Mexborough and Swinton Times, 17 May 1878).
An indication of the continuing influence of the middle class in adult education can be gauged from a study of the strands of the movement in Dodworth from the 1860s. In 1864, a Working Men's Mutual Improvement Society was formed with an initial membership of ninety. ¹ It was patronised by Thomas Taylor (linen manufacturer), who was chairman; by the non-resident Charlesworth brothers (capital owners); two other local linen manufacturers; the vicar; and several Barnsley dignitaries. ² Perhaps dismayed by this preponderance of middle class elements in the Society, Isaac Haigh, Peter Silk (the two miners involved in public opposition to John Normansell in 1868/9)³ and four other 'working men' began to arrange public meetings in a pub and tried in vain to establish a permanent reading and discussion room. ⁴ Initial hostility from one or two of the local establishment, including the vicar, was eventually subsumed and Haigh's initiative attracted the attention of a similar mix of middle class patrons as had the original Improvement Society.⁵ Posterity even credited Henry Richardson (linen manufacturer) and George Senior (colliery speculator) with the initiative for this as well as the earlier venture.⁶

By 1871, the club had got its reading room and a library. Evening classes for miners were started,⁷ but a typical example of some of the lectures arranged - 'What it is that makes a gentleman'⁸ - suggests that the 'abstract necessity of

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 5 Nov. 1864.
³ See pp. 134-6.
⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 4 and 25 July and 19 Sept. 1868.
⁵ Ibid, 6 Aug. 1868.
⁸ Ibid, 27 March 1869.
"civilising", "refining" and "elevating" the working classes' recognised by Price as the main priority of the mechanics institutes at the time, was also a motivating force among the patrons of the Dodworth Club.

In 1878, the township took what seems to have been a logical step of merging the Club with a new Mechanics Institute, opened on the initiative of the vicar, the schoolmaster and Hartley, the manager of Church Lane colliery (and a temperance advocate). In 1879 it had ninety seven members, but through lack of space, the night school was abandoned the year after and the Institute reverted back to the status of the old Working Men's Club. Eventually, through the munificence of the Vernon-Wentworths, the Rev. Taylor and other local benefactors, a new Mechanics Institute was opened in a new building in 1893. The Tory Club, opened in 1886, was closed down at the same time, the Institute being seen by its patrons as a valid alternative. Middle class control over adult education and formal recreational activities in Dodworth, intermittent in the 1860s and 1870s and virtually non-existent in the 1880s (in line with the level of activity), was put on a firm footing at the end of our period: in a sense a reversal of the normal pattern in other townships.

If some working men's clubs, like the one at Wombwell which opened in 1883, were thoroughly proletarian from the beginning, other institutions in less democratic communities

1 R.N.Price, op.cit., p.118.
3 Ibid, 20 Nov. 1880.
5 Ibid, 30 April 1892.
6 Ibid, 28 April 1883.
never threw off patronage from the middle and/or landed classes in this period. Denaby Main, for example, was presented with a new library and Mechanics Institute in 1886 by the Rev. Charles Fullerton. Although John Dixon, the local union leader, was on the committee, its president, not surprisingly was W. H. Chambers, the colliery manager. Direct initiatives in adult education by employers, however, were limited by the same constraints as restricted their activity in political and other fields in the district. The partner-directors of Newton, Chambers and Co., ventured into this field with characteristic enthusiasm, but others were obliged, if they did become involved at all, to share the initiative with other hegemonic groups or to offer amenities like reading rooms (at Wombwell Main and Wharncliffe Silkstone, for example) or penny readings (the latter only being attended, on the whole, by the lower middle classes).

There was no real breakthrough in adult education, formal or otherwise, in this period. The opening of free libraries - Barnsley got one in 1890, although some townships' ratepayers voted down any proposals - made some contribution, as did the gradual development of university extension and allied movements. But the latter had to wait until the early twentieth century. The local political associations, the co-operative movement and the friendly societies contributed little to adult education in this period.

The Co-operative movement.

While the paternalism of the Mechanics Institutes failed to make a significant impression on the South Yorkshire coalfield and the uneasy marriage of classes in many of the working

1 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 30 July 1886.
3 Ibid, 25 Jan. and 12 July 1890.
4 The vote at Monk Bretton, despite a vigorous campaign by Edward Rymer and others, was 74 to 20 against a free library. Ibid, 4 Feb. 1888.
men's clubs of this period had mixed fortunes, the working and lower middle class initiatives that developed the co-operative movement in the district were well rewarded. The movement was slow to gather steam. In 1862, when the Barnsley British Co-operative Society was founded, there were only three registered industrial and provident societies in the district - with 287 members - out of sixty five in Yorkshire as a whole.

The main legacy in this field from the first half of the century was the Barnsley Flour and Provision Society, dominated at first by men like Vallance and Hoey and which, in 1856, had an annual turnover of £10,000. It was soon attracting support from the manufacturing and professional classes who, on one occasion at least, stifled a radical initiative. Edward Newman, the Barnsley solicitor, who was a member of the Society, used his influence to prevent the Society from contributing to the Oaks Relief Fund.

The Barnsley British Co-operative Society (B.B.C.) was formed in 1862 on the Rochdale model with the help of one of the Pioneers, George Adcroft, who, in the early 1860s, was a colliery craftsman at Oaks and Stafford Main. Along with Adcroft on the first committee were two tailors, a plumber, a handloom weaver, a quarryman, a colliery deputy,

1 Return of Industrial and Provident Societies (P.P. 1863, xxix), pp.601-637. One society in Sheffield in 1862 had 778 members and three times the combined turnover of the societies in our district.

2 Barnsley Times, 2 Feb. 1856.

3 Barnsley Chronicle, 9 Feb. 1867.

a bookbinder and a corset manufacturer. Other early promoters included a pit carpenter, a pit cashier, a pit engine tenter, two more handloom weavers, another tailor, three warehousemen and the proprietor of a temperance hotel. One or two, like Ben Haigh, were also members of the Flour Society.

The society made slow progress in the 1860s, as Table 26 indicates, especially during the trade downturn of 1867/8 when the purchasing power of members was restricted. A branch was opened at Dodworth in 1863, however, and others at Wombwell, Higham, Ardsley, Warren, and Gawber by 1869. 1871–6 saw the most significant expansion of membership (40% between 1872 and 1873) and turnover as purchasing power increased and co-operative facilities spread to the out-townships. Branches opened in the eastern townships and the Society diversified into tailoring. Between 1885 and 1887, despite mixed progress, it also branched out into baking and butchery and bought a farm in Dodworth for dairy produce. In 1893 it began to manufacture mineral water. Yet it remained a cautious society, only opening a new branch or diversifying where it was certain demand existed. By the late 1880s, the B.B.C. was a huge undertaking (the fourth largest co-operative society in the country).

1 Coronation History, pp. 22, 24, 30 and appendix.
2 Ibid.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 30 Jan. 1864.
5 A Century of Service, p. 8.
6 Ibid; Coronation History, p. 75.
7 Coronation History, pp. 31–2.
1893 lockout, despite paying £2,000 into the relief fund, standing a large amount of credit and having about £67,000 of investments withdrawn, no financial strain was said to have been felt.¹ B.B.C. branch societies dominated co-operative retailing in the out-townships, except in a few isolated neighbourhoods where local initiatives were taken early on or were sponsored by patrons.

The B.B.C. committee remained throughout this period in the hands of the working and lower middle classes. There was, moreover, a small group of activists who enjoyed at least ten years' (and in one or two cases, about thirty years') involvement. Five of the nine committee members in 1883 still enjoyed office in 1893.² F. Birtles, first president of the Radical Association, had been a B.B.C. committee member since the early 1870s. Isaac Haigh (the miner and, later, accountant) was an occasional committee member as early as the 1860s and was auditor several times in the 1880s. Butcher, the president of the Barnsley Working Men's Liberal Association, was president also of the B.B.C. in 1871.³ All these men were intimately involved with Liberal and Radical politics, as were George Wheelhouse and Ben Hague two other leading councillors/co-operators. Nelson Matthews (a former pit engine tenter, and later a clock maker and the manager of the Dodworth branch shop), a regular committee member, was elected a county councillor in 1894.⁴ Many of these must have been politically successful by virtue of their involvement in the co-operative movement, although there was never an identifiable co-operative platform in Barnsley politics - co-operators were, on the whole, discouraged from electioneering.⁵

¹ Coronation History, pp. 97-8; A Century of Service, p. 9.
² Coronation History, appendix; Barnsley Chronicle, 9 Feb. 1884
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 11 Feb. 1871.
⁴ Ibid, 8 Sept. 1894.
Temperance was strongly represented in the movement from the very beginning. Ben Hague, the general manager of the Barnsley stores and often president of the Society, was probably the leading lay temperance advocate in the district. Wheelhouse, a Wesleyan local preacher, was another. The ideological roots of the society were firmly in self-improvement and were often reiterated, as, for example, in 1869 when the committee rejected proposals for amalgamation with the Flour Society (85% of whose produce they consumed) on the grounds that many members of the latter were mere dividend hunters and not ideologues. Some attempts were made to fulfill their obligations to adult education: a reading room and library were opened in the early 1870s and 1% of the profits of the Society were devoted to education after 1885. These commitments were not, however, noted for attracting mass interest.

The B.D.C. was often ready to recognise its growing dependence, for membership, on the miners and other major industrial groups. In 1876, a suggestion raised at a Yorkshire co-operative conference by a man called Hoey of Barnsley, that the movement should avoid contact with trade unions, was rejected. His argument that trade unions in Barnsley, at least, were 'red hot' and likely to damage the cause, was countered at the conference by Isaac Haigh. Three quarters of the B.D.C.'s members were trade unionists, Haigh claimed, and this type of organisation among them was responsible for the prevailing 'friendly feelings' between employers and workmen in the district. Hoey's move was also censured at a meeting of B.D.C. shareholders in Barnsley a few weeks later. The chairman of the large Hoyland branch

1 Coronation History, p. 60.
2 A Century of Service, p. 12.
3 Not Peter Hoey, the Chartist weavers' leader; he died in 1875.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 22 July 1876.
5 Ibid, 12 Aug. 1876.
of the Society in 1875 was Sam Woffinden, an Executive Committee member of the S.Y.M.A. and a member of Hoyland School Board;¹ and in 1893, over 10,000 members were said to have been miners or their families.²

The B.B.C. did, however, resist attempts by the Trades and Labour Council to gain seats on the committee in 1893 and 1894. In 1894, the four Trades Council-backed candidates included Albert Earnshaw; checkweighman and local board member, of Darton, and the politically active Edward Thorne, checkweighman and branch president at Church Lane in Dodworth.³ Some of the antagonism between these two organisations developed during a strike in 1892 of the tailors in the Society's employ over aspects of management in that department. The directors of the Society backed the controversial tailoring manager to the hilt and criticised Taylor and Murray, two of the miners in the trades Council, for their intervention in the dispute.⁴ The Society's decision to employ sweated female labour during the strike created even more ill-feeling, but the dispute was settled after a month.⁵

In 1862, there were registered co-operative societies in Kilnhurst and Mexborough, both of which had only opened within the previous two years.⁶ In 1875, there were independent societies also at Rawmarsh, Cawthorne, West Melton and Silkstone, while the total number of societies in Yorkshire had trebled to 199.⁷ The combined membership in our district

¹ Ibid, 27 Nov. 1875.
⁴ Ibid, 8 Oct. 1892.
⁵ Ibid, 15 Oct. 1892.
⁶ Return of Industrial and Provident Societies (1862, xxix), pp. 601-37.
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was 5,723, 4,573 of which belonged to the B.C.C. All the mining townships in our district had a branch of the B.B.C., except for Ecclesfield which was 'colonised' by two of the Sheffield societies. By 1886, only the Kilnhurst and Mexborough societies, amongst the independent ones, were registered as operative, with 290 and 368 members respectively. There were, however, several other independent societies which, for one reason or another, were not covered by the official statistics. Swinton had a co-operative society from 1864 to 1875, whose president and secretary in its final year of operation were both ironworkers. It was wound up as insolvent. There were societies in Worsborough Dale in 1858, Wath in 1858 (a flour society) and Wombwell in 1860, although none seem to have lasted much beyond those dates. Denaby Main replaced its company store with a co-operative society store on the initiative of W.H. Chambers, the colliery manager. He became president, not only of the Denaby Main Co-operative Society, but also in 1886, of the South Yorkshire District Co-operative Association.

The Kilnhurst Society was a different response to a similar lack of amenities, aggravated by geographical isolation. It was founded by a group of joiners in 1860, appointed a permanent manager in 1865 and was thriving towards the end of the period. The president of its first formal committee was a foreman at the local pottery and other identifiable committee members were a gardener, a pit labourer (and

2 Rotherham Advertiser, 17 Dec. 1864 and 3 July 1875.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 6 Nov. and 11 Dec. 1858 and 15 Dec. 1860.
4 J. MacFarlane, 'Denaby Main: a South Yorkshire mining village', p. 84.
5 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 15 Jan. 1886.
6 W. Quarrell, op. cit., p. 33.
Primitive Methodist local preacher), a pit blacksmith and three glassbottle makers.¹ The Society had 57 members in 1862, 232 in 1875 and 415 in 1889.² In this last year, turnover was £17,739 and the committee were discussing the possibility of co-operative ownership of collieries.³ Another peripheral village, rather isolated from the type of amenities and services enjoyed by most of the townships in the district, was Silkstone, where, in the 1840s, the miners depended on a company store for their provisions. A co-operative society was started in 1860, reputedly by trade unionists,⁴ just before a major expansion in the Clarke workforce in the neighbourhood.⁵ It had 105 members in 1873 and functioned until the B.B.C. opened a branch in 1883.⁶

The Mexborough society had a firm base throughout the period. In 1890, there were 362 members and, with a branch official from Manvers Main as president (and a winding engineman from Denaby as vice-president),⁷ it made the decision to enter the local political forum by backing candidates at board of health elections.⁸ The cut-township which expressed most commitment to the co-operative ideal, however, was Dodworth. This was not because of any lack of access to retail services (it was only about two and a half

¹ Ibid; Census enumerators' returns 1861 and 1871.
² Various reports in the Rotherham Advertiser and the Mexborough and Swinton Times.
³ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 25 April 1890.
⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 22 July 1876.
⁵ Ibid, 27 June 1863.
⁶ Ibid, 7 June 1873 and 3 Feb. 1883.
⁷ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 14 Feb. 1890.
⁸ Ibid, 21 Feb. 1890.
miles from the centre of Barnsley and had a good range of shops even at the beginning of the period), but because of the involvement of several of its community leaders in the movement, originally, it seems, through ideological motivation. Penlington, the schoolmaster; Whitham, a handloom weaver who took over the first branch shop; Isaac Haigh, who became involved in the Barnsley central committee long before he moved to the town from Dodworth; and Nelson Matthews, branch manager - all achieved renown in the movement beyond the confines of their local committee. Dodworth had the first branch outside Barnsley and, in May 1874, had 320 members, well above the norm for the size of the community. The co-operative presence, particularly in the form of Penlington and Matthews, certainly made itself felt in local politics in the township.

Local co-operative society committees provided the best available access to upward social mobility for miners and other workers, although most of those who did tread this ladder seem to have belonged to a widely defined 'aristocracy' of labour in the district - skilled glassbottlemakers, woodworkers, colliery craftsmen and ironworkers; supervisory grades like warehousemen and pit deputies; and miners' union leaders and checkweighmen. The notable exception was the several former handloom weavers in the movement. These men gained experience either in management and accounting at store level, or in policy making and committee work - or both. This experience and the contacts they made, led many of them into other public arenas of a more political nature. Most of these upward-mobiles severed their working class roots in an occupational context, but the co-operative movement did retain many links with organised labour and maintained day-to-day contact with working class families through the stores, enough, at least to reflect the more limited aspirations of that class.

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 May 1874.
The B.B.C. committee, in fact, virtually spawned the Radical Association in 1885. This, however, was as far as the governing orthodoxy of the local movement was prepared to go. Neither the B.B.C., nor the S.Y.M.A. would have been sympathetic to Rymer's campaign in the early 1870s to put the union's weight behind a new and aggressive system of co-operative retailing and production as a means of bringing about the collapse of commercial and industrial capitalism.¹ The societies, as Royden Harrison points out, may have used Owenite vocabulary, but the more virile ideals of social justice were lost among their business commitments.²

The B.B.C.'s handling of the tailors' strike proves this point. The type of men who found their way onto co-operative platforms were the same ones that found acceptance in other departments of the Liberal-temperance-Nonconformist dominated power structure of the district, reinforcing its hold on the political stage, especially after 1885 and perpetuating the myth of mass working class involvements. Gray describes this process succinctly:

A conscious desire to create a radically different society might, in practical terms, lead only to courses of action readily contained by minor adaptations of the established order. Thus the stress on financial viability in such bodies as co-operative associations made them - regardless of the ideology of their founders - into organisations catering for the more prosperous strata of the working class and institutionalising the values of thrifty and provident conduct.³

Friendly societies and the Volunteer movement.

Even if it was a commonplace in the 1840s that miners, in general, were not the thriftiest of occupational groups, many

¹ See Miners' Advocate and Record, 28 June and 5 July 1873.
² R.Harrison, op.cit., p.9.
³ R.Gray, op.cit., p.185.
of them were, at the time, members of friendly societies. Of the registered societies in the district in the 1870s, the majority belonged to one or other of the affiliated orders. As early as 1863, over half the thirty-nine lodges were affiliated ones; and by 1879, there were only a handful of non-affiliated ones. Ignoring the building societies and the Miners' Permanent Relief Fund, Barnsley claimed 1,495 members of registered societies in 1879; Mexborough - 562; Wombwell - 476; and Silkstone - 247, for example (each figure being more than the local co-operative society membership). The 1860s seems to have been the most active decade for lodge formation, although nineteen (more than in the 1850s or the 1870s) were founded in the 1840s.

There is no doubt that miners must have participated in and, in some places, taken the initiative in these societies. Those who did practice thrift would have had greater amounts to save than most working class groups in the district, especially in the early 1870s and the early 1890s. The attraction of the affiliated orders may also have been the same for the many mobile miners as for the occupational groups more renowned for tramping. Gosden recognised that:

the affiliated orders met the needs of a highly mobile industrial proletariat and their growth and the consequent diminution in the relative importance of local societies may well have been due in part to the latter's inferiority in this respect.

Miners, it is often said, were forced to form clubs of their own because of the dangerous nature of their work and the

---

2 *Report of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies (P.P. 1864, xxxii)*, Appendices.
3 *Ibid, 1879 (1881, lxxxiv)*, Appendices.
resulting actuarial confusion. The comparative absence of pit clubs in Yorkshire in the early 1870s,\(^1\) indicated, however, that miners' savings were being channeled into affiliated friendly societies and co-operative societies. This, if only in a small way, must have contributed to the intermingling of working class groups, which, it has been suggested, characterised this district. Conviviality, Gosden suggests, was as important a feature of the friendly societies, at least up to about 1875, as were the customs and moral codes characteristic of an earlier age.\(^2\)

Gosden suggests that, in the larger urban lodges at least, the leading members of friendly societies were not usually working men, but small businessmen and professionals. There was nothing paternalistic about these men and their attitude to their working class members. As Gosden says:

> A belief in the virtues of free trade, of governmental economy and of leaving people to manage their own affairs, without undue interference from the state was typical of those who were in the social position which most of the prominent members of the affiliated orders occupied at the time.\(^3\)

In 1874, several of the aldermen and councillors - mostly liberal industrialists and tradesmen - in Barnsley were Foresters.\(^4\) Yet despite the fact that we know very little about these societies, it seems unlikely that they held much potential for social control over their members in this period.\(^5\)

---

1 Compare Staffordshire and South Lancashire: ibid, p. 86.
2 Ibid, p. 220.
3 Ibid, p. 92.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 31 Jan. 1874.
5 J. Foster (op. cit., p. 216) asserts otherwise.
In the out-townships, lodges may well have been less top-heavy and were oriented more around local needs. In 1864, local Oddfellows lodges waived the dues of the locked out miners. At Silkstone in 1881, six out of the seven leading figures of the three local lodges (Oddfellows, Foresters and Orangemen) co-operating in a Hospital Sunday gathering, were miners. The working class were even influential at the top of the structure in Barnsley: Abraham Chappell, a fitter and chairman of the Trades Council in the 1890s, had been president of the Barnsley Friendly Society Council in the late 1880s.

The dominance of the more formal affiliated societies in our district seems only to have been a function of the rapid expansion of the coal industry and the influx of a new type of mobile miner. To a certain extent, the miners must have moulded the societies around their specific need for friendly benefits (especially after the demise of the S.Y.M.A. Widows and Orphans fund) and for conviviality.

By the mid 1880s, the friendly society advance seems to have been halted, except for that of the Miners' Permanent Relief and the building societies which must have detracted

1 *Barnsley Chronicle*, 30 April 1864.
2 Ibid, 30 July 1881.
3 Ibid, 11 June 1904.
4 The Barnsley Permanent Building Society was formed in 1853 and opened its first subsidiary branch, at Hoyland, in 1857. There were also building societies formed in the out-townships, such as the Darfield and Wombwell Building Society (formed in 1867). The first three executive members of the Barnsley Society were: Ben Hague (handloom weaver, turned general dealer; later a prominent co-operator and the first manager of the Building Society), George Traviss (coalowner) and Ben Marshall (solicitor and, later, town councillor). See *Barnsley Permanent Building Society Centenary Souvenir 1853-1953* (Wombwell, 1953), pp. 6-7; *Barnsley Times*, 4 April 1857; *Barnsley Chronicle*, 18 May 1867.
from the affiliated and independent societies. The penny banks also contributed to the decline of the social aspects of the movement. Freemasonry, too, does not seem to have made much progress in the district during the 1880s and 1890s. There were lodges in Barnsley (with forty five members), Rotherham and Sheffield in 1878, all of which catered for residents in out-townships in our district.¹ Despite a national expansion in the 1880s, membership had not risen appreciably in our district: there were only seventy eight members in the one lodge in Barnsley in 1897.² Freemasonry did, however, as Lee suggests, provide a melting pot for those members of the middle class who could afford to join.³ There were the expected manufacturers in the Barnsley lodge in 1878, but also eight mine managers and viewers, several clerks and a schoolmaster. The format was similar in 1897, although more men from the out-townships had been drawn into the urban-based lodges.

Finally, note must be made of the state and progress of a far more direct and paternalistic organ of social control: the Volunteer movement. Very little, in fact, was reported about its activity in the district; and it seems to have attracted little support despite the involvement of Earl Fitzwilliam, the Spencer Stanhopes and one or two lesser figures like Robert Clarke of Silkstone, Francis Taylor of Darfield, Henry Pigott and Charles Newman of Barnsley.⁴ There were troops only at Rotherham, Wath and Barnsley in 1861, each with a maximum of 100 members.⁵ Another troop

¹ Registry of Deeds, Wakefield, Masonic Lodge Returns, 1878.
² Ibid, 1897.
³ J.M. Lee, op.cit., p.34.
⁴ Barnsley Almanack and Yearbook 1862, pp. 65-6; Barnsley Chronicle, 21 July 1883.
⁵ Barnsley Almanack and Yearbook 1862, pp. 65-6.
Another troop was opened by Robert Clarke at Silkstone in 1864, twenty-five men joining at its first meeting.\textsuperscript{1} But this most blatant aspect of community paternalism did not survive Clarke's death, and in 1874, there were only 160 Volunteers in the two troops within our district, plus 160 at Rotherham.\textsuperscript{2} In 1883, membership of the movement was described as 'very low'.\textsuperscript{3} It is not possible to identify all the members of the movement, but amongst the officers and non-commissioned officers we find Liberals and Tories, mine managers and colliery clerks, linen manufacturers and landowners. While the movement may have cemented links between a few members of the landed and middle classes—and possibly some workmen, it made very little impact on this district which was not, on the whole, likely to have oriented around this type of paternalistic recreational activity, just as it spurned the rather more modern paternalism of the Mechanics Institutes.

\textsuperscript{1} Barnsley Chronicle, 13 Aug. and 3 Sept. 1864
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid, 17 Jan, 1874.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid, 21 July 1883.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>£1,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>£6,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>£9,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>£13,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>£36,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>4573</td>
<td>£134,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>5977</td>
<td>£176,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>9820</td>
<td>£260,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>12228</td>
<td>£395,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>15415</td>
<td>£467,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER TWENTY THREE

Politics and the Miners, 1855-1884.
The Parliamentary elections and the candidates.

The study area in these years fell within the boundaries of the parliamentary constituencies of the West Riding (until 1865) and the South-West Riding (from 1865 to 1884). Below are listed the various elections and changes in representation in the period: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Viscount Goderich (Lib) and E. Denison (Tory) unopposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Sir J.W. Ramsden (Lib) replaced Goderich, unopposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Ramsden and F. Crossley (Lib) against Tory challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>W. Spencer Stanhope (Tory) replaced Milton, unopposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Stanhope and L.R. Starkey (Tory) against Liberal challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>W.H. Leatham and H. Fitzwilliam (Libs) against Tory challenge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one contest disturbed the electoral peace of the rural West Riding between 1849 and 1864, the year before the county constituency was split. That was in 1859 when James Stuart-Wortley unsuccessfully challenged the Liberals, and in particular the candidature of F. Crossley, accused by Stuart-Wortley of having views 'identical' to those of the old Chartist, Ernest Jones. 2 On other occasions, electoral compromises were reached with uncontroversial candidates from both parties being returned unopposed.

The creation of the South-West Riding division coincided with the establishment of a national grass-roots organisation behind the Liberal parliamentary party 3 and with the

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 10 and 17 April 1880.
2 Ibid, 7 May 1859.
commencement of a new wave of reform agitation. The South-West Riding, though strictly a county seat, included the industrial towns of Barnsley and Rotherham and the expanding coalfield communities. The numerous Nonconformist congregations and the absence of contention over the Irish and Catholicism made the constituency a natural target for Liberal advances. On the surface it seemed that accommodation with the Tories was unnecessary and improper. In fact, the Liberal middle class in the constituency in the mid 1860s were not as cohesive as they might have been if the linen manufacturers had remained as strong a presence, as they had been in earlier decades; and Earl Fitzwilliam's domination of the constituency Registration Association was readily accepted.¹ No independent Liberal candidates appear to have been put forward by a dissenting opposition that rarely showed itself before the 1880s; and Liberal affairs in South Yorkshire settled down under the moderate wing of the party.

Despite this occupation of the middle ground of politics, there were the, by then, almost obligatory contests at general elections. Walter Spencer Stanhope was only narrowly beaten by Milton's Liberal partner, Beaumont, in 1868² and was successful along with L.R.Starkey in 1874. In 1872, Milton's retirement had led to the sharing of the seat with the Tories with what seems to have been a minimum of fuss. These developments were not enough to fuel a major reform campaign from radical opinion locally, as we shall see later. Henry Beaumont, the Liberal member from 1865 to 1874, more than once declared himself in favour of the extended franchise for the counties as well as several reforms in the mining industry that were dear to the hearts of the S.Y.M.A. leaders and their middle class allies.³ As such, he must have taken some steam

¹ See ibid, pp. 120, 124.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 28 Nov., 1868.
³ Ibid, 7 Nov. 1868. These reforms included, of course, the Eight Hour Day.
out of any impending radical alliance. Even the Tory, Walter Stanhope, did not attract much criticism from either working class or middle class Liberals in South Yorkshire. A local man, he was an active campaigner and debater and in the late 1860s shifted his early opposition to trade unions and parliamentary reform and was even ready to air discussion on disestablishment. Whether or not these shifts in publicly expressed opinion were conducted for expediency's sake or not, they were probably highly successful in the context of South Yorkshire politics, which had to accept the reality of an organised mining labour force by the 1860s. Politics therefore remained relatively uncontroversial in the constituency, except for flurries of election rioting at Wath and Rotherham in 1865 and at Barnsley in 1868.

The Fitzwilliams' patronage of the seat was thus a not over-taxing one for the family and the transfer of responsibility to the Tories in 1872 and 1874 did not signal the waning of the Fitzwilliam influence. A far greater threat was to come from within their own party. In 1868, Viscount Milton would not commit himself to support an extension of the franchise for the counties, while in 1884, although Henry Fitzwilliam was obliged to give token support to the Bill, he strongly deprecated 'the method by which the present agitation in favour of the measure in question is being conducted'. The Fitzwilliams, as Ward suggests,

1 Ibid, 23 Nov. 1872.
2 Ibid, 5 Sept. and 7 Nov. 1868.
3 Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record, 12 Aug. 1865; Rotherham Advertiser, 22 July and 12 Aug. 1865; Barnsley Chronicle, 28 Nov. 1868.
4 See J.T. Ward, 'The Earls Fitzwilliam and the Wentworth Woodhouse estate', p.24. This was to be contrasted with the fifth Earl's costly tussles in the 1820s. In 1880, the Liberals spent £8,578 - less than the Tories - on the South-West Riding election (Barnsley Chronicle, 3 July, 1880).
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 7 Nov. 1868.
6 Ibid, 9 Aug. 1884.
became increasingly distrustful of urban radicalism and its challenge to the preserve of the old Whig county families. In 1874, an observer claimed to have evidence that Earl Fitzwilliam had given support to Walter Spencer Stanhope in that year's election campaign, possibly with an eye to getting Tory nomination for one or more members of his family. It was well-known by then that Fitzwilliam did not look favourably on what had recently been done by the 'extreme party in this country'.

Henry Fitzwilliam and the mainstream and radical Liberals became more and more estranged. In 1880, he claimed he had lost his seat at Malton in 1874 because he refused to give any support to Home Rule. In 1883, after he had voted with the Tories on several issues, a motion was passed at a Barnsley Liberal Association meeting regretting that 'the Hon. Henry William Fitzwilliam has again separated himself from the Liberal party on important and critical decisions'. The circumstances brought editorial comment from the Barnsley Chronicle: 'The traditional Liberalism of the Fitzwilliam family seems to be becoming every year of a less and less pronounced character'. A year later, Henry Fitzwilliam himself admitted that if some of the measures brought forward by the Gladstone administration since 1880 had been laid before the country (in 1850), he should have refused them my support. The family's final breach over Home Rule in 1885,

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 11 April 1874.
3 Ibid.
4 S.C.L., WWN T 20, H.W. Fitzwilliam to Gatty, 26 March 1880.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 June 1883.
6 Ibid, 12 May 1883.
7 Ibid, 9 Aug. 1884.
was only a stage in the long-drawn-out divorce proceedings with the radicalising local and national Liberal party. It created an opportunity for the South Yorkshire Liberal middle class to seize the reins of power.

**The electorate.**

As Table 27 indicates, our district voted predominantly Liberal in 1865, to a far greater extent than the South-West Riding division as a whole. As the district contained most of the industrialised townships in the constituency, this was hardly surprising, given the political complexion of the West Riding tradesmen and much of its manufacturing class. Two still essentially rural parishes on the eastern edge of the district - Denaby and Bolton - revealed their propensity to vote Tory as most rural neighbourhoods tended to do, while most of their neighbours east of Barnsley, which had recently been industrialised, tended to vote heavily Liberal. The great variation amongst the voting patterns of semi-rural townships like Wentworth and Silkstone, and also amongst industrialised townships like Rawmarsh and Mexborough, however, reveal the operation of a far more potent factor in electoral behaviour: political patronage. The majority of the voters in Swinton, Rawmarsh, Wentworth, Brampton and possibly Hoyland (plus large numbers in Ecclesfield and Wath) in 1865 were tenants of Earl Fitzwilliam - as farmers, shopkeepers, owners of small workshops or large factories. The voters in these townships responded accordingly: in 1865, most voting for Beaumont and Milton; while a few split their vote between Milton and one of the Tories. Rawmarsh and Hoyland, semi-urban and heavily industrialised, no doubt would have registered a good majority for the Liberals irrespective of the Fitzwilliam presence; but semi-rural townships like Brampton and Wentworth would have been an altogether different

---

1 In 1867, Earl Fitzwilliam had his solicitors draw up a list of his tenants who were allowed to vote (S.C.L., Newman and Bond MSS, NBC 310). In the Barnsley area, in 1865, it was reported that the tenantry were 'brought up in large numbers' to vote Tory (Barnsley Chronicle, 22 July 1865).
matter. Here especially, the 'pressure of a more or less gentle character' that the *Barnsley Chronicle* claimed had been a feature of elections in these townships,¹ created the real contrasts in voting behaviour.

The voters of Darton were predominantly under the influence of the Beaumont family of Bretton Hall, the local landowner and Liberal patron. Darton's Liberal vote was much higher than the neighbouring township of Barugh, which, although more industrialised, had no one dominant landowner. In Cawthorne, the seat of the Spencer Stanhopes, no Liberal votes were cast at all. In Silkstone, where the voters were strongly influenced by the Clarke family and in Dodworth, where the Taylors, the Stanhopes and to a lesser extent the Clarkes - all Tories - held sway, the Liberal vote was less than one might have expected in these early-industrialised townships. Mexborough was a community whose tradesmen were described by a local Tory journal as 'Liberals of a somewhat Radical sort';² yet the influence of the Mentagues of Melton over their tenants in the township was enough to tip the balance in favour of the Tories in 1865. Perhaps only in Barnsley was truly independent voting practised in 1865, producing a pattern that was probably most reflective of true committed political opinion in the district as a whole.

It is not possible to identify occupations of voters from the 1865 Poll Book; but for the three townships under special scrutiny this has been undertaken with the help of trade directories and the Census returns. Table 28 shows that in these three townships, certain expected links between occupation and voting behaviour broke down under local influences. Even the farming vote in Swinton (with Kilnhurst) went to the Liberals; while in Silkstone, the shopkeeper/craftsman group predominantly voted Tory. Most of Swinton's industrialists voted Liberal, while all the industrialists in the other two townships voted Tory. An important general

¹ *Barnsley Chronicle*, 25 June 1892.
² *Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record*, 2 Sept. 1865.
point to note at this stage is that all the coalowners entitled to a vote in the three townships registered theirs with the Tories, against the trend of industrialists in the district as a whole, but paralleled amongst coalowners in the wider community. Eight out of ten coalowners identified in the Poll Book as voting in our district were Tories in 1865.

Even if much of the voting was merely token, the difference in tone between the Liberalism and Toryism of the late 1860s was bound to have had some effect on the non-voting population. In Silkstone, all the senior colliery personnel and owners, the vicar, the farmers the owner of the largest number of houses and the church and school benefactor - all were Tories, some of them active politically. In 1880, Mrs. Clarke and her colliery manager organised and paid for the printing of election propaganda. It is not surprising that Silkstone's not inconsiderable population of miners developed a sense of isolation from the mainstream of South Yorkshire coalfield life, endowed as it was with the benefits of the evangelistic Liberal/Nonconformist institutions, albeit with something of a deadening effect on independent working class initiative. Silkstone, however, in its isolation, did develop a thriving and working class-dominated co-operative society and one of the best-known brass bands in the district, to name just two of the more plebeian institutions lacking in some of the townships dominated by a Liberal manufacturing and tradesmen class. In Swinton, it was only the fact that so many of the industrial and professional Liberal leadership became Unionists in 1885 that enabled the mining working class to gain the firm footing in its institutions that it did in the 1890s.

Barnsley was a more open forum and produced a more realistic political polarisation. Although politics did not overtly play an important part in Town Council elections, the

1 S.C.L., CR 102, Teasdale to Clarke, 20 March 1880.
political loyalties of the councillors were identifiable from an early date. Appendix 6 endorses the general impression of a preponderance of Liberals among the middle class, especially amongst those who were active in public affairs in Barnsley. If we take the out-townships in isolation, however, the majority of important political figures, most of them industrialists, were Tories. Apart from the linen manufacturers (and the largest of them, Thomas Taylor, was an active Tory) and the senior personnel of Newton, Chambers and Co., large industrialists in the district tended to be Tories. Dawes, the Clarkes, the Days, Tune, Guy Senior, Marsden Inns, Rylands, Barron and the Mitchells are examples. Few of these men were active in Barnsley politics, however, and some were even overshadowed in the out-townships by a much more broad-based and more politically active group of Liberal Nonconformist tradesmen, small manufacturers and professionals.

Organisation and the press.

The new Liberal party of the 1860s did not have a strong, formal grass-roots organisation. There were the Registration Associations, but they tended to be dominated by the big constituency-wide Liberal interests and were skeletal affairs at the best of times. There did grow up, from the late 1870s in Barnsley and the larger out-townships, local Liberal Associations, which enjoyed a high degree of participation by a few working class representatives (like Thomas Haigh, miners' leader and founder and Vice-President of the Dodworth Liberal Association in 1880;¹ and Joseph Fletcher, former miner and executive member of the Wombwell and Darfield Liberal Association in 1881²) and many members of the Liberal and Radical lower middle class.³ These organisations were not,

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 15 May 1880.
² Ibid. 22 Jan. 1881.
³ Such as the Reverend Leslie and E.B. Jenkinson (a jeweller) in the Mexborough and District Association in 1878 (Mexborough and Swinton Times, 21 June 1878).
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however, much more than debating societies until the old Barnsley Liberal Association was reconstituted as the Barnsley and District Liberal Association in 1882 producing, in 1883, the first of the ward-based Liberal and Radical Unions whose aim was to put Liberals on the Council, the School Board and the Board of Guardians for Barnsley. Not surprisingly, many mainstream Liberals did not entirely approve of this development.

Vincent points out that:

The propaganda of the (Liberal) party was carried on by the new Press, not by the party organs proper; and the great standing armies which bound men to serve under the Liberal flag were those not of the Liberal Associations but of militant Dissent and the labour aristocracy.

In the Barnsley area, until 1885, the latter were not of paramount importance, except as a pressure group, but the welding capacity of the local Press and the climate of Nonconformity was no less important in and after 1885 than it was in 1865. Just as the Sheffield Independent gave the Leader family a central position in Sheffield Liberalism, so the Lingards, publishers of the Barnsley Chronicle from 1858 and proprietors from 1862 to 1888, obtained a foothold in local Liberal institutional politics. As has been mentioned, the Lingard interest in the town, other than a purely financial one, waned in the early 1880s, yet the Chronicle maintained a relatively progressive stance, committed especially to the furtherance of organisation among the miners. The only times it wavered from this line were when it found its loyalties divided in the 1871 Council election, when Normansell opposed the mainstream Liberal

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 20 May 1882.
2 Ibid, 14 April 1883.
and in the mid 1880s, when its editor, Alex Paterson, questioned the wisdom of the emergent Radical group's aim of introducing overt political alignments into local institutional affairs. As Thomas Frost, a journalist unconnected with the Chronicle, commented: 'The Radicals regarded the editor of that journal as a political jelly fish'. Nevertheless, an attempt by Frost to capture the radical vote for his own paper, the Barnsley Independent (a reconstituted version of the former Tory paper, the Barnsley Times), failed. The Barnsley Times, begun in 1855, never had anything like the circulation of the Chronicle and considerably less news coverage. Other attempts to sustain non-Liberal papers in the district failed, notably the Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record, which claimed to be independent, and to support, in 1865, parliamentary reform and Gladstone's finance code, while consistently attacking the policy and the personnel of the S.Y.M.A. and other labour organisations. It labelled Normansell, MacDonald and other miners' leaders: 'under-miners' whose business is agitation'.

In 1877, the neglected eastern part of the coalfield, previously served by the rather non-committal and unpenetrative Rotherham Advertiser, got a permanent paper of its own in the Mexborough and Swinton Times. It was founded by John Turner and his son Walter, both of Mexborough. John and his children received compensation from the Denaby Main Colliery Co., for fatal injuries to his wife for which the company was judged responsible. Part of the money was used to set Walter up as a printer. The Turners were

1 See pp. 494-5.
3 Ibid, p.317. Frost was sacked later by the paper's proprietor, Wood, in an attempt to re-establish the paper's Tory identity (ibid, p.323).
4 Mexborough, Swinton and Wath Record, 5 Aug. 1865.
5 Ibid, 9 Sept. 1865.
6 See Rotherham Advertiser, 3 April 1869.
committed to giving ample ventilation to the activities and some support to the aims of organisation among the local miners and other working class groups. John, who died in 1887, was also a teetotaller and an active Primitive Methodist,¹ and his creed was reflected in his paper's coverage and editorials.

Working class involvement.

The S.Y.M.A.'s official involvement in local institutions from a political point of view was minimal. This was as true of the union under Normansell as under either of the other secretaries or teams of secretaries, despite his brief foray into local government. While on the Council and in his efforts to become elected, Normansell did not set out to identify himself with the local Liberal leadership and, early in 1872, actually disassociated himself and his union from one of the foci of local Liberal politics, the Barnsley Chronicle, by placing the S.Y.M.A. subscription with the Tory Barnsley Times instead.²

With no other single working class group in a strong enough position to seize whatever opportunities for involvement there were in local Liberal politics, it was left to the initiative of a few isolated individuals, like John Butcher and Edward Jones, to loosen marginally the strong grip which the middle and landed classes had applied. These few individuals and their allies among the radical middle class had little impact on the overall political apathy of the district before the 1880s - an apathy that was not altogether discouraged by the Barnsley Chronicle.

There was, for example, little enthusiasm for moves to seek parliamentary borough status for Barnsley - the success of which would have enfranchised large numbers of the local working class after 1867. An early attempt among Board of

¹ Mexborough and Swinton Times, 21 Oct. 1887.
² S.Y.M.A. minutes (Normansell's notes), 18 Nov. 1872.
Health members in 1859, for example, faltered because of quibbling over who should call a public meeting to discuss the issue.¹ A Reform Union branch was formed in Barnsley, but not until April of 1866.² It is not clear on whose initiative it was founded, but the chairman of the provisional committee was Thomas Lingard and members included a high proportion of the Liberal councillors - Parker, Hague, Newman, Carter and Richardson, for example - as well as three or four former linen workers' leaders - including Vallance, Mirfield and John Garbutt (who was later to become involved in the local republican organisations).³ The Reverend Compston, the outspoken Baptist minister, and Philip Casey, the only miners' representative identifiable, were also present at the inaugural meeting. Mention of Reform League activity, also with similar personnel, suggests that local branches of the two bodies merged in these 'closing stages of the battle for reform', as Brian Simon puts it.⁴ He points out that phenomena like this 'epitomised the rapprochement of the organised working class seeking the right to vote and the Radical manufacturers and industrialists seeking access to power'. Barnsley produced this pattern on a smaller scale, although with two important groups - the miners and the coalowners - almost altogether missing from the scene. Interest in the movement was not sustained and the publicised meetings that followed tended to be small and largely confined to Vallance and his associates.⁵

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 12 March 1859.
² Ibid, 7 April 1866.
³ See International Herald, 26 Oct. 1872.
⁵ For example, see Barnsley Chronicle, 16 Feb. 1867.
The need for working class leaders to identify with the Liberal party in the late 1860s, with Gladstone's criticisms of union violence and intimidation covering a fairly wide canvass, was not so clear cut as in later decades. In our district, the 1869 lockouts did not do much to clarify this identification, with Newton, Chambers and Co., as active. Liberals and the Baines family of Leeds, major shareholders in Denaby Main, furnishing a Liberal M.P. John Dixon of the W.Y.M.A. wrote to the Barnsley Chronicle in April 1869, with a gesture of solidarity with the Denaby miners, suggesting that:

Now that workmen's unions are no longer of any use for the purpose of aiding political sycophants to obtain seats in the House of Commons, their efforts to obtain their social emancipation through unity of action are completely ignored by some of the very men who only a few months since were flattering them and soliciting their influence in the political arena. ¹

This and the pressure of his main commitments contributed to Normansell's decision not to become involved in the Barnsley Working Men's Liberal Association when it was formed in mid 1869.² It was claimed, at the Association's inaugural soiree, that, unlike a parallel Tory organisation, it had 'grown up from the feeling of the working men themselves'.³ Its president was John Butcher, formerly an iron moulder who had moved to Barnsley in 1865 to work at Shaw's foundry. Butcher was a model 'self-improver': he was a Wesleyan local preacher and became president of the Barnsley British Co-operative Society in 1871. With no support from the miners,

¹ Ibid, 24 April 1869.
² Ibid, 1 May 1869.
⁴ Ibid, 14 Aug. 1875 (obituary). He was also on the first Barnsley School Board. In 1874, he joined Ben Hague as an estate agent, rent collector and agent for the Leeds Permanent Building Society.
however, management of the Association was left to one or two of the surviving ex-Chartist handloom weavers, along with Lingard, Brady, Parker and other middle class Liberal councillors. ¹ Butcher saw no contradiction in this, nor in the lack of any overt political activity stemming from the Association. He was proud to emphasise that:

We have higher objectives in view than the spread of our political views: we wish by those institutions to provide for the rational recreation of the working class and to provide for their mental and moral improvement. ²

In other words, this organisation, and the not dissimilar Conservative Working Men's Association, were little more than alternatives to the ailing Mechanics Institute. Patronage, especially by the three interested landed Liberal families - the Fitzwilliams, the Leathams and the Beaumonts - was lavish in the early days of the Barnsley W.M.L.A. and a similar organisation based in Mexborough.³

The Conservative Associations in the district and the short-lived Conservative Working Men's Associations were also virtually one and the same at the top. ⁴ 'A Liberal' pointed out, after scrutiny of the Barnsley organisation which claimed to be run by and for working men:

I find that the president is an eminent civil engineer and local manufacturer; that the vice presidents comprise four leading county magistrates, two extensive colliery owners, and a Thurlstone manufacturer; that the treasurer is a genial retired Barnsley tradesman of independent means; and that other officers and the committee comprise the following: one professor of music; clerks and bookkeepers; master builders, shopkeepers and independent gentlemen, but the working man - Conservative working man - remains yet to be "caught". ⁵

¹ Ibid, 6 May 1871.
³ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 7 Sept. 1872 and 29 Aug. 1874.
⁴ The Barnsley C.W.M.A. was founded in February 1869 (Barnsley Chronicle, 13 Feb. 1869).
⁵ Ibid, 20 Feb. 1869.
With no direct electoral advantage to be won from courting the working class in this district, what semblance of a Tory counter-attack was launched in the late 1860s and the 1870s had little conviction or success, unlike in many of the parliamentary boroughs. ¹

The *reforri agitation of early 1874, with the prospect of several miners' M.P.s in sight, led to an injection of working class interest in the Barnsley W.M.L.A. At a meeting in January, the prospect of sending a miner to Parliament for Barnsley, in anticipation of the achievement of parliamentary borough status for the town or major parliamentary reform, was discussed by spokesmen for working class groups and Liberal councillors. ² In 1875, Joseph Arch spoke in strong terms against farmers at a meeting in Barnsley accompanied on the platform by several of the town's middle class. ³ The opportunities for airing relatively advanced political and trade union views were there for the taking. Few senior miners' officials seized the opportunities; this was left to rank and file leaders like Jones, Archer and Rymer who were often seen at public meetings pressing for the county franchise. The first two were active in their local working men's Liberal associations. ⁴

Like Normansell, Frith was not a political animal. Yet by 1876, his union had begun to pay lip service to the Liberal cause. At the 1877 miners' demonstration, a motion demanding household franchise for the counties was passed; ⁵ while in the

³ Ibid, 27 Nov. 1875.
⁴ Ibid, 31 July and 27 Nov. 1875.
⁵ S.Y.M.A. minutes, 13 Aug. 1877.
run-up to a by-election in Sheffield in 1879, Frith, Chappell and the S.Y.M.A. Council issued a bill advising miners to 'Discharge your duty like men' and vote Liberal:

It is to this party that Miners owe almost all the beneficial regulations which are now in force: and we should specifically call your attention to the fact that it was the late Liberal Government which passed the Amended Mines Regulation Act.

The long marriage between the miners in South Yorkshire and the Liberal party had begun, although at first the miners in our district could offer little more than lip service. With many it was even less than this: a miner from Darfield wrote in 1877, deploring the 'disgraceful apathy of miners on county franchise'. Philip Casey, while leader of one of the splinter unions of the early 1880s, even appeared on a Tory election platform in Hetton, County Durham, invoking the wrath of the politically committed Durham Miners' Association. The stark exception to the miners' overall lack of political involvement before 1884 was to be found among the small group of republicans.

The republicans.

South Yorkshire harboured an enclave of early 1870s' proletarian republicanism, especially among miners and the Barnsley Irish. A republican club in Barnsley was referred to in the International Herald in August 1872 and Edward Rymer - then at Sharlston colliery, but also in close contact with the Barnsley republicans - claimed to have recruited 200 people to the movement in two months of that summer.

---

2 Barnsley Chronicle, 14 July 1877.
3 Ibid, 10 April and 30 Aug. 1880.
4 This has been surmised from the names of several of the active participants.
5 International Herald, 17 Aug. 1872.
6 Ibid, 10 Aug. 1872.
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In October, the Barnsley club set out to recruit in the South Yorkshire mining villages and two weeks later, a delegate meeting was held at Mexborough to establish a district organisation. At that meeting, there were representatives from Sheffield, Barnsley and a number of mining villages, including Wombwell and Hoyland. Tibbott, the chairman of the Barnsley club; Rymer, the delegate from the Wakefield district; and Archer and Sheldon from Wombwell were among the most vocal.

No agreement on a central district fund was reached at that meeting, but a national conference of Republican clubs, to be held in Sheffield, was called. Rymer and Tibbott were among those on the provisional committee. This first national conference of republican clubs was held on December 1st with thirty four clubs represented, mostly from Yorkshire and the North-East (especially the Cleveland district from which the Miners' Advocate and Record was issued). The organisation which emerged from this conference - the National Republican Brotherhood - was explicitly intended by the militants on its executive (especially John De Morgan, W.H.Riley and Thomas Smith) to be an independent republican party. They agreed that they 'must, as reformers, separate (themselves) from the present dominant political parties and form a new one - a people's party'. Their aim was 'the establishment of a Government based upon the rights of man'.

1 Ibid, 12 Oct. 1872.
3 Ibid, 9 Nov. 1872.
5 Ibid.
The tone of the Brotherhood - and of De Morgan in particular - did not appeal to Charles Bradlaugh and three of his supporters who soon withdrew from the executive committee, their places being filled by Rymer and one or two of the other South Yorkshire republicans. By this time, however, the grand design of the movement had faltered. Membership of the Barnsley club was on the decline, as Rymer reported, and the ideological and personal battles between Bradlaugh and De Morgan were causing concern among some of the active working class members. Disaffections caused a July conference to be cancelled and the Brotherhood’s final conference in Nottingham in September presided over the collapse of the movement. Of the clubs in our district, only the little one at Barugh Green, where Rymer then lived and participated along with John Deakin, a former Towers supporter, seems to have survived into 1873.

Edward Rymer presents us with ample evidence of the republican viewpoint through his published correspondence and articles in the period from 1872 to 1874, and to a lesser extent in the late 1870s and beyond. In many respects, he echoed the mainstream proletarian republican ideas of W.H.Riley. For example, he attacked landlordism with far more force than the middle class republicans in the contemporary Land Tenure Reform Association. Rymer called for 'a revolution that shall overturn the system and put an honest land industry on the soil in peace and independence'.

1 Ibid, 15 March 1873.
2 Ibid, 8 Feb. 1873.
3 Ibid, 5 April 1873, Rymer, in particular, voiced his disapproval of dissention within the ranks of the Brotherhood.
5 Deakin was secretary of the Barugh Green club from November 1872 (ibid, 9 Nov. 1872).
6 Miners' Advocate and Record, 2 May 1874.
Royden Harrison distinguishes between, on the one hand, the essentially political transformation sought by the middle class republicans, aimed predominantly at severely curtailing the power of the aristocracy and landlords and establishing in their place a meritocracy; and on the other hand, the political and social revolution implied in the demands of the proletarian republicans.¹

Rymer welcomed the 'coming revolution' in 1873 and 1874. He foresaw the establishment of a republic which would radically shift the balance of power, not only in Parliament but also in the place of work. Co-operative production was the linch pin of this new society:

Let us have mines, factories, workshops and dwellings of our own in every coal district in the kingdom. We can if we will produce £100,000 a year for co-operative mining purposes, and in less than 20 years the whole commercial system of this empire would be changed into co-operative industry. ²

For not putting union funds to good use in this way, Rymer attacked the S.Y.M.A. leaders. 'Without productive co-operation, our trades union will be but a palliative or barbarous institution'.³

Despite his close identification with some of the most militant proletarian republicans, Rymer shared the Owenites' belief in a peaceful transformation to a co-operative economic system: encouraged by example and spurred on by the righteous indignation of the working class. 'Men are becoming fearful of their own safety and capital must sooner or later enter into negotiations for peace, and recognise justice'.⁴ The

¹ R.Harrison, op.cit., pp. 212-3.
² Miners' Advocate and Record, 5 July 1873.
³ Ibid.
miners in particular, unlike the farm labourers, were 'to a certain extent, already free, and in comfortable means of living'.¹ For them, circumstances 'may not demand such harsh measures to accomplish the work of emancipation'. So, he believed, was it to be in England as a whole. Englishmen are able to reform successfully without bloody revolt, and though a European conflict seems imminent, England may float safely through the storm if we act steadily and patriotically.²

Unlike De Morgan and Riley, Rymer saw the path to radical change through a reformed parliament and a morally purged Liberal government. The election of February 1874 was to be the 'coup d'etat of Gladstone, who, we believe, will yet act the glorious part of a Washington'.³ The securing of manhood suffrage was to mark the English revolution; and the standard bearers were to be the labour representatives, Burt and MacDonald.

In the 1880s, despite years of political muzzling in Yorkshire, Rymer became an active campaigner for the radical wing of the Liberal party in the Forest of Dean. In 1883 he brought Charles Bradlaugh to speak at the Dean miners' annual demonstration⁴ and, in 1885, was instrumental in the successful promotion of Thomas Blake, a local radical as parliamentary candidate for the new Dean parliamentary constituency.⁵ If Rymer's last public political appearances were on Tory platforms, it was more a result of the frustration of his earlier radicalism than of a genuine shift in his political convictions.

¹ Ibid, 2 May 1874.
² Ibid, 1 Nov. 1873.
³ Ibid, 7 Feb. 1874.
⁴ Dean Forest Mercury, 20 July 1883.
⁵ See, for example, ibid, 16, 23 and 30 Jan. and 24 April 1885.
Rymer in 1873 realised that he was fighting an uphill battle even to win over the mining rank and file to enthusiasm for franchise reform, let alone some of his more radical proposals. 'A little extra wage for labour has entirely obliterated any latent desire for political freedom, hence the coldness displayed by the miners here on the Suffrage question'. 1 Many of these men were, in Rymer's opinion, 'mere drunken idiots and hardly capable of understanding wrong from right in political matters'. 2 And so Rymer inevitably returned to the objectives of moral and educational reform which, he insisted, must precede any thorough change. This was a view he shared with many a more moderate middle class Radical. Even if he may not have foreseen it at the time, Rymer, by his insistence on these preconditions, was endorsing the formula for the Lib-Lab alliance, mooted at trade union level in the 1870s and formalised politically in the mid 1880s. Ironically, it was this alliance which frustrated the more unilaterally proletarian surge of the 1880s and 1890s, a movement which, if it had been given its head, might have fulfilled Rymer's more radical ambitions.

The logic of this, however, escaped Rymer's more moderate contemporaries and he was excluded from union office and (in Normansell's time, at least) from union platforms. Nevertheless, the fact that Rymer and his associates gained some acceptance - by employers and local electorates, as well as by the mining rank and file - was an indication of the relative liberality of the area. Rymer, Tibbott, Sheldon, Archer and Deakin were all newcomers to South Yorkshire, some having been rejected by employers and professional union leaders alike in their home counties. Yet each arrived,

1 Miners' Advocate and Record, 31 Oct. 1874.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 4 Dec. 1875.
independently it seems, in South Yorkshire where they found
a common mouthpiece for their views in the republican
movement, short-lived and obscure though it may have been.
They remained part of an isolated movement. The relatively
benign early 1870s were not appropriate years for preaching
revolution. Nor was the South Yorkshire coalfield the best
environment for the wholesale haranguing of communal morals.
But if Rymer's claims that the Miners' Advocate and Record
was read in large numbers in the district were correct, the
appeal of a radical interpretation of mining affairs may have
been great, all the more so in view of the fact that 'in two
important districts the miners were advised by their agents
to have nothing whatever to do with' the paper.1

The orthodoxy of South Yorkshire middle-class Liberalism
was radical enough for John Normansell and his successors at
the helm of the S.Y.M.A., even if they never embraced it with
much enthusiasm. A.J. Mundella narrowly managed to persuade
Normansell along with Dronfield and other local labour leaders
to move for political objects like the county franchise.2
But when it was suggested to the Executive Committee in 1875
that a 'People's newspaper' should be started, it was rejected
out of hand, there being no grounds, in the Committee's
opinion for discontent with the local newspapers and the
national labour press.3 As Vincent puts it, the attraction
of Liberalism to the middle and to working classes was
basically the same in this part of our period.4 'The great
moral idea of liberalism was manliness, the rejection of the
various forms of patronage, from soup and blankets upwards,
which had formerly been the normal part of the greatest number.5

1 Miners' Advocate and Record, 31 Oct. 1874.
3 S.Y.M.A. minutes, 20 May 1875.
4 J. Vincent, op. cit., p.113.
Rymer, Normansell and many of the Barnsley (and Sheffield) middle class Liberals shared these aims. Rymer's tone was that much more insistent because he personally had nothing to lose from rapid change, unlike the others.
TABLE 27

Voting patterns in the townships in the study area in 1865.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Tory</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Liberal vote as % of total vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ecclesfield</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derton</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombwell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barugh</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsborough</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk Bretton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexborough</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conisborough</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodworth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankersley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denaby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawthorpe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 739 508 43 57.3%

TABLE 28

Voting by occupation in Silkstone, Dodworth and Swinton (with Kilnhurst) in 1865.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Silkstone</th>
<th>Dodworth</th>
<th>Swinton (with Kilnhurst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Tory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentlemen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: West Riding Poll Book 1865; White's Directory of Sheffield; Census enumerators' returns, 1861, 1871.
CHAPTER TWENTY FOUR

Politics and the Miners 1885-1894.
The elections of 1885.

In 1885, the Boundary Commissioners divided the South-West Riding division into eight parliamentary constituencies. Three of these - Barnsley, Holmfirth and Rotherham - were wholly or substantially contained within the study area; and two more - Hallamshire and Doncaster - marginally encroached on the area in the south-west and the north-east, respectively. Both the local Liberal interests and the organised miners in the district were prepared for the change.

After contributing in a small way to extra-parliamentary pressure for reform in 1882 and early 1883, the Y.M.A., through its Executive Council, moved, in 1883, that the branches should form political associations along the lines of the Durham County Franchise Association, to prepare for the anticipated passing of the Third Reform Bill. The Y.M.A. Annual Report for that year instructed the committees of these associations to perform vigilantly many of the duties previously incumbent on the Liberal registration associations: seeking to 'acquire a perfect knowledge of the number of inhabited houses in their own villages' for example.

The union's determination to have more than just the token voice in electoral and legislative matters which, at the best of times, was all that was open to the organised miners in the district before, was further reflected in the formation of the Yorkshire Miners' Political Association in 1884. Amongst other things, its objects were 'to secure and further all legislation directly and indirectly bearing upon labour both socially and politically', to gain 'direct labour

---

1 See, for example, R.G. Neville, op. cit., (Ph.D. thesis), pp. 441-3.

2 Y.M.A. minutes, 27 Aug. 1883.

3 Y.M.A. records, Annual Report 1883.

4 Y.M.A. minutes, 14 Aug. 1884.
representation in the House of Commons', and to form a 'Labour Platform' in local and wider political affairs. An earlier suggestion from the Houghton Main branch that a levy should be raised to promote Ned Cowey as a labour candidate for one of the new divisions, over the heads of the local Liberal party machine, was discreetly dismissed.

The tactic of pre-empting the local Liberal caucus's agreement on a candidate by putting up one of the miners' choice was successfully employed in the Forest of Dean by Edward Rymer in 1885. There, it seems, the miners were faced with a Liberal coal and land owning alliance with no intervening group of Radicals. Rymer's move effectively staked out the miners' claim to this middle ground. In South Yorkshire, an active Radical group, albeit with few initial links with the miners, took a dominant role in the Liberal party machine from 1884 onwards, rendering any independent move by the miners superfluous in the contemporary political context. In May 1884, these Radical elements were at work within the Barnsley Liberal Association. At its annual meeting that month, it was resolved that H.W.Fitzwilliam had forfeited all confidence and that the 'Central Association of the Southern Division of the West Riding is constructed on the wrong principles'.

In 1885, as Neville demonstrates, Pickard concluded an electoral pact with the Liberals by which he was to be given a clear run in any one constituency chosen by the Y.M.P.A., in return for the Yorkshire miners' support in the others.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid, 21 April 1884.
3 Dean Forest Mercury, 16 and 23 Jan. 1885.
4 Barnsley Chronicle, 24 May 1884.
In January 1885, Pickard assured the two political parties of his moderate intentions: 'We contend that, seeing the influence the miners have in all eight divisions, their demand for direct representation in one only ought to be at once recognised by both political parties'.

It is true that, as Parrott admitted at the time, the Y.M.A.'s low membership in theory hampered its Political Association's ability to insist on political representation. But in three of the constituencies - Barnsley, Rotherham and Normanton - the miners' voting power was formidable (estimated by the Barnsley Chronicle to be about 7,000 in each). Pickard himself wrote that Normanton and Barnsley might be suitable for miners' representation, but soon dropped his claim to the latter. 'When we shall get into such a flourishing position as to send two or three representatives, then we shall select Barnsley.'

Meanwhile, the local Liberal Associations were manoeuvring to make the most of the division of the South-West Riding, relying, as they felt they could, on the miners' vote. Mexborough Liberals, for example, were fighting the Tories in the Doncaster area for the inclusion of their township in that division in the hope that even that most Conservative of the eight divisions might return a Liberal to Parliament. The Liberals' efforts were also concentrated on the Holmfirth division which was largely rural despite the presence of many miners and other industrial workers in Worsborough, Dodworth and Barugh.

1 Wakefield and Normanton Free Press, 24 Jan. 1885.
3 Ibid, 14 Feb. 1885.
5 Ibid, 7 Feb. 1885.
6 Ibid, 24 Jan, 1885.
By 1885, the Liberal link with the Fitzwilliam family had been decisively broken, but the outwardly more progressive Beaumont family retained some influence through William Beaumont who chaired the Barnsley division Liberal Election Committee. It would have been stronger if a close relative, H.F. Beaumont of Whitley Beaumont had remained a prospective candidate for Holmfirth, rather than having accepted the nomination for Colne Valley in May 1885.

Alongside Beaumont on the Barnsley division committee were Frith, Cowey and Pickard of the Y.M.A., J.Cass and G.J.Raley of the Radical group, and G.Lingard, C.Harvey and Dr. Sadler, all mainstream Liberals. The initial choice of candidates was between A.H.D.Acland and R.O.Milnes. Pickard anticipated the local election committee's decision and placed his support behind Milnes, claiming: 'it is not a question of persons with me, but it is a question as to whom the Party places confidence in'.

Support for Acland, however, centred around one or two leading members of the Radical Association and R.Holden who was later to be associated with the independent labour movement in the district. Any more conflict between these groups was pre-empted by Acland's acceptance of the nomination for the Rotherham division and Milnes' elevation to the peerage. The unanimous adoption by the Liberal 200 of Courtney Kenny, a Cambridge lecturer and barrister, and one time Bradlaughite, was seen as a victory for the Barnsley Radical Association, formed two months previously.

1 Ibid, 31 Jan. 1885.
2 Ibid, 30 May 1885.
3 Ibid, 4 April 1885.
4 Ibid, 2 May 1885.
5 Ibid, 23 May and 15 Aug. 1885.
6 Ibid, 5 Sept. 1885; Barnsley Illustrated Annual Business Review 1897, p.16. Kenny was related to the Stansfield family, wealthy coalowners from West Yorkshire.
7 Barnsley Chronicle, 15 Aug. 1885.
Some local observers refused to recognise any distinction between the Radicals and the contemporary Liberals in the Barnsley district - free as they were from patronage by most of the more traditional Whig families.¹ The Radical Association, before the emergence of the Trades and Labour Council, had a distinct working class bias. Several local miners' leaders, like Holdsworth of Wombwell and Berry of Monk Bretton, became associated with it, although the district officials were more reticent.² But there were also many personalities common to the mainstream Liberal organisations and to the Radical Association; John Hough, for example, was both Liberal registration agent and a spokesman for the Radicals. Although the sources of all their funds are not known, it appears that the Barnsley Liberals' experience provides an exception to Barker's tenet that labour representation was hampered by 'the dependence of local (Liberal) associations upon the munificence of a few rich subscribers'.³ The Radicals were even highly critical of H.F. Beaumont's record in Parliament⁴ and this may have influenced his decision to seek nomination elsewhere.

It is probably less true that the Barnsley constituency party was unfriendly to the idea of a working class candidate, as Barker contends was generally true,⁵ than that sufficient pressure from the Y.M.A. officials and other working class leaders in the district was never applied, through a combination of lack of confidence and of satisfaction with the efforts and image of the local party. Without the support of Earl Fitzwilliam, of course, the attractions of wealthy

¹ See letter from G. Alexander in Barnsley Chronicle 12 Sept. 1885.
² Ibid, 18 July 1885.
³ M. Barker, Gladstone and Radicalism (Harvester, Hassocks, 1975), p. 130.
⁴ Barnsley Chronicle, 18 July 1885.
⁵ M. Barker, op. cit., p. 131.
candidates were evident. This, Barker suggests, was usually more pertinent after the Home Rule split when subscriptions fell away. H.J. Wilson, the Liberal candidate in the Holmfirth division, met nine tenths of his electioneering expenses out of his own pocket in 1886, largely because of the fall in subscriptions.¹

The Holmfirth division presented the Liberals with far more of a clean political slate than did Barnsley. It consisted of a rather unwieldy mixture of mining communities (in the south-east), hill-farming villages and weaving communities (in the north and west), which, despite some old radical traditions and the growing mining population, had for many years been the undisputed domaine of a disproportionate number of landowning Tory magistrates. In this environment party politics rarely reared its head: 1885, for example, saw what was said to have been the first public political meeting within living memory in Silkstone.²

At the hub of the Liberal campaign to organise the division were a large number of men from Dodworth. Most of the township's representatives on the Central Election Committee were from the tradesmen/shopkeeper class, but among them were also the local schoolmaster and Radical, R. Penlington, the manager of Church Lane colliery, R. Hartley, and a local moderate miners' leader, Israel Stringer.³ Both Penlington and Hartley volunteered to drop out of the Committee in favour of Edward Thorne, a far from moderate Church Lane miner, who narrowly failed to get elected. The list, however, was adhered to. Thorne was elected as delegate for Cawthorne, while Silkstone, with an almost exclusively

¹ Ibid, p.130.
² Barnsley Chronicle, 5 Sept. 1885.
³ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 21 March 1885.
Tory middle class, returned at least two miners to the Committee. 1 H.J. Wilson, senior partner in the Sheffield Smelting Company, a former secretary of the Sheffield Liberal Association and an active temperance advocate, 2 was announced as the Liberal candidate in May 1885. He carried out an active campaign from a Radical standpoint on national and international issues. 3 Tory opposition was ineffectual in both divisions. The original nomination of Guy Senior, the Barnsley brewer, as Tory candidate for that division seemed likely to attract the active support of the not insignificant local Tory trade and manufacturing interest. 4 But Senior's withdrawal in October and Walter Spencer Stanhope's disinclination to stand were major setbacks. Eventually, Bruce Vernon-Wentworth, twenty-three year old son of the Stainborough landowner, not long out of Sandhurst, stepped into the breach. He conducted a low-profile campaign, emphasising his local roots and attempting to play down his family's traditional lack of involvement in the coal industry. 5 His task was a thankless one, despite active support from a few important local industrial leaders, like Joseph Mitchell, and from the spokesmen for the Wombwell and District Auxiliary Miners' Association.

In Holmfirth division, the Tory, Colonel Legge, had a similarly tough time whenever he entered the mining townships. Dodworth Liberals gave him a particularly hostile reception. 6

1 Ibid. They were identified beyond reasonable doubt in the 1871 Census and the Wages Books in the Clarke MSS.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 12 Dec. 1885.
3 At a meeting in Dodworth, he objected 'to the Army and Navy being used as the police and bum-bailiffs of the world': a reference to the war in Egypt (Barnsley Chronicle, 25 July 1885).
4 Ibid, 4 July 1885.
5 See, for example, ibid, 14 and 21 Nov. 1885.
6 Ibid, 28 Nov. 1885.
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Voting in the election was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Holmfirth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>6,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon-Wentworth</td>
<td>Legge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>3,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both divisions enjoyed a turnout of over 85%. 1

In Rotherham, Acland the Liberal beat Major Hoole, a local Tory landowner by an even bigger margin than the one in Barnsley. 2 Some of the most active campaigning went on in Hallamshire division where Charles Fitzwilliam, third son of the Earl and a Captain in the Horseguards, was adopted as the Tory (though tactfully described himself as an Independent). 3 His opponent was Frederick Mappin, former mayor of Sheffield and Master Cutler, and head of Turton and Sons steel and file manufacturers. 4 Despite the active support of the whole Fitzwilliam family, including the ladies who went down Elsecar and Hemingfield pits to canvass, 5 Fitzwilliam lost by a margin of over 2,000. Even Doncaster went to the Liberals. Outside our district in Normanton division, Pickard was opposed by Col. A.H. Charlesworth, a member of the influential coalowning family. Cowey claimed that Charlesworth had been chosen by the Tories on 'the grounds that workmen would vote the way the masters told them'. 6 The Tories never had agreed to allow a miners' representative to be returned unopposed. 7 The Normanton result was one of the closest in the new divisions. 8

1 Ibid, 5 and 12 Dec. 1885.
2 Rotherham Advertiser, 5 Dec. 1885. The result was 6,301 votes to 2,257.
3 Barnsley Chronicle, 31 Oct. and 7 Nov. 1885.
5 Ibid, 14 Nov. 1885.
6 Ibid, 14 March 1885.
8 5,608 votes to 3,706.
These Liberal victories, plus the crystallisation of the bond between the organised miners and the Radical wing of the local Liberal party, became the model for South Yorkshire politics for many years. The initial barriers to the promotion of more than one miners' candidate in the new divisions - barriers imposed as much by the miners' leaders as by outside factors - were not overcome until this status quo was threatened by new, radical forces.

The constituency organisations and later parliamentary elections.

Many of the Liberal institutions in the district strongly reflected the determination of the unofficial Radical/miner alliance to gain a voice. Liberal and Reform clubs were established in many of the out-townships. In Wombwell, for example, local miners like Holdsworth and Fazey, along with the Radical Congregationalist minister, Hadfield, played prominent roles on the Liberal Club committee.¹ Local Liberal Associations became lively political forums for all classes and in some cases, such as Swinton,² miners held executive positions. In Barnsley, a Radical and Liberal Club, formed early in 1888 (and said to number about 200 working men among its members³), merged in June of that year with the Barnsley Division Radical Association, giving the latter a broader and more permanent base.⁴ In 1892, the president of this, arguably the most influential institution in politics in the Barnsley district, was Dr. Halton, an Irishman and former Tory who became a Radical after the Home Rule split (and mayor of Barnsley from 1892 to 1894).⁵ The vice-presidents included John Frith of the Y.M.A. and Abraham Chappell of the Trades

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 27 Feb. 1886.
² Mexborough and Swinton Times, 20 May 1892. John Baker, the Mauvers branch official was secretary.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 7 April 1888.
⁴ Ibid, 30 June 1888.
⁵ Ibid, 11 March 1899 (obituary).
and Labour Council; the secretary was a Nonconformist minister and temperance advocate, Rev. J.R. Clarke. The mix was similar in 1894. Meanwhile, the continuing Barnsley Division Liberal Association came to look more and more like its Radical partner. In 1894, its executive included (out of eighteen people) Pickard, Frith and Parrott; Holden and Taylor who had strong links with the Trades and Labour Council; two Nonconformist ministers in Hadfield and Young; and four or five other active Radicals including Halton, Haigh and Birtles (the first president of the Radical Association).

In Barnsley and the district as a whole, it is true to say that, as was the case almost everywhere else, the miners and other working class groups had by no means 'captured the caucus or outgeneralled it'. In the out-townships especially, the appearance of the odd local miners' leader among the mass of Liberal tradesmen, professionals and the diminishing group of Liberal manufacturers (as was Dixon's experience in Mexborough, for example) in active party politics, could not be regarded as a working class triumph. Yet it would be wrong not to see most miners' leaders as figures who shared an identity of interest with many members of these other groups. This identity had been born and nurtured in non-political arenas like the chapels and temperance associations and was formalised during the political manoeuvrings of 1884-6.

Despite the heavy odds against them, it was inevitable that the Tories would step up their political activity from the low level of the early 1880s, especially after the recruitment of many important Liberal Unionists in 1885 and 1886. The

1 Ibid, 30 Jan. 1892.
3 Ibid, 17 March 1894.
4 M. Barker, op.cit., p.133.
5 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 6 Jan. 1893.
Barnsley Division Conservative Association included, among its members, several Barnsley Town Councillors; and had, as its president in 1886, R.C. Wilmot, the land agent for the Martin family of Worsborough. The advent of Bruce Vernon-Wentworth into local politics endowed it, at first, with new confidence and aggressiveness. Tory clubs were opened - in Stainborough in 1887 and Wombwell in 1888, both paid for by Vernon-Wentworth - often providing the focus for a renewed drive for working class recruits (as in Dodworth). The two Primrose League Habitations in the district - with 1,076 members in 1886 (including 726 females) - were successful both in linking the efforts of active Tories across the district and cementing Tory feeling in certain communities where the League was particularly in evidence. A district Primrose League gathering at Mrs. Clarke's Noblethorpe Hall in 1890 attracted about 500 people; while a local meeting in Silkstone in 1893 was attended by the two major employers in the township, most of the senior colliery personnel and other members of the local middle class.

The anti-Liberal counter-attack, of course, began in 1886. Not only did the Fitzwilliams, the Beaumonts and other landed Liberals like the absentee Foljambe's make the transition to the Tories via the Unionist road, but so too did several of the wealthiest manufacturing and professional Liberals like A.M. Chambers of Chapeltown, F.L. Harrop of Swinton, and

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 3 April 1886.
2 Ibid, 8 Jan. 1887 and 7 Jan. 1888.
4 Ibid, 26 June 1886.
5 Ibid, 9 Aug. 1890.
6 Ibid, 29 April 1893.
Sadler, Pigott, Harvey and Peckett of Bursley (the last three of them, with the Tory Thomas Taylor, being the remaining major linen manufacturers living in the town). This development confined the active Liberal base still further to the working and lower middle classes where Radical sentiments were strongest.

In 1886, the South Yorkshire party machines campaigned vigorously on the Home Rule issue. The result was no significantly reduced majority except in Doncaster where W.S. Shirley (the Liberal) narrowly fought off a challenge from H.W. Fitzwilliam who was nominated as a Liberal Unionist (and also in Normanton division where Pickard's majority was eaten into by Colonel Charlesworth). Fitzwilliam seems to have been most unpopular in Mexborough where he was forced to enter a hall, where he was scheduled to speak, through a back door because of an intimidating crowd of miners who eventually forced their way into the hall and disrupted the meeting. Kenny and Wilson still polled over 85% above the votes for their opponents, Vernon-Wentworth and Walter Armitage (formerly a Tory agent in the district). In Rotherham, Acland beat F.J.S. Foljambe (also standing as a Liberal Unionist) by a margin of over 3,000.

In 1888, H.W. Fitzwilliam snatched Doncaster from the Liberals in a by-election registering a majority of 211;

1 Ibid, 25 June and 3 Dec. 1887.
2 Rotherham Advertiser, 17 July 1886. Shirley polled 5,050 votes to Fitzwilliam's 4,792.
3 Wakefield Free Press and West Riding Advertiser, 10 July 1886. Pickard polled 4,771 to Charlesworth's 3,724.
4 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 9 July 1886.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 10 and 17 July 1886.
6 Mexborough and Swinton Times, 2 March 1888.
while in the same year, the Normanton Tories selected a new candidate in anticipation of a by-election following speculation about Pickard's bankruptcy in the Pepper libel suit.¹ His damages were paid, however, mostly from a defence fund organised chiefly by H.J. Wilson, his local parliamentary colleague;² and the political storm abated.

The Tories in the Barnsley area were clearly incensed at the Liberals' ability to capture the miners' votes. As the 1890s progressed, moreover, the growing interest in mining in the Doncaster area held obvious portents for the fluctuating political complexion of that division. In 1890, Bruce Vernon-Wentworth provoked a controversy when he openly accused Pickard of manipulating the mining vote and misusing miners' union subscriptions. In the Barnsley Chronicle, he claimed that Pickard had taken 'the money of Conservative miners to promote Radicalism';³ while, at a Conservative Association meeting at Barugh, he claimed that, as able as the miners' leaders might be, 'they assumed to rule to a certain extent over their members, and told them what to do'.⁴ He also claimed that seven pence of every shilling subscribed by the Y.M.A.'s members was spent on salaries - a claim denied by Parrott.⁵ The Barnsley Chronicle considered that Wentworth's main grievance was that he was never invited to attend miners' meetings and that Lord Compton had been invited to attend a Y.M.A. Council meeting before he had even been adopted by the Liberal division committee as parliamentary candidate on Kenny's retirement.⁶ The result of Wentworth's

¹ Barnsley Chronicle, 17 March 1888.
² Ibid.
⁴ Ibid, 18 Jan. 1890.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ See Barnsley Chronicle, 8 Feb. 1890 and 16 Feb. 1889.
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attacks was, as the Chronicle put it, a 'fiasco';¹ and he publicly retracted some of his criticisms of Pickard.²

Unlike the Lancashire coalfield in 1893, South Yorkshire did not provide the fuel for any breakaway Tory group of miners who might have become frustrated with their leaders' involvement in Liberal political institutions.³ Bruce Vernon-Wentworth was, no doubt, hoping to attract support from this direction.

Compton, a diplomat and son of the Marquis of Northampton (and formerly M.P. for Stratford),⁴ was a Radical who campaigned vigorously on temperance issues.⁵ In 1892, an opponent was eventually found for him in the form of F.J.S.Foljambe, a Unionist. Compton won with a majority proportionate to those of Kenny in 1885 and 1886.⁶ Acland and Pickard were returned with increased majorities and Doncaster was marginally regained for the Liberals despite a lively campaign by H.W.Fitzwilliam.⁷ Mappin was returned unopposed for Hallamshire, as he had been in 1886.⁸ The only setback for the Liberals was a decreased majority for H.J.Wilson in Holmfirth over the Tory, Harold Thomas, a Sheffield barrister.⁹ This development, however, was attributable more to the troubles that had beset Wilson in his clash with the miners over his opinions on the Eight Hour Day, than to any increase in support for the Tories.

¹ Ibid, 8 Feb. 1890.
² Ibid, 1 Feb. 1890.
³ R.Challinor, The Lancashire and Cheshire Miners, p.201.
⁵ See, for example, Barnsley Chronicle, 11 June 1892.
⁶ Ibid, 23 July 1892.
⁷ Ibid, 16 July 1892.
⁸ Ibid, 16 July 1892 and 10 July 1886.
⁹ Wilson polled 5,640 to Thomas's 3,317.
In 1890, the Y.M.A. was full of confidence in its ability to use the alliance with the Liberals to gain local M.P.s' support for the Eight Hour Day. The 1889 Y.M.A. Annual Report suggested that the miners' pledge to support the Liberals might only be honoured if the latter would 'do our work' in Parliament. In October 1890, it was reported that Mappin had reversed his initial opposition to legislation on this issue and fallen into line with other South Yorkshire Liberal M.P.s. All except H.J. Wilson.

Initially pledged to support the Eight Hour Day, Wilson began to make public his reservations in 1890 when the M.F.G.B. swung into action on this issue that was to dominate all others in the industry for the following two years. The 1892 Bill won considerable support from Liberal industrialists (though not from the coalowners) and provided evidence that by 1892, as Barker puts it, 'the first stage in the conversion of Gladstonians to the new Liberalism had successfully been accomplished'. Wilson, however, though radically inclined, decided to follow his own convictions on this issue.

In October 1890, the Church Lane and Strafford Main miners, the core of working class Liberal support in the Holmfirth division along with the Barrow miners, passed a resolution at a mass meeting which sought to instruct their fellows not to vote for any candidate not pledged to support the Eight Hour Day Bill. This was endorsed at a wider divisional mass meeting in November. An amendment to select another candidate
in the place of Wilson, however, was withdrawn amid warnings from Hough of the Barnsley Radical Association not to split the Liberal vote. A month later, at a meeting of the Holmfirth Division Liberal Association council, a motion was put by James Murray of Worsborough, 'That this Council is of the opinion that the restriction by statute of the hours of labour in mines to eight hours per day is just and expedient', effectively mandating the council to seek a parliamentary candidate pledged to support that cause. An initial division on the motion produced a 59-57 split against, while a later formal division, committing the seventeen who didn't vote, produced a majority of 21 against it. The chief grounds for rejecting the motion were that more information was needed on the issue before the council could commit itself to such a partisan cause.

The Eight Hour Day had not been a contentious issue on a mass scale in South Yorkshire since 1858 when it had effectively become part of custom and practice in the district, although longer hours had been creeping in at some collieries since the late 1870s. It was not altogether surprising that non-mining members of the Liberal Associations were unsure and perhaps even suspicious of why the Y.M.A. and its local spokesmen should be so insistent on support for this piece of legislation. The immediate outcome of the failure of the Holmfirth council resolution was the departure of the 55 miner-members of that body, who pledged themselves, moreover, not to attend any more meetings. There was an ironic twist to this story in that eight miner-delegates from Dodworth and a few from Worsborough had not attended the contentious meeting at all, anticipating a defeat for the Eight Hour motion. If these men had been more aware of their own numerical strength in the Holmfirth Liberal council, they might have attended

1 Ibid, 13 Dec. 1890.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
and swung the voting, on the initial division at least, the other way. This would, indeed, have been a victory for miners' grass-roots initiative.

Throughout 1891, the local miners, led by James Murray, Edward Thorne and Levi Dyson, were publicly critical of Wilson, using their own, rather than the formal Liberal Association platforms. Thorne himself announced, in October 1891, his readiness to stand against Wilson at the parliamentary election. Even Pickard voiced strong criticism of the local Liberal party's uncritical support for Wilson. At a Barnsley meeting, he said: 'If the Liberals meant to absorb the miners, they must hold out the right hand of fellowship'.

Realising their increasing isolation, however, the miner-activists of Holmfirth division eventually backed down. In April 1892, after the defeat of the Bill's second reading, they met at Dodworth and agreed to send delegates to the Liberal Association council to press for a majority support for a future Eight Hour Day Bill, in the hope that Wilson would feel obliged to vote for it. The question of unseating him was never raised. In response, Wilson agreed to compromise. At the annual meeting of the Holmfirth council, he agreed to support another Bill in principle, while being given a 'free judgment as to the conditions'. The miners on the council agreed to back his candidature on these terms, although the controversy undoubtedly lost him some electoral support in 1892.

1 Ibid, 24 Oct. 1891.
2 Ibid, 2 Jan. 1892.
3 Ibid, 9 April 1892.
4 Ibid, 7 May 1892.
This affair demonstrated that, although miners' spokesmen were determined that their industry's most important issues should be given a voice through their new political involvement, not even the radical rank and file leaders amongst them were prepared to break irrevocably with their Liberal allies. Unlike the Nottinghamshire miners who were prepared to back a Unionist against the Liberal in Nottingham West division in 1892 because of the latter's opposition to the Eight Hour Day Bill, the Yorkshire miners officially committed themselves to support for the Liberal candidates. As expected, Wilson voted against the Eight Hour Day in 1894, yet retained the backing of the Holmfirth Liberal Association council. This time, opposition came from outside. A meeting at Penistone of supporters of independent labour (Murray and Dyson amongst them) passed resolutions hostile to Wilson and proposed that Ned Cower be asked to contest the next election. This move came to nothing; and although another labour candidate - an I.L.P. member from Halifax - was selected, his candidature was withdrawn and Wilson won by a majority of about 1,500 over his Tory opponent. The Tory expected to pick up miners' votes as a result of the controversy, and actually criticised Pickard for not issuing a manifesto on his behalf. But, as the Chronicle put it: 'The figures show that the miners for the most part remained true to their Radicalism'.

1 A.R. Griffin, op. cit., p. 197.
3 Ibid, 6 and 20 July 1895.
5 Ibid. In 1900, his majority was cut by half on a contest against Major Stuart-Wortley (ibid., 13 Oct. 1900).
Independent labour politics.

The Wilson affair produced a spark of opposition to the Lib-Lab alliance, but an opposition that was largely confined to two or three particularly militant pits, led by the most militant of effective local activists and which eventually veered away from a confrontation at the eleventh hour.

As we have seen (in Chapter Twenty), a quasi-independent labour group did emerge out of the Barnsley Trades Council in 1891 when it offered a direct challenge to the Liberals in the Barnsley Council election. The Barnsley Trades and Labour Council provisional committee, set up on the 7th of March, 1891, was said to be 'a humanitarian and philanthropic institution' and strictly non-political.\(^1\) In these early exploratory days, it included a few working class (in their early working lives at least) members of the Radical Association, like Haigh and Wheelhouse; and also John Frith representing the Y.M.A. The confrontation in the south-east ward in the autumn, however, soon got rid of these fellow travellers. The Trades Council made many enemies through their independent move. James Dunn, the president of the Barnsley National Labour Federation and secretary of the local coachmakers' union, accused the Trades Council leaders of fighting for sheer spite because the large working class representation on the ward committees had been unsuccessful in getting a labour candidate nominated as a Liberal.\(^3\) Radicals like Halton and Hough talked of treachery, while endorsing their Association's belief in labour candidates under the Liberal banner. Pattison - formerly a trustee of the Radical and Liberal Club but in 1891, the president of the Trades Council - and Sherratt, the secretary of the latter,

\(^1\) Church Lane, Barrow and possibly Strafford Main.

\(^2\) Ibid, 7 March 1891.

\(^3\) Ibid, 10 Oct. 1891.
emphasised their independent stand by resigning, along with several others, from the Barnsley Liberal Association committee.\(^1\) They accused Hough, a member of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of being an enemy of Trade Union's.\(^2\)

The ensuing Town Council election saw the end of recriminations and in January 1892, the *Barnsley Chronicle* stepped in as peacemaker. An editorial declared that:

'with slight modifications we are prepared to adopt Mr. Tom Mann's programme\(^3\) in its entirety, provided the experience of the past ten or a dozen years is not ignored'.\(^4\) Labour advocates should 'reflect upon who have been their natural allies in the past'.\(^5\) The *Chronicle* continued to hanker after limitations on the intervention of national party politics in local institutions, even after the severance of the Lingard family connection with the paper. In 1887, an editorial warned against an over-development of party allegiances, claiming that Barnsley was 'in danger of being submerged under the rapidly rising tide of political benevolence'.\(^6\) Independent labour did not, therefore, conjure up such horrors before the *Chronicle*'s (and perhaps many others') eyes as it did before those of the more involved local Liberal activists.

---

1 Ibid, 17 Oct. 1891.


5 Ibid.

6 Ibid, 12 Feb. 1887.
Unlike the republicans of the 1870s, the socialist spectre in South Yorkshire in the first half of the 1890s was an extremely unobtrusive one. In Sheffield, it is true, men like A.J.Mundella and H.J.Wilson confided their fears about the independent labour movement as early as 1885. The former wrote to the latter: 'Radical Outsiders . . . will split us up and fall in the end themselves. Where will they find two worthy Labour candidates?' Edward Rymer warned the working class readers of the Barnsley Chronicle against 'plunging into a Socialistic anarchy with humanity to gratify the morbid lust for revenge'. He pleaded 'England, beware that Socialism does not grow in thy midst'. In the same year, Pickard warned his members against the 'Socialists' who were at work in Northumberland, making life difficult for his colleague Thomas Burt. Sheffield managed to form a Labour Association in 1885 and a Socialist Club in 1887. But no such activity could be traced in the study area, other than the slender arms of the independent labour movement based on the Barnsley, Rotherham and Mexborough and District Trades Councils.

The Barnsley Trades Council in 1892 gave its full backing to the campaign to elect Lord Compton. It was also beginning to attract a number of local miners' spokesmen, not all of them opposed to the Lib-Lab alliance. In 1892, Keir Hardie was invited to a demonstration organised by the Trades Council and addressed large numbers of miners from Barrow, Oaks and Rylands Main collieries in particular. A year later, during

1 W.S.Fowler, A Study in Radicalism and Dissent (Epworth Press, 1961), p.75.
2 Barnsley Chronicle, 5 March 1887.
3 Ibid, 1 Oct. 1887.
4 S.Pollard, op.cit., p.121.
5 Barnsley Chronicle, 2 and 9 July 1892.
6 Ibid, 24 Sept. 1892.
the lockout, John Frith spoke at another Trades Council demonstration. The core of active support from the miners, however, remained in the forms of Richard Holden and Edward Thorne (of Church Lane), James Murray and Levi Dyson (of Barrow) and Thomas Taylor (of Church Lane and Rylards Main) who became increasingly involved in the movement during the campaign against H.J. Wilson. In 1891/2, Holden and Dyson had been involved, along with Penlington (the Radical Dodworth schoolmaster) and one or two other activists from the Holmfirth division, in an attempt to found 'a real working men's paper, devoted to Radicalism and Labour' in the shape of the Barnsley Standard. It ran for about a year, publishing its last issue on the 12th of November 1892.

The isolation of this group was confirmed in 1894 when the miners were criticised at the Trades Council Annual General Meeting for having been lax in their affiliations, despite the support the Council had given them in the previous year's lockout. Pattison claimed: 'They had offered every inducement to the miners to join the Council, as miners did in other districts . . . But still the miners held aloof'. Abraham Chappell suggested at the meeting that it was because Pickard had been against the Trades Council from the start. The executive in 1894 consisted of representatives of engineers, joiners, bricklayers, masons, glassblowers, bobbin turners, typographers, power loom turners, corn millers, bleachers, carters, insurance agents and one unidentified trade.

1 Ibid, 12 Aug. 1893.

2 See Barnsley Chronicle, 8 April and 27 May 1893.


4 Barnsley Chronicle, 26 May 1894.
In 1893, the Mexborough and District Federated Trades Council was in existence,\(^1\) with active support from local miners' leaders. Its president in that year was John Baker (the chairman of one of the Manvers Main union lodges), and on the committee were, amongst others, John Dixon (of Denaby) and William Phillips and William Annables (both of Thrybergh Hall).\(^2\) Also strongly represented were the glassbottlemakers; the secretary of the Council was A. Greenwood, the local union secretary.\(^3\) Baker and others had close links with the Rotherham and District Trades Council,\(^4\) but political activity in these two bodies appears to have been negligible at this stage.

Unlike in Lancashire,\(^5\) the Independent Labour Party and the Social Democratic Federation in South Yorkshire made no great strides in and immediately after the 1893 lockout, although they did contribute to fund-raising activity in the coalfield at the time.\(^6\) The I.L.P. claimed in 1894, however, that the movement was spreading among Yorkshire miners as a 'result of what the travelling miners saw in the textile districts during the strike'.\(^7\) One local miner, Willie Wright, did claim to have been converted to 'Socialism' by his experience in the lockout, and in 1897, delivered a series of lectures on the nationalisation of the mines in the

\(^1\) Though Laybourn (op. cit., facing p. 162) claims it was not founded until 1896.

\(^2\) Mexborough and Swinton Times, 21 April 1893.

\(^3\) This may have been a relative of Alfred Greenwood, secretary of the Glass Bottle Makers United Protection Society in Yorkshire from the 1870s (see above, pp. 451-2), but was unlikely to have been the same man.

\(^4\) Sec, for example, Mexborough and Swinton Times, 17 Nov. 1893.


\(^6\) J. Lawson, op. cit., p. 74.

\(^7\) Labour Leader, 9 June 1894.
Mexborough and Swinton Times in response to requests from the local I.L.P. branch that had recently been set up.¹

In June 1894, Ben Tillett opened an Independent Labour Club in Barnsley, whose first president was James Murray.² This development, no doubt, explains the lack of involvement by Murray and his associates in the Trades Council that year. Their attention was, moreover, soon drawn to the south — to Attercliffe, an industrial suburb on the eastern edge of Sheffield — where a parliamentary by-election was to be fought between a Liberal, Alderman Longley (a local timber merchant) and an I.L.P. candidate, Frank Smith. As soon as the seat was made vacant, the Attercliffe branch of the Labour Electoral Association claimed it as its own and the Sheffield Federated Trades Council announced that it was ready to put up its president, Charles Hobson, as a labour candidate.³ When the Liberal Association went over their heads and nominated their official candidate, the Trades Council backed down, despite the presence of an I.L.P. member, Thomas Shaw, as its vice-president. The I.L.P., however, took up the fight and the Trades Council agreed to endorse its action, while agreeing to take no active part in the contest.⁴

After ignoring a plea from Shaw to lend a helping hand, Pickard unequivocally came out in support of Longley. He sent a telegram to Joseph Oxley, a member of the Liberal Committee in Sheffield, which read:

As one who first suggested Mr. Hobson as a candidate for Attercliffe, now that he has resigned, although I had hoped differently, my advice is Vote Straight for Longley, who is pledged to the Miners' 8 Hours Bill, and who also did so well for our Sheffield Miners during the stoppage of 1893. Please make this public.⁵

¹ See, for example, Mexborough and Swinton Times, 29 Jan. 1897.
² Labour Leader, 9 June 1894; Barnsley Chronicle, 9 June 1894.
³ Labour Leader, 30 June 1894.
⁴ Ibid, 30 June and 7 July 1894.
⁵ Ibid, 14 July 1894.
This move brought a vote of confidence from the Barnsley Radical and Liberal Club, but was attacked by Tillett, campaigning in Sheffield. Murray and Taylor lent their full support to the Sheffield I.L.P., but the Barnsley Trades Council remained silent right through the campaign which resulted in a victory for the Liberal. These divisions in the local labour movement were compounded in 1897 during a by-election in Barnsley, again fought between a Liberal industrialist (this time a coalowner who would not even commit himself to support the Eight Hour Day principle) and an I.L.P. candidate (a national gasworkers' union leader). Curran, the I.L.P. candidate, was initially adopted by a conference of workers called by the Barnsley Trades Council; but there were some defections among the Council itself, including Abraham Chappell and Uttley (the vice-president). Murray, Holden and other active members of the Barnsley Labour Club came out in support of Walton, the Liberal, and joined local miners' leaders all over the district in campaigning for him. Only James Walsh (the checkweighman at South Kirby colliery, on the borders with West Yorkshire), James Taylor (of Houghton Main) and Thomas Taylor (of Rylands Main), amongst the prominent miners' spokesmen in and around the district, gave their support to Curran, who was forced to operate from an outlying township, Hemsworth, because of the hostility to his campaign in Barnsley and the central townships. The Wombwell miners pelted Curran and John Burns with more than just words at a meeting during the campaign.

1 Barnsley Chronicle, 28 July 1894.
2 Ibid, 7 July 1894.
3 Ibid, 25 Sept. 1897; J. Lawson, op. cit., p. 73.
In 1905, the Barnsley Trades Council decided to support the Liberal, Walton against a prospective I.L.P. challenge, and as a result, he was elected unopposed in 1906. Not until 1912, at a by-election in Holmfirth division, did the Y.M.A. finally break with Lib-Labism and back an independent candidate (William Lunn, an I.L.P. member and miners' branch official from West Yorkshire); this despite a glaring under-representation of miners in South Yorkshire constituencies.

These occurrences raise two questions which this thesis has attempted to answer: why the miners’ union leadership were so adamant in their support for the Liberals after the mid 1870s and why the rank and file rarely questioned this allegiance. The Conclusion will summarise and clarify the arguments put forward as explanations for these and related questions.

---

1 Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922, entries for 1905 and 1906.


CONCLUSION
A large number of miners in the second half of the nineteenth century - in our area and others - had no lasting participatory contact with the improving institutions of the society at large except through token membership of a union, a friendly or co-operative retail society. The extent to which miners in South Yorkshire differed in this respect from other working class groups in the area is not entirely clear; although in the case of the glassbottle makers, handloom weavers, ironworkers (taken as a whole) and potters, the difference was almost certainly not significant for the purpose of this thesis. What is clear is that there was considerable social distance between the temperate, respectable, aspiring, institutionally-involved, chapel-going mining minority (who tended to be the leaders and spokesmen both of the status quo and of the articulate opposition up to the late 1880s and, in most cases, beyond) and the poorly educated and uninstitutionalised majority. This distance was as great as in most other working class occupational groups, even though this mining 'aristocracy' was not necessarily based on criteria of skill. Miners in the study area reached the limits of institutional involvement open to the working class on a representational and individual bases. However, the contrast between this minority and the rest of the miners was found along a continuum and should not be seen as a dichotomy. What is more, the extent of polarisation on this continuum was almost certainly not so great as was found in other coalfields, not because large numbers of miners achieved positions of responsibility in the institutions of the wider community,

Edward Rymer, for example, bore many of the characteristics of the mining 'aristocrat'; yet he more often than not worked as a trammer or daywage labourer. There were to be found amongst this minority, however, a disproportionate number of checkweighmen and deputies who usually had special skills or were literate and numerate to an advanced degree.
but because many of those who did (miners, other workers and members of the middle class), put more effort into attracting the allegiance of the miners as a whole than their peers did elsewhere. The mobile, 'cosmopolitan' and independent-minded South Yorkshire mining workforce, in its search for a collective identity, responded favourably.

The majority of miners and of members of other major working class groups besides, were neither the amoral, uncivilised roughs, in whose image a judge cast the miners of South Yorkshire in 1887; \(^1\) nor were they 'distinguished by sobriety and industry' to the extent that the 'Roving Correspondent' of the *Manchester Guardian* would have his readers believe in 1873. \(^2\) Most lay in between, pulled in both directions perhaps, but maintaining a relatively consistent, if elusive (for the historian) identity. Foster claims to have identified 'two mutually exclusive groupings' in the working class in Oldham: the mass subculture and a smaller, temperance-oriented working class leadership, with 'no apparent connection between the two'. \(^3\) If, however, this latter group had not had constant feedback from its mass base, what function could it have advertised for itself and how could it have maintained sufficient authority and credibility to continue? Even though the majority avoided membership of the formal institutions, it did receive and respond to some of the values that overflowed from them. These were the dominant middle class values of thrift, (albeit collectivised through union and friendly society) and work; and in the absence of any viable alternative ideology, they permeated even the furthest reaches of the

---

\(^1\) *Barnsley Chronicle*, 14 May 1887.

\(^2\) *Manchester Guardian*, 14 May 1873.

\(^3\) J. Foster, *op.cit.*, p.223.
continuum. Members of the labour aristocracy, including a number of miners, consolidated their position as community spokesmen in the 1870s, relying little on the trade unions as institutions for the furtherance of their temperance, co-operative or educational activities. When the miners' union crumbled in the late 1870s, these men did not lose their credibility, and remained in a position to make the most of the major institutional changes that began with the passing of the Third Reform Bill in 1884.

Of course there were important differences in the response of the mass mining workforce to these changes, from community to community. The strike proneness of the miners of Dodworth, Denaby, Monk Bretton, Hoyland Silkstone and Barrow has been identified and discussed in the context both of the industrial environment (especially the nature and policy of the colliery owners) and of the community itself (especially the antiquity of the large scale mining operations and the stability of the mining population). Some final points can be made which endorse the findings that, although the miners in some of the more urbanised townships - like Wombwell and Swinton - reacted with militancy to distant and insensitive management, they formed a large part of communities which displayed an institutionally-based political moderation, an absence of paternalistic controls and a resident middle class that was often tolerant and even welcoming of increased working class participation. Kaijage dates the beginning of this type of social milieu in Barnsley from the start of our period: 'Thus from the 1850s, Barnsley saw the end of the oligarchic parochial institutions, and more and more working men came to play important roles in local affairs'. This change took effect in the out-townships during the early 1870s.

Richard Mitchell, the first secretary of the S.Y.M.A., was happy to publicise in 1863 what he believed was the noteworthy experience of the Charlesworths' miners in Rawmarsh and Swinton. 'So soon as these men leave the pitbank, the authority of capital ceases. They feel and enjoy the blessings of liberty, and all this produces a mutual and desired respect between employer and employed'.¹ Warren Vale, the pit in which they worked, had been strongly unionised since the first testing confrontation in 1858. The union was recognised and, as John Silkstone, delegate to the M.N.A. conference in 1864, put it:

> the workmen, from previous experience, have confidence in the masters that advantage will not be taken of any trifling changes in the market ... The masters from past experience have confidence in the men, and are therefore enabled to take the large contracts ... Of all the large collieries in Yorkshire, none have a better trade than the strictly union colliery in Rawmarsh.²

This ordering of affairs was also popular with the non-mining middle class. It meant that 'No instance of any person becoming troublesome to any parish for relief ... has occurred since the commencement of the society' at Rawmarsh.³ Here was the model later to be pursued by John Normansell; while a few miles away, at Oaks, bitter disputes were frequently poisoning the air. Swinton and Rawmarsh, as well as benefiting from the Charlesworths' realism, also had strong Radical presences in their major institutions which, from 1894, were to share power on the urban district councils with the working class.

Wombwell, although a much newer and less occupationally heterogeneous community than Swinton, had similar experiences,

¹ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, 18 July 1863.
² Ibid, 18 June 1864.
³ Ibid, 18 July 1863.
especially from the early 1870s. Rymer claimed, in 1873, that Wombwell

is the very soul of the South Yorkshire Union. The miners here, as a rule, are of the very best description, and Wombwell can boast of its good, sober and steady workmen - men who are full of life and take an interest in the affairs of the country. Here a School Board is in operation, and the people seem bent on establishing a purer civilisation of singing, music and a close attention to all the principles which constitute the power and stability of a real union. ¹

Rymer began work at Wombwell Main in 1878 and later described it as 'the finest pit in England - where I held a respectable position'. Its working environment seems to have satisfied his craving for a type of artisan's independence. ² This image of the democratic, hard-working, temperate, self-improving community was bolstered by the Radical Nonconformist minister Hadfield in 1884:

How did they stand in Wombwell? How many people of wealth and culture lived in that place able to give themselves to philanthropic effort for the benefit of the working classes? They could count them on their finger ends. Let them look at the other side of the picture. They had a Co-operative Society. Who are the people who supported and managed it, and carried it on? The miners. They had a Penny Bank. Whose savings went into it? The miners' savings. There were Building Societies supported by the miners. ³

By way of contrast, we can use Rymer's description of an, in many ways, less advanced part of the district: 'Dodworth, Silkstone, Gawber, Higham, Barugh and Barugh Green, are all without educational stores, while the miners here, as a rule, are sunk in ignorance, drunkenness and superstition'. ⁴

¹ Miners' Advocate and Record, 7 June 1873.
² Dean Forest Mercury, 4 April 1884.
³ Barnsley Chronicle, 16 Feb. 1884.
⁴ Miners' Advocate and Record, 17 May 1873.
These early industrial communities, most of them still semi-rural, more demographically stable, dominated by paternalistic employers and landowners, devoid of a large tradesman class and other Radical influences, did, on the whole, respond rather differently (though Dodworth must be said to have occupied the middle ground). Where the paternalism of these and other similar communities was thorough and reasonably sensitive to the real needs of the workers and their families, the latter tended to respond in kind, producing peaceful, stable communities as unenthusiastic about the spread of urban-type institutions as they were about industrial action. The Fitzwilliam miners, the miners of Silkstone and, generally, those employed by Newton, Chambers and Co., fit this description. Dodworth, on the other hand, was a transitional community, still dominated by wealthy Tories, but, perhaps through its proximity to Barnsley, possessed of a more mobile and independent-minded population. The miners of Stafford Main became enthusiastic unionists, although they made little impression on the limited number of community institutions in Dodworth. The unlucky Church Lane miners responded rebelliously to the treatment that was meted out to them by a disorganised and insensitive employer, finding few compensations in the community in which most of them lived.

The miners in more culturally or geographically peripheral communities like Silkstone and Denaby Main (and one or two of the new pit villages to the north east of the district, like Hemsworth and South Kirby), might tentatively be considered as examples of isolated masses, unable to dissipate their grievances and the spectre of their industrial opponents in the community at large.\(^1\) Strikes at Denaby, as we have seen, were long and bitter. There were as many at pits like Strafford and Edmunds Main, but the whole tone of these

\(^1\) See C. Kerr and A. Siegel, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-2.
conflicts was different. The miners in the heart of the S.Y.M.A. district rarely felt they were struggling in isolation and a certain amount of their confidence must have been fed back to the employers (except the hard-core absentees). Distance from the union heartland around Barnsley seems to a certain extent to have provoked from the miners either pacificity or aggression depending on other inputs, especially those manipulated by the employers. In most cases it was the employers' exploitation of this relative isolation, rather than the geographical isolation itself, which created the conditions for the peculiar responses. Isolation was not the norm in the study area. Indeed, it is doubtful that one could identify a truly isolated community on the Kerr and Siegel model in the study area proper. Nor does it seem that many of the miners in our period developed an occupational subculture cohesive enough to generate, as Hyman puts it, 'sufficient consciousness of class conflict so that dominant social values were neutralised'.¹ The union spokesmen and the militant opposition encouraged occupational consciousness among the miners, yet neither really rejected the dominant social values. The marriage of the two spheres of consciousness was being celebrated in 1873 when Rymer remarked:

Already we have seen the press, the pulpit, the platform, the school board, the council room, the store room graced and improved by the presence of the miner there. There is noble management, and ought to stimulate us ... on in the work of self-redemption.²

The urban institutions had been provided and were still dominated by the middle class, but that was no reason to boycott them.

Some members of the middle class establishment may have welcomed the miners onto the school boards and into the negotiating rooms, seeing them as their new henchmen in the

¹ R.Hyman, Strikes, (Fontana, 1972), p.128.
² Miners' Advocate and Record, 5 April 1874.
labour community. But the miners' spokesmen did not, in
general, curry favour with the middle class for its own sake,
even if the professional leadership divorced themselves, even
from the next rank of leadership, by nature of their mobility
and outside associations. At the workplace, the miners'
leader no longer mouthed the circumspect understatements of
the middle class and could be as verbally aggressive and
forthright as any of his members. As Hobsbawm said of the
labour aristocrat: he 'might wear a top hat and think on
business matters exactly like his employer, but when the
pickets were out against the boss, he knew exactly what to do.

The miners' unions in Yorkshire did not fulfill the hopes
raised by the achievement of mass membership in the early
1870s - hopes of forming and developing independent agencies,
controlled by miners. Instead, their leaders negotiated
alliances with various other community groups and individuals
- from the representatives of the handloom weavers and the
Sheffield trades in the very earliest months of the S.Y.M.A.,
to the highly politicised Radical lower middle class of
Barnsley in the later years of the period - in their search
for an identity and as a safeguard against any possible
resurgence of a common front among the fragmented employer-
class of the district.

Until the late 1880s, these alliances were rarely tested
in conflict situations. The land and coalowning classes, on

---

1 In terms of income, the professional leaders
of South Yorkshire were in a class of their
own. Pickard received a salary of £514 p.a.
in 1894; Frith and Parrott got £154 each
(Barnsley Chronicle, 21 July 1894).
It would be wrong to over-emphasise the
relative affluence of these men (though
perhaps not their relative security of income)
as Challinor comes close to doing in
Alexander MacDonald and the Miners, p.31.

2 E.J.Hobsbawm, Labouring Men, p.323.
the whole, lacked the ability or the will to press home what should have been an advantageous economic position. Typical of their inability to muster their latent strength was their concession of the Eight Hour Day, virtually as custom and practice, for much of this period. The district offered the miners relatively good housing, free of their employers' control, physical amenities or the promise of them through the dense network of local boards of health, and even institutions in which a few of their spokesmen could participate. This and other aspects of the material and socio-political environment enabled the union leaders to sell the moderation of 'MacDonaldism' to the South Yorkshire miners right into the 1880s. In the later years of that decade, the coincidence of the alliance with the Radicals and the formation of the M.F.G.B. ensured the continuity of the leadership traditions, even if the policy-makers had to prove rather more flexible than John Normansell.

Real progress on wages and conditions were made in this period. Gregory points out the improvement in the miners' lot generally over the second half of the nineteenth century: 'many of the older men could doubtless remember a time when the rest of society looked on them as not much more than dangerous and violent savages'. The leaders' constant re-emphasis of the early achievements of their peers and predecessors usually silenced all but the most determined of their critics; and the latter's inability to define a viable alternative, at least until the early 1890s, ensured the survival of the old leaders. Large numbers of miners disagreed with their leaders' handling of wage issues, contributing to, as Challinor puts it: 'a differentiation that resulted in miners' anger often being expressed against union leaders rather than the employers'. But articulate spokesmen of the mass view were almost everywhere missing, culturally isolated
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or otherwise muzzled by their inability to use the established and legitimate channels of the union platform and, to a lesser extent, the community institutions.

Industrial moderation, then, held the centre of the miners' stage in our district, by means of a combination of a favourable industrial and social environment and a leadership whose attitudes were shaped by this environment; and, to a certain extent, who succeeded because their attitudes were compatible with it. They were motivated, moreover, to ride out the short-term economic difficulties which put an unusual amount of strain on the relationship between the miners and the employing class. When the leaders' hold over the miners' loyalties was weakened - especially between the late 1870s and the late 1880s - any increase in the expression of militancy was limited by a less easily definable web of community controls which also gave public credibility to the working class leadership in more favourable years. This, rather than the fear of unemployment through economic failure, seems to have limited the miners' willingness to resort to industrial action to defend or advance wages.

Political moderation amongst the miners was the hoped for outcome of the ability and willingness of influential interest groups in the district to accommodate the miners within the local institutional infrastructure. This accommodation seemed, to the more far-sighted, to be more and more mandatory as the district's economy grew more dependent on mining as the period progressed. The accommodation was spearheaded not by the major employers but by the lower middle class Liberals and Radicals, urged on by a few influential voices among the established non-mining working class (especially in Barnsley). But, with a few notable exceptions - the Denaby Main Colliery Co., and Earl Fitzwilliam, in particular, though with distinctly different methods - the mining and many other employers, though predominantly Tory, did not erect
insuperable barriers to this accommodation. Similarly, few indulged in the sort of protracted industrial confrontation which irretrievably soured workplace relations and made the miners involved wary of contact with middle class institutions. To what extent this restraint on the part of the coalowners was voluntary and the product of a realistic assessment of the benefits of a socially integrated labour force; or alternatively to what extent it was a function of the new employers' - particularly the coalowners' - failure to constitute a cohesive local oligarchy, remains to be seen.

The existence of a high level of proletarian republican activity in the 1870s; the sheer effectiveness - despite their numerical insignificance - of the independent labour spokesmen in and around Barnsley; and the discontent vociferated and enacted by groups of young miners towards the end of our period, sound warning notes at anyone attempting to stamp a rigid political stereotype on this district. Enough contradictions and exceptions can be found, moreover, to frustrate attempts to devise an easy rule of thumb with respect to industrial militancy. Also, the close-knit nature of web of communities and the mobility of much of the workforce and several of the employers, renders inter-community comparisons difficult. There does appear, however, to have been room for variations in the structure and policies of coalownership to have had profound effects on the balance of social control and on the mood of the miners in a few localities. In Denaby and the Fitzwilliam communities, these considerations outshone all the other variables, including notions of the 'isolated mass' and considerations of size. This study has laid great emphasis on these and other examples - the communities and collieries at the poles of several continua in order to highlight the fact that most industrial and residential communities tended to cluster well away from those poles. The strength and persistence of Lib-Labism beyond our period was the most tangible indicator of this cohesive centripetal tendency which was embodied in South Yorkshire's industrial as much as in its political history before 1914.
Miners' leaders (resident in the study area) who regularly performed roles at district level (other than the full-time officials).

Sam Broadhead (Warren Vale)
George Cragg (Church Lane)
Joseph Fletcher (Wombwell Main)
Isaac Haigh (Strafford Main)
Thomas Haigh (Strafford Main)
Dan Halford (Silkstone Main and Wath Main)
Fred Hall (Aldwarke)
William Longley (Stanhope Silkstone)
David Moulson (Warren Vale)
James Murray (Barrow)
George Senior (Thorncliffe Drift)
William Silkstone (Warren Vale)
Israel Stringer (Clarke's Silkstone)
James Wadsworth (Wharncliffe Silkstone)
Sam Woffinden (Elsecar)

Sources: minute books of the S.Y.M.A. and the Y.M.A.; local press.
Prominent miners' spokesmen who did not regularly perform roles at district level.

William Annables (Thrybergh Hall)
Thomas Bailey (Manvers Main)
John Cooper (Manvers Main)
John Dixon (Denaby Main)
Levi Dyson (Barrow)
Albert Earnshaw (Woolley)
Richard Holden (Church Lane and Monk Bretton)
Edward Jones (Oaks and Cortonwood)
James Marsland (Silkstone Fall and Denaby Main)
John Rowney (Manvers Main)
Edward Rymer (Darfield Main, Silkstone Main, Manvers Main, Wombwell Main, Monk Bretton, Rylands Main)
Joseph Sheldon (Wombwell Main)
Edwin Somerset (Thorncliffe Drift)
Thomas Taylor (Church Lane and Rylands Main)
Edward Thorne (Church Lane)
John Whyatt (Wombwell Main)

Sources: as for Appendix 1.
APPENDIX 3

List of known disputes at major pits in the study area (of four days' duration or more).

1855 Old Mill
1856 Oaks
1857 Wharncliffe Silkstone
1858 District-wide
   Oaks
   Elsecar and Parkgate
1859 Edmunds Main
   East Gawber
   Wharncliffe Silkstone
1860 District-wide
   Clarke's Silkstone
   Edmunds Main
   Oaks
1861 Edmunds Main
   Oak
1862 None
1863 None
1864 District-wide
   Oaks
   Blacker Main
1865 Thrybergh Hall
   Darley Main
   Strafford Main
1866 Thorncliffe
   Blacker Main
   Thrybergh Hall
   Mount Osborne
   Darley Main
   Warren Vale
1867 Wombwell Main
   Edmunds Main
   Silkstone Fall
1868 Silkstone Fall
   Victoria
   Darley Main
   Hallroyd
1869 Denaby Main
   Edmunds Main
   Silkstone Fall
1870 Hoyland and Elsecar
1871 Monk Bretton
   High Stile
1872 Silkstone Main
   Strafford Main
1873 Stubbin
   Rosa and Old Mill
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1874 Hoyland Silkstone (2) | Stubbin
       Hallroyd | Oaks
       Church Lane | Darston
       Monk Bretton | High Stile
       Stafford Main

1875 Denaby (2)
       Stubbin
       High Stile (2)
       Rosa and Old Mill
       Mount Osborne
       Silkstone Fall

1876 District-wide
       Wentworth Silkstone
       Silkstone Main
       Mitchell Main
       Wharncliffe Woodmoor

1877 Denaby Main
       Church Lane
       Hoyland Silkstone

1878 Rosa and Old Mill
       Hoyland Silkstone
       Higham
       Mitchell Main
       Hallroyd
       Warren Vale

1879 Hoyland Silkstone
       Rockingham
       Monk Bretton
       Martins Main

1880 Barrow
       Hoyland Silkstone

1881 District-wide

1882 Elsecar

1883 Oaks

1884 Barrow

1885 District-wide
       Aldwarke Main
       Monk Bretton

1886 Denaby

1887 Church Lane

1888 Stratford Main
       Church Lane
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Location 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Clarke's Silkstone</td>
<td>Hoyland Silkstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlton Main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>District-wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Houghton Main</td>
<td>Church Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Hoyland Silkstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>District-wide</td>
<td>Rylands Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Aldwarke</td>
<td>Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cortonwood</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: see Table 10.
### APPENDIX 4

Residence, economic interests and trading status of the proprietors of major collieries in the district.

Method: Column 3 - up to four of the principal partners/shareholders have been considered. As in other columns, only the longest standing proprietorship group has been considered unless ownership was shared evenly in terms of years by two groups, in which case, both groups are dealt with. 'Local' residence implies habitual residence in the district or its immediate surroundings (including Sheffield and Rotherham). If the leading proprietors of a colliery are evenly split in terms of residence, the colliery is defined as 'mixed'. Column 4 - this refers to place of residence of two or more of the leading proprietors. Column 5 - known interests either in terms of full-time occupations or investment. Column 6 evidence of interests in other South Yorkshire collieries (named) on behalf of one or more of these proprietors, or in pits in other coalfields (coalfields only named). Column 7 - collieries only confirmed as limited liability if they had this status for ten years or more in the period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collieries, or colliery groups under co-ownership</td>
<td>Title of firm</td>
<td>Residential base of major owning interest</td>
<td>Specific location of outside interests</td>
<td>Other main economic interests</td>
<td>Location of other colliery interests</td>
<td>Limited liability or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aldwarke Main</td>
<td>John Brown &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colliery/steel</td>
<td>Carr House, Cortonwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Barrow</td>
<td>Barrow Haematite Steel Co.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>Colliery/Steel</td>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blacker Main</td>
<td>Blacker Main Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Darfield Main</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Denaby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( &amp; Pindar Oaks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Darley Main</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croft and Batty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Denaby Main</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>West Yorks</td>
<td>Colliery/</td>
<td>West Yorks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( &amp; Cadeby Main)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carpets</td>
<td>Woolley, Darfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Edmunds/Swaithe Main</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Mitchell Main,</td>
<td>Cortonwood, Wombwell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Collieries Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>East Gawber</td>
<td>R. Craik &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Linen/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bleaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elsecar</td>
<td>Earl Fitzwilliam</td>
<td>Land/iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( &amp; Stubbins)</td>
<td></td>
<td>mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Houghton Main</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Tyneside</td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Tyneside</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houghton Main Collieries Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hoyland Silkstone</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Coal &amp; Coke Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lundhill (&amp; Brampton)</td>
<td>Lundhill Coal Co.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>West Yorks</td>
<td>Bleaching/</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Manvers Main</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Tyneside</td>
<td>Colliery/</td>
<td>Tyneside, South Kirby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manvers Main Collieries Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mitchell Main</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>East Yorks/</td>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>Edmunds/ Swaithe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell Main Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Monk Bretton</td>
<td>Mixed/</td>
<td>West Yorks</td>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>Mount Osborne, etc.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monk Bretton Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mount Osborne</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( &amp; Old Mill, Agnes &amp; Rosa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Newton, Chambers'</td>
<td>Newton, Chambers &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>North Gawber</td>
<td>Thorpe's</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>West Yorks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( &amp; Darton Hall</td>
<td>Gawber Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Willow Bank)</td>
<td>Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Oaks</td>
<td>Firth, Barber &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/C.Cammell &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Roundwood</td>
<td>Cooper, Sellars</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Aldwarke, Wath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Silkstone Main/ (Various)</td>
<td>Mixed/</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Darton, South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanhope</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Sutcliffe &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Other small pits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wath Main</td>
<td>Wath Main Coal Co.</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colliery</td>
<td>Aldwarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>Coopers &amp; Co</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silkstone ( &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worsborough Park &amp; Rockley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wharncliffe</td>
<td>Wharncliffe</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coal merchant Wombwell, railways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silkstone</td>
<td>Silkestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cortonwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colliery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wombwell Main</td>
<td>Wombwell Main Co.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colliery/</td>
<td>Cortonwood,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>Edmunds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wharncliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silkstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Woolley</td>
<td>Woolley Colliery</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>West Yorks.</td>
<td>Colliery/</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>Denaby, Darfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Yorks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collieries in Silkstone and Dodworth townships (Swinton had no surface colliery operations other than one or two of the Charlesworths' subsidiary pits).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Church Lane (<em>&amp; Higham)</em></td>
<td>Old Silkstone &amp; Dodworth Coal and Iron Co.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Lancs</td>
<td>Cotton, iron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Clarkes' *</td>
<td>R.C. Clarke (and Trustees)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Hallroyd (<em>&amp; Silkstone Common)</em></td>
<td>Haynes &amp; Lawton/ South Yorks.</td>
<td>Local/ Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Moorend</td>
<td>W. Crowther</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Nabbs</td>
<td>J. Ownsworth</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Rose Hill</td>
<td>G. Senior</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Silkstone Fall * (&amp; Rob Royd)*</td>
<td>Adshead, Booth &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coal merchant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Strafford Main * (&amp; Rob Royd)*</td>
<td>Strafford Colliery Outside Co.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
<td>Professional, commercial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Major collieries.

APPENDIX 4 cont. (Sources:)

APPENDIX 5

List of prominent manufacturers and other members of the resident middle class.

N.B. This list does not claim to be completely comprehensive, even given the validity of the parameters of preminance (see p. 482). Obituaries in the local press were rare before 1870, and the eastern end of the district was badly served by the Rotherham Advertiser, remedied in 1877 by the appearance of the Mexborough and Swinton Times.

Occupation/economic interest; resident township; major institutional roles/politics/religion (if known); predominantly pre-/post-1874 (if this is relevant).

T. Allen watchmaker; Barnsley; local board, guardian, school board, Liberal, Quakers.

H. A. Allport colliery managing director (Wharncliffe Woodmoor); Dodworth; local board, Tory, Wesleyan; post-1874.

T. Barron glass bottle manufacturer; Mexborough; local board, overseer, Tory.

W. Batty colliery owner (Darley Main and Pindar Oaks); Worsborough; local board and urban district council, school board, magistrate, Tory, Wesleyan.

F. Boocock builder; Wombwell; local board, guardian, Tory; post-1874.

J. Bower building contractor; Swinton; local board, urban district council, vestry, Liberal, Church, post-1874.

C. Brady draper; Barnsley; town council and county council, Liberal, Quakers.

G. Brown tailor and property owner; Barnsley; town council, volunteers, Liberal.

G. J. Burnley colliery managing proprietor (North Gawber, Darton Main, Woolley Beamshaw, Haigh); Darton; local board, Tory; post-1874.

W. Burrows draper; Barnsley; guardian, town council, overseer, Liberal.

J. Canter linen manufacturer; Barnsley; town council, Liberal; pre-1874.

J. Carnelly linen manufacturer; Barnsley; local board; pre-1874.
A.M. Chambers colliery owner (Thorncliff) and iron manufacturer; Chapeltown; rural district council, parish council, school board, magistrate, Liberal Unionist, Wesleyan (local preacher) to Church.

G. Chambers colliery owner (Thorncliff) and iron manufacturer; Chapeltown; Liberal, Wesleyan, pre-1874.

W.H. Chambers colliery manager (Denaby Main); Conisborough; guardian, rural sanitary authority and rural district council, Tory, Church; post-1874.

J. Cheatter colliery managing director (Monk Bretton); Monk Bretton; local board, Tory, Church.

J. Cook corn miller; Barnsley; town council, Liberal, United Methodist.

S. Cooper colliery owner (Wentworth Silkstone, Worsborough Park, Rockley); Worsborough; Tory, Church.

R. Craik bleacher and colliery owner (East Gawber); Barnsley; local board, Liberal; pre-1874.

G. Dawes iron manufacturer; Hoyland; local board, Tory.

G. Dawson ironworks manager (Thorncliff); Chapeltown; county council, school board, magistrate, Liberal, Wesleyan.

W. Day colliery owner (Mount Osborne, Old Hill, Rosa, Agnes and - for a while - Monk Bretton); Monk Bretton; local board (Barnsley).

C.W. Fincken colliery manager (Hoyland Silkstone); Hoyland; local board, county council; Liberal; post-1874.

H. Fountain colliery owner (North Gawber, Darton Main, Woolley Beamshaw, Haigh); Darton; local board, county council, Tory, Church.

J. Fountain colliery owner (as H. Fountain); Barnsley; local board, Tory, Church; post-1874.

B. Hague general dealer and estate agent; Barnsley; local board and town council, co-op., Liberal to Tory.

I. Haigh accountant; Barnsley; town council, co-op., Radical; post-1874.

M. Halton physician; Barnsley; town council, guardian, volunteers, Radical, Catholic.

J. Hanlon schoolmaster; Barnsley; school board, Liberal, Catholic.
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H. Harvey  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; local board, Liberal, Quakers.
C. (and T.) iron founder; Swinton; local board, vestry, school board, Liberal, Congregationalist.
J. Haynes  colliery owner (Hallroyd); Silkstone; guardian, vestry, Tory, Church.
R. Inns  iron founder; Barnsley; local board and town council, school board, guardian, magistrate, etc., Tory, Church.
F. G. Jackson  physician; Barnsley; local board, Liberal, Church.
W. Jackson  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; local board, Tory, Church.
E. Kay  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; town council, Liberal, Wesleyan.
W. Kemp  glass manufacturer; Swinton; local board, guardian, Liberal.
J. Kenworthy  iron founder; Silkstone/Barnsley; local board, vestry, Tory.
C. Lingard  newspaper proprietor; Barnsley; town council, guardian, Liberal, Wesleyan; post-1874.
T. Marsden  paper manufacturer and colliery owner (Winter colliery); Monk Bretton/Cawthorne; town council, school board, magistrate, Tory, Church; post-1874.
B. Marshall  solicitor; Barnsley; town council, Liberal.
J. Mitchell snr. iron manufacturer and colliery owner (Edmunds and Swaith Main and Mitchell Main); Worsborough/Bolton; local board, school board, guardian, county council, magistrate, Tory, Wesleyan.
E. Newman  solicitor; Barnsley; town council, magistrate, Liberal.
T. Newton snr. iron manufacturer and colliery owner (Thorncliffe); Chapeltown; vestry, Liberal, Wesleyan; pre-1874.
W. H. Oxley  steel manufacturer; Rawmarsh; local board, guardian, Liberal; pre-1874.
E. Parker  bleacher/yarn agent; Barnsley; local board, co-op., Liberal.
W. Peckett  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; local board, Liberal, Quakers; pre-1874.
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H. Pigott  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; town council, county council, school board, magistrate, Liberal, Wesleyan; post-1874.

J. B. Pigott  linen manufacturer; Barnsley; local board, town council, Liberal, Wesleyan; pre-1874.

R. Pybus  newspaper proprietor; Barnsley; local board, Tory.

G. Raley  solicitor; Barnsley; town council, school board, Liberal, Wesleyan; post-1874.

H. Richardson  linen manufacturer; Dodworth; local board (Barnsley and Dodworth), school board (Barnsley), Liberal, Wesleyan.

D. Rylands  glass manufacturer and colliery owner (Rylands Main); Ardsley/Barnsley; town council, Tory, Church.

S. Seal  quarry contractor; Darfield; county council, vestry, guardian, Liberal, Congregationalist.

B. Sellars  colliery owner (Wath Main and Roundwood - part shares in both); Rawmarsh; local board, county council, Liberal.

George Senior  property and colliery speculator (Rose Hill, Dodworth, plus investments in Derbyshire coalfield); Dodworth/Barnsley; local board, guardian, Tory, Church.

Guy Senior  brewer, Barnsley; local board, town council, Tory.

J. Shaw  ironfounder; Barnsley; town council, school board, Liberal, Congregationalist.

J. S. Spencer  bleacher; Dodworth/Barnsley; local board (Dodworth), guardian (Worsborough), Liberal; pre-1874.

J. F. Thompson  colliery managing director (Manvers Main); Adwick upon Dearne; local board (Wath).

W. Tune  brewer; Barnsley; town council, Tory.

J. Tyas  solicitor and colliery owner (Edmunds and Swaithe Main and Wombwell Main); Barnsley/Worsborough; local board, town council, school board, Tory, Church.

P. Waddington  glass manufacturer; Mexborough; local board, Tory.

J. H. Watson  insurance agent (of independent means); Mexborough; local board, county council, Liberal.
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G. Wheelhouse, bleachworks manager; Barnsley; town council, co-op., Radical, Wesleyan (local preacher); post-1874.

S. Whitworth, brewer; Wath; local board, guardian, county council; Tory.

T. Wilkinson, grain merchant; Ardsley/Barnsley; town council; Tory.

E. Wood, flint glass manufacturer; Worsborough/Barnsley; town council, Liberal, Baptist.

Sources: Barnsley Chronicle, Mexborough and Swinton Times and Rotherham Advertiser, 1858-1917; Occurrences and Events of Interest in Barnsley and District 1229-1922.
The occupational structure of boards of health and councils in selected townships and in selected years.

N.B. Bleachworks proprietors are classed as 'large manufacturers'; innkeepers are classed as 'shopkeepers/small tradesmen'; those styled simply as 'gentlemen' have been grouped with 'others' who include builders (other than small joiners), grain merchants and maltsters.

### Barnsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1869</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linen manufacturers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron founders and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery proprietors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers, tailors,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yarn merchants and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outfitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other shopkeepers/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small tradesmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inc. managers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dodworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1865</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1894 (U.D.C.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colliery proprietors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers/small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradesmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery managers and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wombwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1865</th>
<th>1874</th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1894 (U.D.C.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colliery proprietors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers/small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradesmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery managers and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 6 cont.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monk Bretton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1894 (U.D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery proprietors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large manufacturers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers/small tradesmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery manager and senior staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Swinton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1894 (U.D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery proprietors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large manufacturers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers/small tradesmen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliery managers and senior staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Barnsley Chronicle; Mexborough and Swinton Times; Almanacks; White's Directories.
APPENDIX 7

Glossary of mining terms used in the thesis.

Adit, dayhole, drift: a mineshaft, or the pit to which it led, which was not vertical but which permitted entry and egress on foot.

Bank, benk: the coal face of an individual stall. The pillar and stall system was the method of extracting coal to be found in most South Yorkshire pits.

Banksman: a senior surface labourer responsible for the safe operation of the shaft haulage system and in particular for the giving of signals.

Blacklegs, blacksheep: strikebreakers, usually not union members.

Colliery: the combined operations connected with the coal industry centred on a coal mine. A pit was sometimes a synonym for colliery, or could mean just a mineshaft and its associated underground workings.

Confiscation: the practice of subtracting the contents of inadequately filled coal tubs from a faceworker’s quota.

Corf: a coal tub.

Datallers, daymen, daywagemen: the class of colliery labour employed at a fixed daily wage. These workers rarely undertook any tasks by the piece.

Firemen, firetriers: senior daywagemen (often deputies) who inspected workings by means of igniting small pockets of accumulated gas.

Hewer: the term used most commonly in this thesis for faceworkers. These men were often known, ambiguously, in South Yorkshire as colliers.

Hurriers, trammers: both these terms came to be used generally for underground haulage hands, usually boys.
APPENDIX 7 cont.

**Longwall:** the method of extracting coal by advancing a wide coal face without leaving wasteful pillars, as in the more usual system in South Yorkshire.

**Motty:** the token which identified a faceworker and was placed in his coal tub before its journey to the surface.

**Riddles:** wide-mesh sieves used underground for sorting the large coal from the small.

**Screening:** the process of sorting the size and quality of the coal on the surface, usually after it had been attributed to the miners' quotas.

**Straitwork, deadwork:** the tasks involved in developing new areas of underground working, necessitating the cutting of stone and not coal and hence not directly remunerative to the piece-rate miner.

**Take:** the area within a colliery company's lease.

**Wedging:** the process of cutting coal by manual undermining, rather than by the use of explosives.
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